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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Rhetoric of Social Movements

In a paper presented at the 1946 conference of the Speech Association of America, Herbert A. Wichelns recommended that rhetorical scholars "turn their attention from the individual 'great orator' and undertake research into such selected acts and atmosphere of public address as would permit the study of a multiplicity of speakers, speeches, audiences, and occasions." Acting on Wichelns recommendation, in 1952, Leland Griffin suggested that there were four potential areas of study which could be pursued: the period study, the regional or regional-period study, the case study, and the movement study. He also emphasized that of these four approaches, the movement study had received the least attention. Therefore, to ameliorate the problem, he developed a significant methodology for the study of a historical movement.

More than a decade later, Edwin Black, in his book, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, addressed this same issue. While criticizing aspects of Griffin's methodological approach to the study of movements, Black praised Griffin for "suggesting a reconstitution of the subject matter of rhetorical criticism for the individual speaker or the individual speech to the persuasive movement," thereby
opening a new and exciting prospect for rhetorical criticism. Black, however, expressed two concerns: (1) other than Griffin, there were few movement studies being conducted; and (2) there was no "cogent and reasonably uniform methodology for the movement study beyond Griffin's suggestion of historical relativism."³ In essence, Black concluded that rhetorical critics had achieved little more than a promising beginning in the study of social movements.

In 1970, Wayne Brockriede, encouraging a continued expansion from the single speaker approach to rhetorical criticism, argued that a more accurate conception of rhetoric might result if the primacy of the speaker were replaced by an emphasis on people interacting in a situation; if an exclusive emphasis on persuasion were replaced by a recognition that people relate in various ways, and if a preoccupation with the form of a discourse were replaced with a focus on how people act together functionally.⁴ Brockriede was expressing the need to study the protest and dissent demonstrations which overshadowed the 1960s and emerged as an important source of symbolic influence.

Also arguing for a more expansive view of rhetorical criticism, other than exclusive concentration upon the study of public speaking, was Douglas Ehninger who believed that rhetorical studies should "focus on how and in what ways man uses and is used by symbols of inducement...whether they are expressed as speeches, essays, films, dramas, novels, poems, or demonstrations."⁵

Perhaps Golden most appropriately summarizes the reasons for studying social movements when he states:
The study of social movements rather than individual orators or addresses should be the major concern of rhetoricians in the years ahead. Confronted with the enormously complex and persistent social problems, the masses to a large extent, have lost confidence in the ability of a single speaker or a great man to deliver an adequate response. No longer, therefore, are they willing to rely on the eloquence of a Lincoln or a Churchill; instead they are prone to place their faith in some form of collective activity that is rhetorically based. Notwithstanding the abiding concern that psychologists and sociologists have in movements, and despite the pioneering contributions they have made in this field, it is the communication theorist who is best qualified to handle the rhetorical elements always present in this type of discourse.6

The turbulence and unrest generated during the 1960s and early 1970s by social and political movements centered in Civil Rights, the Vietnam War, Women's Liberation, and Gay Rights convinced rhetorical scholars that further research was needed in order to discover the ways in which collectives of individuals, through the use of languaging strategies create, or attempt to create, a new social order.

The tenor of the times dictated the types of social movements upon which critics focused their attention. Because the political pendulum reached its zenith with the revolutionary rhetoric of the "New Left" many rhetoricians concentrated upon those conflicts existing between aggressor spokespersons, who advocated social change, and defendant spokespersons who defended the status quo. Therefore, "establishment-conflict" theories and their related studies are numerous. However, as society entered the late 1970s, the political pendulum was returning to its mid-point, revolutionary rhetoric was waning, and more moderate means of accomplishing changes in the
society were being explored. These emerging movements, which deny any conflict with the established order, have received attention from only two rhetorical scholars, Ralph Smith and Russell Windes, who established a unique theory for the study of "innovational movements."

In the early years of the 1980s, the political pendulum is swinging past the middle and the rhetoric of the "Conservative Right" is emerging. It is upon the reform and revivalist movements being spawned by this conservative trend in the American social milieu that rhetorical critics can focus their attention. Studies need to be conducted so that rhetoricians can expand their knowledge of the ways in which various organized collectivities use language to construct and propagate social realities as social movements. In a word, rhetorical critics can fulfill their functions of formulating new theoretical principals concerning social movements and testing and validating those rhetorical theories already in existence.

The National Association for Neighborhood Schools

A social movement that is reflective of the conservative rhetoric prevalent in today's society is the National Association for Neighborhood Schools (NANS), an "anti-busing" organization that encourages nationally, as well as locally, organized political activism to stop court-ordered desegregation of the public schools. The purpose of NANS is:
to stop forced busing as well as federal intervention in schools either by Constitutional Amendment or by such other means as may be necessary to accomplish this objective. We can do this by enlisting the support of people in your community to join with representatives in the Congress and state legislatures to stop forced busing.8

NANS leaders maintain a loose affiliation with the Conservative Caucus "which is thought to be the key connection of the New Right's grassroots organizing efforts for candidates and causes."9 The dream of this caucus is "to place hundreds, perhaps thousands of activists in every congressional district in the country, something like a network of Committees for the Defense of the Counter-Revolution"10 in efforts to change current political policies. This concept will be discussed in depth later as part of the rhetorical situation. However, the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan as President of the United States served to indicate that the Conservative Caucus has experienced some degree of success in accomplishing its goals. Its affiliates, therefore, deserve to be recognized and studied by the rhetorical critic. Karlyn Campbell argues: "the social critic applies the concepts developed in academic criticism which tests, refines, and elaborates symbolic forms and processes. It is the social critic who appraises contemporary acts before all their consequences are known."11 This study of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools is a social criticism designed to place an argument before the public in an effort to stimulate thought and discussion. In doing this, our knowledge of rhetorical theory is enhanced.
The National Association for Neighborhood Schools also merits study because it is a social movement whose strategies and objectives have evolved and matured with the times. Since 1954, when the United States Supreme Court decreed that "separate educational facilities were inherently unequal" and ordered the abolition of dual school systems throughout the country, school desegregation was and continues to be one of the most salient social issues confronting the American people. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, initial desegregation attempts, which were concentrated in the Southern states, met with fierce resistance from whites who used every tactic from judicial delay to mass protests and violence in efforts to prohibit black and white children from attending the same public schools. As a result, the term "desegregation" became synonymous with "violence." Across the South, white supremacy groups, fighting to preserve the sanctity of segregation, clashed with state troops and federal marshalls sent in to protect and preserve the right of black children to attend formerly all white schools. Northern liberals, unaware that their own schools were also deeply mired in the vestiges of segregation, were appalled by the bigotry and hatred exhibited by their Southern neighbors. Foreign news broadcasts of the disruption and violence indicated to the world that all was not well in the land that bases its existence upon freedom and equality. Besides presenting a negative image to the world, the Southern struggle to preserve the status quo of segregation was, indeed, an embarrassment to the entire nation. Eventually, however, the voice of reason prevailed and Southerners, though still
opposed to desegregation, realized its inevitability and refrained from the use of violence as a means of voicing that opposition.

During this same period, the late 1960s and early 1970s, the segregative practices of Northern school districts were being scrutinized by desegregation advocates. In the election of 1972, Richard Nixon succeeded in making school desegregation, particularly "forced busing," a political issue. His public opposition and efforts to impede the transportation of pupils for the purpose of desegregation occurred at the same time that Northern school districts were involved in court litigation. Many Northerners, particularly those living in urban areas, were being told by the Supreme Court and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to desegregate their schools. Many Northerners, however, believing that their segregated schools were the result of housing patterns over which they had little control rather than de jure segregation, felt that federal agencies had little right to intervene. In efforts to protect and preserve their neighborhoods as well as the concept of the neighborhood school, some Northern whites resorted to the same "violence in the street" tactics as their Southern predecessors and their contemporaries who opposed the Vietnam War.

Battle lines were drawn as school boards, as well as local, state, and national politicians, divided along liberal-conservative ideologies, thus intensifying the political arena of desegregation. In some cities school board members were successful in arousing public anger by openly defying court rulings. The Ku Klux Klan, long a Southern bastion for white racism, gained Northern converts and
new white supremacy groups were organized. Housewives and mothers, influenced by the women's movement, became chief organizers and spokespersons for the "anti-busers." One of the most prominent women of the anti-busers was Louise Day Hicks of the Boston School Committee, who preached violence rather than peaceful compliance with school desegregation orders. And similar to a decade before, media reports fed the American public a steady diet of anti-busing rhetoric, protest demonstrations, and riots between anti-busers, pro-busers, and/or police which occurred in cities such as Pontiac, Detroit, Boston, and Louisville. Again, desegregation had become synonymous with violence.

However, this violence, which placed children in the middle of the confrontation, thus endangering their safety and well-being, finally became alarming to millions of American people. The violence oriented anti-busers had created a negative image for themselves, and as much as people opposed desegregation, they had reached a point where they opposed violence even more. Many wished for a peaceful resolution to the problem and expended their efforts to achieve that goal. A non-violent form of protest that was acceptable to the American people was needed. And it was the National Association for Neighborhood Schools which answered that need in the most American way possible--through the courts and the ballot box. Legal and political activism are the major strategies employed by the NANS and almost every other social movement that is currently active in the early
1980s. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the rhetorical critic to study these acts of man so as to better understand man himself.

Purpose and Methodology of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the rhetoric of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools in an effort to contribute information to our knowledge of the rhetoric of collective behavior, both theoretically and in terms of assessing the role of rhetoric in our society. To achieve this purpose, the study focuses on three primary questions: (1) What was the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools? (2) What rhetorical strategies were employed by the NANS to create a rhetorical vision as a response to the situation? (3) What rhetorical roles and problems were assumed by the NANS' leadership?

Scott and Brock, like some critics, believe that rhetorical criticism is in a pre-paradigmatic stage with many theories competing for acceptance. However, contemporary critics argue for methodological variety demanded by Albert J. Croft who stated, "A pluralistic approach to research is the only intellectually defensible position." Because various systems focus on different rhetorical aspects of a movement, it is incumbent upon the critic to determine which system(s) best highlights the characteristics of the rhetoric being studied so that the purpose of criticism, which is to describe, to analyze, and to evaluate the products of man, can be fulfilled.
Essentially, the methodology employed in the study of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools is centered in three essays which concentrate on key rhetorical theories which are significant for the study of a social movement. Lloyd F. Bitzer, in "The Rhetorical Situation," argues that "situation is the source and ground of rhetorical activity...and therefore of rhetorical criticism." He emphasizes that rhetoric can have meaning only when it is understood in the context of the situation in which it occurred. Bitzer prescribes the requirements for and the features of the rhetorical situation and the way it should be treated by the critic.

The discovery and appreciation of rhetorical visions should be one of the functions of criticism, according to Ernest Bormann in "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality." Bormann argues that the critic can make a useful contribution to understanding the movement and its adherents if he can illuminate how "people who participated in the rhetorical vision related to one another, how they arranged themselves into social hierarchies, how they acted to achieve their goals, and how they were aroused by the manifest content of their rhetoric." Bormann theorizes about the ways in which fantasy themes are woven into the dramas that create the rhetorical vision and the critical method to be used by the critic studying the social reality of the rhetorical movement.

Assuming a sociological perspective for the study of a movement, Herbert Simons, writing in "Requirements, Problems, and
Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," develops a leader-centered approach for the study of social movements. Simons outlines the rhetorical dilemmas confronting those who lead reform and revolutionary movements. He examines the requirements the leader must fulfill, the problems faced by the leader, and the rhetorical strategies the leader may adopt to meet the requirements. Simons emphasizes that the primary rhetorical test of the leader is his ability to resolve or reduce the rhetorical problems he encounters. If the leader succeeds, the movement will succeed; if the leader fails to solve the rhetorical problems of the movement, in all probability, the movement will also fail.

The Rhetorical Situation. When posing the question, "What is a rhetorical situation?" the critic is concerned with the nature of those contexts in which speakers create rhetorical discourse, methods of description, their characteristics, and how they result in the creation of rhetoric.

Bitzer defines the rhetorical situation as "a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence." Prior to the creation and presentation of discourse there are three constituents of any rhetorical situation: the exigence, the audience, and the constraints. "The exigence is an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something
waiting to be done."20 "A rhetorical audience consists only of those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change."21 "Constraints are made up of persons, events, objects, and relations which are part of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence."22

The rhetorical situation invites discourse which is a fitting response prescribed by the situation; the situation is realistic, exhibiting structures which are either simple or complex; and rhetorical situations either mature and decay or mature and persist.

Fantasy Themes and Rhetorical Visions. Information gained from research conducted in small groups behavior has implications for rhetorical theory. Robert Bales discovered the process in which zero-history groups remove themselves from the "here-and-now" by engaging in the creation of fantasy themes. These themes could be a recollection of group experience which occurred in the past or a dream of what the group might do in the future and they serve the important function of developing a common culture. When group members respond emotionally to the dramatic situation they publicly proclaim some commitment to an attitude. Dramas also imply motive and by chaining into the fantasy the members gain motivations. Values, attitudes, religious, and political dramas are tested and legitimized as common to the group through the process of fantasy chains. Individual members feel that they have entered a new reality
inhabited by heroes, villains, saints, and enemies, but nonetheless, a reality that seems more real than their everyday world.

Bormann argues that these dramatic moments are not confined to small groups, but have application for larger groups hearing a public speech. "The dramatizations, which catch on and chain out in small groups are worked into public speeches and into the mass media and, in turn, spread out across larger publics, serve to sustain the members' sense of community, to impel them strongly to action, and to provide them with a social reality filled with heroes, villains, emotions, and attitudes."23

The composite dramas which catch up large groups of people in a symbolic reality is the rhetorical vision.

A rhetorical vision is constructed from fantasy themes that chain out in face-to-face interacting groups, in speaker-audience transactions, in viewers of television broadcasts, in listeners to radio programs, and in all the diverse settings for public and intimate communication in a given society. Once such a rhetorical vision emerges it contains dramatis personae and typical plot lines that can be alluded to in all communication contexts and spark a response reminiscent of the original emotional chain. The relationship between a rhetorical vision and a specific fantasy theme within a message explains why so much 'persuasive' communication repeats what the audience already knows.24

Similar to small groups, rhetorical movements are also composed of fantasy chains, public fantasy events, and a rhetorical vision. A small group meets to discuss a problem; a theme is dramatized, catches on in the group and is chained out; a common symbolic reality complete with heroes and villains form more dramas; the group
goes public and adds converts; a public message for the masses is developed; listeners are carried to a world which seems more real than the one in which they live; the rhetorical vision is spread and the rhetorical movement emerges. If the rhetorical vision is emotionally satisfying then the members of the movement are not troubled by contradictory evidence from their practical experience.

An important assumption made by the critic conducting an analysis is that words or the rhetoric are the social reality; meanings, emotions associated with meanings, and motives are embedded in the expressions of the message of the rhetorical vision. "When a critic begins with the approach that each rhetorical vision contains as part of its substance the motive that will impel the people caught up in it, he can not only anticipate the behavior of the converts," but he can also attribute motives to that behavior based upon the language of the rhetorical vision. In this way, the critic can make a valuable contribution towards understanding the reasons as to why man behaves as he does.

A Leader-Centered Perspective. Simons begins with the assumption that if they are to experience success, leaders of social movements must fulfill the same rhetorical tasks as leaders of private corporations or government agencies: "(1) they must attract, maintain, and mold workers into an efficiently organized unit; (2) they must secure adoption of their product by the larger structure; and (3) they must react to resistance generated by the larger structure."
Since the leader of a social movement can expect minimal internal control of group members and maximum external resistance from the established society, he must constantly balance the conflicting demands on his position and the movement he represents. At times these rhetorical acts will seem incompatible and counterproductive, however failure to meet these demands will result in the disintegration of the movement. This disintegration can usually be traced to one of three factors: (1) in order to deal with outside pressures a movement may lose sight of its ideological values and become pre-occupied with power for its own sake; (2) it may go to the opposite extreme and in its efforts to remain true to its ideology, forsake the strategies and tactics necessary for implementation of its program; or (3) to attract membership from those with dissimilar interests, the movement may dilute its ideology, waste time on peripheral issues, or abandon its substantive concerns and exist solely to provide membership satisfaction.

Striving to keep the movement intact, the leader is constantly faced with choices between ethical and expediential considerations. The leader may be confronted with the following dilemmas: (1) If the movement consists of members who so strongly identify with their cause and feel that any means to achieve their end are acceptable, the leader may mask the goals of the movement, deny the use of taboo tactics, promise what he cannot deliver, or exaggerate the strength of the movement. If he objects too strongly to the use of militant tactics, he may lose his following. (2) The leader may also need to
distort, conceal, and exaggerate the ideologies and generalized beliefs of the movement. He must define the social situation in ambiguous terms, create structures for anxiety and targets for hostility, foster in-group feelings, and articulate the belief that the movement will succeed. He then faces the problem of creating rationalizations for the deceptions when outsiders discover the truth, or worse, he could come to believe his own lies. (3) The leader must constantly balance the movement's need for efficiency with the members' need to participate in the decision-making. (4) The leader is constantly faced with conflicts between role expectations and role definitions. He must appear to be what he cannot be; he must skillfully manipulate all situations. (5) In an age of mass media, he must adapt his rhetoric to several audiences simultaneously. (6) Movements require a diversity of leadership types with whom any one leader must compete and cooperate. Different phases of the movement require a different leadership style.

Simons contends that leaders of social movements will fall along a continuum from the sweet and reasonable to the violently revolutionary, with each leadership type having its own rhetorical tactics and style. The moderate leader engages in peaceful persuasion; he is the embodiment of reason, civility, and decorum in human transactions; he reduces the psychological distance between the movement and the establishment. The militant leader, on the other hand, uses rhetoric as an instrument and an act of force; he harasses, cajoles, and threatens the targets of change. Hostility to the establishment is shown through dress, manners, slogans, etc.
While moderate and militant leadership styles are antithetical, it is imperative that the successful leader know when to use each, or when to adopt intermediate strategies in order to accomplish the goals of the movement.

A pluralistic methodological approach which centers on Bitzer's model of the rhetorical situation, Bormann's concept of fantasy themes and rhetorical vision, and Simon's leader-centered perspective serves to highlight those characteristic features of the rhetoric employed by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools as it attempts to create a new social reality for its members and the society-at-large. This pluralistic approach also serves to enhance our knowledge of rhetorical theory which is the primary task of criticism.

Data for this study has been gathered from books, newspapers, news magazines, NANS newsletters, bulletins, pamphlets, and personal interviews. Newspapers surveyed include: New York Times, Washington Post, Louisville Courier-Journal, Indianapolis Star, Columbus Dispatch and the Columbus Citizen-Journal (Ohio); Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Wilmington News (Delaware). Magazines surveyed for this study include: U.S. News and World Report, Time, Newsweek, New Times, Phi Delta Kappa, and the Civil Rights Digest. NANS newsletters and bulletins between the years 1976-1981 have been reviewed. Information such as letters, news articles, and editorials pertaining to the movement or educational matters was provided by the NANS Statistical and Information Center. Minutes of NANS of Columbus
meetings were provided by Anna Mae Durham. In addition, a speech presented by Dr. Ralph Scott, founder of NANS, which was presented in Columbus, Ohio, in October of 1977, has been incorporated into the study.

In order to obtain information concerning the rhetorical problems encountered by the leaders of a movement, four NANS leaders were interviewed. Kaye C. Cook, founder of NANS of Columbus, was selected because she established the first direct NANS affiliate in the nation. She is the Secretary of the national organization and currently serves as a lobbyist for NANS in Washington, D.C. Robert DePrez was selected because he currently serves as NANS' First Vice-President and Director of NANS Statistical and Information Center. DePrez is also a local anti-busing leader in Louisville, Kentucky. Jean Ruffra was selected because she is a former President of NANS, serves on the NANS Board of Directors, and is also an anti-busing leader from Louisville, Kentucky. William D. D'Onofrio was selected because he currently serves as the President of NANS. Originally, Lillian Dannis, a leader from Warren, Michigan, consented to participate in this study; however, because repeated attempts to solicit information were ignored by Dannis, she was eliminated from the interview process.
Chapter Outline

The second chapter of the study answers the question: What is the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools? More specifically, it answers the following questions: What is the exigence being addressed? What is the nature of the rhetorical audience? What are the constraints imposed upon the situation?

The third chapter answers the question: What rhetorical strategies were employed by the NANS to create a rhetorical vision as a response to the situation? In order to answer this question, the study focuses on the manifest content of the fantasy chains that contribute to construction of the rhetorical visions. Specific questions include: Who are the dramatis personae? What are the typical scenarios? What meanings are inherent in the dramas? How does the fantasy theme work to attract the unconverted? How does the movement fit into the scheme of history?

The fourth chapter focuses on the leaders of the NANS and addresses the question: What rhetorical roles and problems are assumed by NANS' leadership? Several specific questions include: What are the rhetorical requirements of the movement which the leaders must meet? How do the leaders meet these requirements? What are the rhetorical problems encountered by the leaders? What rhetorical strategies do they employ to resolve or reduce these problems? What are the ethical dilemmas faced by the leaders of the NANS?
The fifth chapter summarizes the conclusions reached in the previous chapters and then generates the implications of the research as it relates to rhetorical theory and to NANS as a contemporary social movement.

**Review of Literature**

Since literature pertaining to the study of school desegregation is extensive, it is necessary to narrow the focus of this review to include those selections which represent a cross-section of the information available. Even though the various arguments represented by the essays in *The Development of Segregationist Thought* are scientifically and humanistically indefensible, they continue to be implicitly woven into the fabric of contemporary American beliefs and attitudes, thus perpetuating prejudice and racism. *The Ordeal of Desegregation* presents an historical overview of Southern school desegregation and the resistance encountered during the first decade of desegregation. This book serves as a valuable resource for the identification of both opponents and proponents involved in the desegregation struggle. *The Battle of Boston*, on the other hand, is an in-depth analysis of the problems encountered in one of the most volatile confrontations in Northern school desegregation history. This book is beneficial to the rhetorical critic because of its emphasis upon the rhetorical activities of those involved in the movement. *Prejudice and Pride* is a federal report which assesses desegregation progress after twenty-five years. It
accurately reflects the divided opinions of those individuals who work in the area of civil rights and desegregation. This report has been cited by NANS as a support for the argument that even the experts cannot agree on the value of desegregation. The final book, The Busing Cover-Up, written by Ralph Scott, founder of NANS, under the pseudonym of Edward Langerton, presents those arguments most often used by NANS to prove that desegregation is destructive to the American society.

The Development of Segregationist Thought, edited by I. A. Newby, is a collection of essays depicting segregationist thought since 1890. Newby selected 1890 as the starting point for these essays, dealing with the genetic, intellectual, and moral inferiority of black people, because it was the year in which the Mississippi Constitutional Convention began the process by which Southern states disfranchised their Negro citizens, relegated them to segregated, second-class status, and constructed a legal, constitutional defense for those policies.

Newby argues that segregationist thought in the early twentieth century was an amalgam of science, social science, history, and religion designed to prove that blacks were inferior to whites; for without such proof, Southern racial policies were indefensible. Scientific racists explained racial differences and inequalities as being the result of evolutionary adaptations to differing environments. Because of their tropical environment, which made few demands upon the individual, Negroes remained primitive. Caucasians, on the other hand, being challenged by the frigid weather of the
North, developed into a superior race.

Physical and genetic differences between races produced differences in social behavior. Immorality, illegitimacy, broken families, unemployment, violence, and irresponsibility were outward manifestations of innate racial qualities; the Negro's social, economic, or political position was thus a consequence of his racial inadequacy. Because of these inherent limitations, he could not absorb American civilization and its institutions which were the products of the white man's racial genius. Democracy, constitutionalism, Christianity, free enterprise, and modern technology were beyond the Negro's capacity; he could not compete in a society based upon them. To preserve this superior civilization, it was important that mongrelization, or the mixing of the races, did not occur; for when mixed, racial characteristics, like water, seek the lowest possible level.

While scientific racism was attractive to race theorists, the average Southern segregationist relied upon God and the Bible to support a belief in Negro inferiority. Southerners preached that racial inequality was self-evident and God's will. Historians also significantly contributed to segregation when they contended that slavery was a benevolence for Negroes, a humane and necessary instrument for transforming savages into useful, contented members of the Christian civilization. These arguments also gave credence to the need for segregated schools. Since the Negro was inferior, he could not learn as quickly or as much as the Caucasian; therefore, he needed
his own schools where he would not suffer adverse psychological effects from being forced to compete with the intellectually superior Caucasian.

Segregationist arguments of the early twentieth century rested upon assumptions and value judgments rather than concrete empirical data. Modern scientific data indicates that there is no genetic inequality among the races. In fact, the range of individual differences within each race is greater than the average differences between races. Unfortunately, there are those individuals in the society who continue to believe that there are innate racial differences which serve to justify continued segregation.

In The Ordeal of Desegregation, Reed Sarrat undertakes the formidable task of providing an analytical journalistic account of desegregation in public education during the decade between the Supreme Court decision in 1954, and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Written under the auspices of the Southern Education Reporting Service, an organization established to collect and disseminate factual, objective information developments in education arising from the Brown decision, Sarratt focuses on the roles played by key groups and individuals in the seventeen Southern and border states and the District of Columbia. Responses and actions of state governors, Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, state legislatures, federal judges, educators, lawyers, police, newspaper editors, the clergy, businessmen, and organizations of whites and
blacks are described as the nation experienced the greatest social revolution of the century.

From his research Sarratt reached the following conclusions:

(1) The degree of compliance by whites to Brown depended upon several factors. Resistance stiffened with proximity to the Deep South; white opposition was greater where Negro population was high; and opposition was greater in rural than urban areas.

(2) After the Brown decision there was a "vacuum of leadership" from responsible sources; national and community leaders, the press, the clergy, and public officials were silent. The leaders marched with the people, not ahead of them and the people, for the most part, were proclaiming, "segregation forever."

(3) Time and events brought changes of attitudes among white Southerners and their leaders; they found that when desegregation could no longer be avoided, it could be controlled; and, except in a few instances, given the choice between desegregated schools or no public schools, they chose desegregation.

(4) Even though the number of black children attending school with white children was low, the change was great when viewed against the deeply-rooted customs and traditions of a society that had been segregated for more than three hundred years.

(5) The attitudes of blacks partially accounted for the gradualness with which desegregation spread. While some blacks fought militantly for desegregated schools, most took no active part in the struggle. Perhaps, fear of reprisals, past oppression, or indifference kept them from seeking the right to a desegregated education.

(6) The Brown decision cleared the way for the movement of black Americans toward
full equality of citizenship. It laid the foundation on which full equality under the law could be built. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 added part of the framework; when the structure would be completed was unpredictable.

The Battle of Boston by John Hillson is a descriptive analysis of the rhetorical tactics and strategies employed by the opponents and proponents of school desegregation in the city of Boston from 1974 through 1976.

Lead by Louise Day Hicks and other politicians throughout the city, the opponents, forming an organization called Restore Our Alienated Rights (ROAR), engaged in every strategy possible from court suits to street violence to prohibit the implementation of Judge Garrity's desegregation order, particularly in the South and Charlestown High School areas. Hillson describes ROAR's organizational structure which enabled it to mobilize hundreds of people for picket lines and mass demonstrations. Aided in their attempts to maintain a segregated system by political leaders, including President Ford, who stated their opposition to forced busing, and the police who were often unwilling to quell violence, and in some cases perpetuated it, ROAR was responsible for turning Boston 1974 into the Little Rock of 1957.

Acknowledging the fact that the rights of black children to attend the formerly white schools of South Boston were not going to be protected by public officials who refused to call in federal
marshalls, the author provides an account of the counter-movement, which was created to show the entire nation and the world that ROAR, while extremely vocal, did not speak for the entire population of Boston. Coalitions were established among the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Student Coalition Against Racism, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, religious leaders, and black and white individuals and organizations which mobilized for teach-ins, peaceful (and not-so-peaceful) demonstrations, and school-community activities in their efforts to restore peace to a strife-worn city. Once ROAR saw the strength of the counter-movement and the Supreme Court ruled that desegregation would continue in Boston, its strength dissipated.

Hillson is critical of the local Boston news media for not adequately reporting the terrorization of blacks by whites in the early phases of desegregation. He contends that if the press would have reported the violence as it occurred, a greater effort might have been made to restore order during the early phase and much of the later conflict could have been eliminated.

The author also reminds us that the arguments used by desegregation opponents, such as, forced busing results in violence, forced busing wastes money, and forced busing results in white flight, are really attempts to mask white racism and to perpetuate white supremacy. He concedes that the struggle for equal educational opportunity is far from over, not only in Boston, but in the rest of the nation as well.
Prejudice and Pride: The Brown Decision After Twenty-five Years is a report prepared for President Carter by the National Academy of Education. Commissioned by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a panel of nineteen educators, civil rights practitioners, and lawyers were to assess the impact of the Brown decision outlawing school segregation. The panel addressed the following questions: (1) What did Brown say, and in what context? (2) To what extent has the Brown decision been implemented? What have been its effects to date? (3) What disparate positions are held about its contemporary meaning and relevance by those concerned with achieving social justice? (4) What are the policy options ahead in implementing the spirit of Brown?

The diverse answers to these questions indicated that even informed individuals often disagree over philosophical values and current public policy in the area of desegregation. Some panel members agreed that Brown's immediate and long term impact was to create a favorable climate for the passage of civil rights legislation and the Economic Opportunity Act, for challenging racial discrimination in voting, employment, housing, and education, and political justice on behalf of minorities, women, the handicapped, and the elderly. There is divided opinion as to its implementation in school desegregation. Some panelists believe that its implementation in the seventeen Southern states was successful; others argue that in view of de facto segregation in the North, "the glass is still more than half-empty."
Issues such as the harmful effects of Brown, white flight, black achievement test scores, and bi-lingual education are also debated. However, the panelists, even in their disagreement, point out that there is no single elixir which will cure the patent manifestations of continuing prejudice in our society.

The panelists did reach consensus on these points: (1) The President and other national leaders should remind all American citizens of the continuing, baneful effect of prejudice upon domestic tranquility, the nation's economic strength, and self-respect. (2) State and local governments should play a bigger role in negotiating and solving discrimination problems, taking some of the enforcement burdens off the courts and federal executive branch. (3) The migration back to the cities may help to improve and desegregate city schools.

The Busing Cover-Up, written by Dr. Ralph Scott, under the pseudonym of Edward P. Langerton, is an attempt to repudiate the "myth," which has been created and perpetrated by social scientists, that transporting children to school for the purpose of racial balance significantly advances the learning process. This myth, which has been generated by social scientists who juggle statistical data and tests in order to prove that busing is successful, is also contributing to the disintegration of American education, according to Scott.

Scott presents four arguments which are designed to show that forced busing was engineered and is currently being justified by a
web of distortion and wishful thinking fabricated by high-ranking federal officials and social scientists who have succeeded in persuading judges, religious leaders, and the media to believe that blacks learn better when they sit next to whites. The arguments are: (1) American social science since the 1930s has become a freewheeling vehicle for liberal social change; (2) in the Brown decision, which opened the door for massive busing, the Supreme Court blindly accepted prevailing social science myths and translated them injudiciously into law; (3) forced busing has not helped black or white students, either educationally or emotionally and that neighborhood schools did not deprive black or white students of their legal or constitutional rights; and (4) there is an educational remedy for dealing with past social injustice, such as home-based programs in which parents will be encouraged to assume a substantial part of the responsibility for their children's learning, although most black leaders and white liberals vociferously reject this remedy.

Throughout the book Scott indicts the United States Supreme Court, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, pro-busing social scientists, such as Kenneth Clark, who deliberately distort the facts for their personal and political gain, liberal congressmen, the media which refuse to tell the truth about the evils of forced busing, court judges, and white liberals who subject others to the evils of busing, but who have their own children sent to private schools.
Scott argues that forced busing has weakened the traditional bonds of home, school, and community that have long served as major socializing agents; busing has led to an increase in rapes, extortions, burglaries, thefts, and an unprecedented wave of wanton destruction in the schools; busing has resulted in increased frustration in black children who are unable to compete academically with their more intelligent counterparts (the average I.Q. of a black child is 85); and busing is a waste of money which could be better spent on upgrading academic programs as well as the family lives of children in the ghetto.

In order to prove his arguments Scott takes issue with organizations such as the National Education Association, the American Psychological Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and the National Association for the Study of Social Issues. These groups and their leaders, according to Scott, are on record as favoring forced busing. And they, as well as federal commissions and state educational agencies, have promoted pro-busing bias by proclaiming that racist thinking dominates the anti-busing movement. As a result, these scare tactics make it extremely difficult for honest social scientists to evaluate this issue accurately.

Scott also indicts social scientists and academicians for their inability to tolerate dissent by refusing to publish anti-busing research in professional journals. He believes that social scientists have responded to the busing issue politically, not objectively nor rationally; and if university administrators were truly concerned about
academic freedom the facts on busing could have been dissected long ago. In actuality, administrators have remained silent while anti-busing professors were punished for treating the subject objectively. Scott also believes that, as an anti-busing advocate, academia has punished him because he has lost federal grants for his academic work and professional journals have refused to publish his research. It was to avoid this type of punishment that Scott originally wrote The Busing Cover-Up under a non de plume.

The major criticism of Scott's arguments is that he resorts to the same half-truths and distortions of the evidence, to prove that busing does not work (in that short-term test scores of black students have not shown a significant increase) that he accuses social scientists and academicians of doing in their efforts to prove that desegregation is beneficial to both black and white students. Throughout the book, the author cites supportive evidence for his claims from research that he has conducted at a midwestern university. However, since the book was originally published under a pseudonym and the name of the university is never given, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for a student of desegregation or social science to verify the results of this research. Since Scott purports to be a social scientist he has a responsibility to provide statistical data that can be easily perused by others in the discipline. Later editions of the book have been published under the name of Ralph Scott, but even this does not surmount the problem of vague research references which lack complete citation. Along this same line, incomplete
citations of sources which are used as evidence also make it difficult to check these resources for accuracy of interpretation.

It is also apparent that Scott, on occasion, employs false premises to prove his claim that busing is expensive. For instance, he states that school districts have met desegregation expenses by reducing regular school programs and cites Dayton, Ohio, as an example. Dayton City Schools did close for five days in 1971, five years before a desegregation plan was implemented throughout the city; lack of funds had nothing to do with expenses incurred as a result of court-ordered desegregation. In another instance, he cites New York City which in 1975, unveiled plans to fire about 11,000 teachers and to assign about forty students into each classroom. Again, this financial deficit cannot be attributed to desegregation but rather to New York's overall fiscal problems and successful bargaining by the American Federation of Teachers whose wage demands practically bankrupted the system.

Throughout the book, incomplete analyses of Supreme Court decisions, particularly Milliken v. Bradley in Detroit and United States v. Board of School Commissioners, Indianapolis, Indiana, are provided. An individual unfamiliar with the cases, as well as others mentioned by Scott, would be left with fallacious interpretations of these decisions. Scott also presents a simplified version of the controversy surrounding James Coleman's desegregation related research of 1966 and 1975 (often referred to as Coleman I and II). Since these studies focus on entirely different areas of research it
is deceptive to attempt to draw a comparison between the two in an effort to establish the claim that busing does not work. Coleman's research has been used and misused by both desegregation advocates and busing opponents as each attempts to prove that busing is or is not successful. Scott further escalates the controversy and confusion surrounding Coleman.

Even though Scott is accurate that social science is highly political in nature, and while it is perhaps true that neither advocates nor opponents of desegregation have produced research which unequivocally supports either position, it is also unfair to assume that desegregation does not work because the test scores of black children have not significantly improved. The original Brown decision did not concern itself with test scores, but considered another factor such as equality of access to mainstream American life; this access had long been denied to minority Americans. It would also be dishonest not to admit that urban areas which have desegregated are having serious problems with resegregation resulting from white flight. But to blame this problem, which is occurring at the same time our cities are in a general economic decline, entirely upon desegregation is unrealistic and short-sighted.

In future years, historians and social scientists may discover that the attempt to achieve racial balance in public schools was either the most positive step ever taken to achieve equality within the society or the greatest failure of "social engineering" ever perpetrated upon the public education system. Until that time, however, it is incumbent upon educators and social scientists, whatever
their predispositions toward the issue, to present research which is valid, reliable, and open to public scrutiny.

Selected Review of Literature Pertaining to Social Movements

Literature pertaining to the study of social movements generally falls into three categories, depending upon the theorist's major area of emphasis: historical, sociological, or rhetorical. Leland Griffin best represents the historical approach while Simons "turns from history to social science for his methodological attempts to provide a broad framework within which persuasion in social movements may be analyzed." However, it is generally agreed that the rhetorical critic is concerned with the language of movements. For that reason, the review of literature is centered around those methodologies that focus on language. Griffin's seminal essay on the study of a historical movement is included because it made an important contribution to the discipline. However, in a later essay, Griffin, influenced by Kenneth Burke, approaches the study of movements from a language perspective. Bowers and Ochs are included in this section because they represent the "establishment-conflict" theory for the study of movements. Smith and Windes balance the "establishment-conflict" perspective with their study of the "innovational movement" which is reflective of the non-confrontational movements which also occur within the society.

In his classic essay, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," which served as the genesis for future movement studies, Leland
Griffin emphasized that a historical movement is something that has occurred at some time in the past.

1) Men have become dissatisfied with some aspect of their environment;  
2) They desire change and desiring change they make efforts to alter their environment; 
3) Eventually their efforts result in some degree of success or failure, the desired change is or is not affected and we may say that the historical movement has come to its termination.34

Like the historical component, the rhetorical component of the movement is dynamic, and has a period of inception, a period of rhetorical crisis, and a period of consummation. The student of rhetoric is concerned with those efforts designed to effectuate change through the use of persuasion.

Griffin stresses that any movement—social, political, economic, religious, or intellectual, successful or unsuccessful deserves study. When attempting to isolate and analyze the rhetorical movement, two broad classes may be distinguished: "(1) pro-movements in which the rhetorical attempt is to arouse public opinion to the creation or acceptance of an institution or idea, and (2) anti-movements, in which the rhetorical attempt is to arouse public opinion to the destruction or rejection of an existing institution or idea."35 Within each movement there are aggressor orators and journalists who attempt in the pro-movement to establish and in the anti-movement to destroy, and defendant rhetoricians who attempt in the pro-movement to resist reform and in the anti-movement to defend institutions.
The study should be organized to include the historical and rhetorical backgrounds of the movement, including a description, analysis, and criticism of the inception, development, and consummation phases of the rhetorical movement, resetting the rhetorical movement in the matrix of the historical movement, and summarizing the rhetorical pattern peculiar to the movement.

In the final analysis, the purpose of studying the social movement is to discover the various configurations of public discussion, whether or not rhetorical patterns are repetitious, if set forms exist in a movement, and the degree of validity in our fundamental assumptions that rhetoric has and does have a vital function as a shaping event in human affairs.

Writing in a later essay, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," Griffin expands upon his historical approach to the study of movements and asserts that "all movements are essentially political, concerned with governance or dominion, the wielding and obeying of authority, that politics above all is drama and that drama requires conflict. All movements are essentially moral, striving for salvation, perfection, and the good." Influenced by Burke, Griffin incorporates Burkeian philosophy into his movement structure.

To study a movement is to study a drama, an Act of transformation, an act that ends in transcendence, the achievement of salvation. It is to study the Scenes that bracket the Act, for any movement is a sequence of movements between the limits of before and after. It is to study the Agents that make the Act....It is to study the essentially
human Agency that men use in the making of movements, which is to study rhetoric....And the purpose of all such study is to discover the motive or motives--the ultimate meaning or Purpose of the movement.37

"Movements begin when some pivotal individual or group--suffering attitudes of alienation in a given social system, and drawn (consciously or unconsciously) by the impious dream the mythic Order-enacts gives voice to, a 'No'."38

During its period of inception, the rhetoric of the anti-movement is negative and designed to produce a sense of division. The first strategy is to accentuate the injustice in the present situation. The second strategy is to provoke conflict so that the priests of the existing order will organize a counter-movement. The second phase of the period of inception occurs when the rhetoric of dissent and the counter-rhetoric are given public notice and transformed into the rhetoric of conversion and catharsis. Its first strategy is to promote conversion of the alienated and undecided into the movement. Its second strategy is to provoke action and to move the unconverted.

During the inception period the movement is confronted with three dangers: (1) the counter-movement will triumph, (2) the rhetors in the movement will fail to adapt their strategies or to develop appropriate responses to unforeseen exigencies, and (3) as the membership increases in size the movement will splinter and fail to achieve solidarity. To escape these dangers the rhetoric of the final phase of the inception period is designed to achieve and maintain solidarity, to intensify recruitment and the commitment of
those converted, and to announce impending triumphs.

The period of rhetorical crisis is a time of mass decision, collective catharsis, purgation, and the resolution of public tensions. It is a time of creation in which consubstantiality is established by killing the old order and giving birth to the new hierarchy or new system of authority.

During the period of consummation, men have been redeemed; they have been purged of injustice and they desire to remain purged. Its rhetoric is in the order of love; it is the rhetoric of the pro-Movement--the rhetoric of assent and allegiance, praise, edification, prayer, courtship. Its strategies are to arouse man's desire to obey the new order and to actualize the perfecting myth of the movement. For a time the period of consummation or this state of Redemption will prevail, but because men remain by nature divided, there are those who will eventually rise up and say, "No," to the existing order. The rhetoric of a movement in its ending is of self-sacrifice, self-Victimage, and Mortification; the cycle of man's discontent with the political structure begins anew.

In "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Robert Cathcart subscribes to Griffin's dramatistic approach to the study of movements and emphasizes that all discussion about movements centers around the tokens, symbols, and transactions which unite or separate people who organize to produce change. Movements are carried forward through language that brings about the identification of the individual with the movement. The
form of a movement is a rhetorical form, one which gives substance to its rationale and purpose.

Cathcart believes that a dramatistic theory of movements needs a dramatistic (politico-rhetorical) definition. He fails to provide such a definition, but suggests that the two Burkeian ratios, agency-scene and agency-act, are necessary to the inception of a movement. "In order for a movement to evolve there must be one or more actors, who perceive that the existing order is faulty and protest through various symbolic acts that salvation cannot be achieved unless collective action is taken." However, there cannot be a movement unless establishment rhetors recognize the agitators as anarchists attempting to destroy the foundation upon which the existing order exists. The dialectical tension growing out of the moral conflict between the aggressor and establishment rhetors defines movements and distinguishes them from other dramatistic forms.

Conceding that his earlier attempt to define a social movement was inadequate, in a later essay, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Cathcart, again embracing Griffin and Burke, argues that a movement can be identified by its confrontational form which is essential if a movement is to exist. Cathcart establishes a distinction between managerial rhetoric of a reform or status movement and confrontational rhetoric. Managerial rhetoric, "as viewed through the Burkeian prism, is a rhetorical form which recognizes man's division but accepts the common substance." The rhetoric produced
by the reform movement embodies the values of the system and accepts that the order has a code of control which must not be destroyed even while the system attempts to perfect itself. Within such rhetoric, identification with agency and purpose is always present. It is the rhetoric of piety, according to Burke, that is characteristic of most reform activities, which limits agitation and dictates its strategies.

The rhetoric of confrontation, on the other hand, is a rhetoric of corrosion and impiety. The dramatic enactment of this rhetoric reveals persons who have become so alienated that they reject the existing order and cease to identify with the prevailing hierarchy. They find themselves in a scene of confrontation where they stand alone, divided from the existing order; they dream of a new order where there will be salvation and redemption. It is the confrontation which produces the dialectical tension. Confrontation serves to give a movement its identity, its substance and its form; it is a symbolic act that dramatizes the complete alienation of the confronter; it demands a response from the existing order—a response which will fuel the confrontation; confrontation serves to identify the membership of the movement; acts of confrontation are public statements of conversion which formally commit the individual to the movement.

Cathcart believes that the Burkeian philosophy of rhetoric requires a rhetoric of confrontation if the role of man as symbol maker and user is to be understood.
Augmenting Cathcart's earlier attempts to define a social movement, and also greatly influenced by Kenneth Burke, Charles Wilkinson, writing in "A Rhetorical Definition of Movements," states that movements rhetorically defined are "languaging strategies by which a significantly vocal part of the established society, experiencing together a sustained dialectical tension growing out of a moral (ethical) conflict, agitate to induce cooperation in others, either directly or indirectly, thereby affecting the status quo."¹⁴¹

Languaging is defined as a process by which man, the symbol using (making, misusing) animal orders his world and himself according to a world view and a self view that are uniquely his own. Movements are always acts of man and, therefore, languaging strategies; this makes them rhetorical in nature, but having historical, sociological, and other components defined according to the accidents of time, place, and circumstance. The sociologist and the historian provide the Scene of the movement and indirectly the Agent.

Wilkinson explains that in the second facet of the definition, "a significantly vocal part of an established society": (1) significance is not determined by size nor success, but by timeliness, purpose, notoriety of agents, and the methods it uses to voice its cause, (2) vocal is not limited to verbal response, but is viewed in the widest range possible, and (3) movements occur within an established society. The third facet, "experiencing together a sustained dialectical tension growing out of moral conflict," necessitates that the dialectical tension must be experienced by a number of people over
a period of time. In situational terms this establishes the Agency of movements, while in process terms it isolates the essence of language. The fourth element, "agitation," is important because it separates the languaging strategies of the movement from those strategies which remain in the normal discursive means of persuasion. "Inducement of cooperation in others," the next element, reaffirms the Burkeian nature of the definition and its rhetorical essence. This element which designates Act would always, in process terminology, be one of adapting self or changing others by whatever strategies of mortification or victimage may be necessary for the Purpose of the movement.

The final element, "producing an effect on the status quo," determines the Purpose of the movement which is the ultimate ordering or reordering of society.

In his essay, "A Rhetorical Criticism of Movements: A Process Analysis of the Catonsville Nine Incident," Wilkinson applies his definition of a movement as the basis for analyzing the Catonsville Nine incident in Maryland. He argues that through the analysis of a particular movement's rhetoric, the critic can trace the process through four stages of development by identifying and examining the rhetoric of dis-order, the rhetoric of guilt, the rhetoric of mortification and victimage, and the rhetoric of redemption.

After observing the strategies employed in the Civil Rights and the Anti-Vietnam War movements, Bowers and Ochs, writing in The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control, developed a definition and
methodology for the study of establishment-conflict movements. They define agitation or protest as existing "when people outside the normal decision making establishment advocate significant social change and encounter a degree of resistance within the establishment such as to require more than the normal discursive means of persuasion."\textsuperscript{43}

Strategies of the agitators or aggressive spokespersons fall under the label of petition of the establishment, promulgation, solidification, polarization, non-violent resistance, escalation/confrontation, Gandhi and Guerrilla. These strategies will be met by the rhetoric of control coming from the defenders of the established order. These strategies include avoidance, suppression, adjustment, and capitulation.

Bowers and Ochs distinguish between two types of movements. In the first type there is agitation based on vertical deviance in which the agitators "subscribe to the value system of the establishment, but dispute the distribution of benefits within the value system."\textsuperscript{44} The second type is agitation based on lateral deviance which occurs when the agitators dispute or reject the value system itself. Lateral deviance was demonstrated by the Yippies at the 1968 Democratic National Convention; vertical deviance was demonstrated by the American labor movement and the Civil Rights Movement when led by Dr. Martin Luther King.
The major strength of Bowers and Ochs' methodology for the study of movements is that they have labeled and categorized the various rhetorical strategies used by both the aggressor and defendant rhetors of a movement; however the strength is also a weakness in that it permits categorization of strategies without encouraging the development of new theory which will further explicate agitation as it occurs within the social order.

Arguing that the "establishment-conflict" theory is too limited to account for important collective acts which "cannot be interpreted through a dialectic of radical division," Smith and Windes, in their essay, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," contend that rhetoricians should be concerned with "meliorative acts to modify social arrangements so that they become expressions, under new conditions, of an old ethnic and an old hierarchy." To fulfill this need they have developed a theory for the study of innovational movements.

Unlike the establishment-conflict theory, which demands a reconstitution of society's values, the innovational movement calls for modification of existing institutions, without disturbing the symbols and constraints of existing values or modifying the social hierarchy. This modification may have one of two objectives: "(1) either institutions as changed will allow individuals effectively to act out their values, or (2) they will more vigorously reinforce belief in existing values." Since the aggressor spokespersons of the innovational movement are members of the established order, "they
do not call attention to any division, nor do they fuse themselves with any guilt."

To meet its rhetorical needs the movement engages in the following rhetorical strategies: "(1) spokespersons deny the existence of conflict between their proposed innovation and the values of society, (2) the movement must emphasize the weakness of traditional institutions and the strength of traditional values, and (3) the movement must create a dialectic between its scene and its purpose."

If the strategies are successful no defendant spokespersons will emerge and there will be no dialectic occurring between aggressor and defendant spokespersons, which gives drama to the establishment-conflict movement. It is therefore incumbent upon the innovational movement to create this dialectic between its purpose and the scene. This is done through the projection of the rhetorical vision, in which the "personae are impersonal scenic elements which can be condemned for eroding society's values....If significant audiences come to view their scene through the vision of the innovational movement, the dramatic imperative of the movement is met."

Smith and Windes believe that the innovational movement has both intrinsic and extrinsic value. "Intrinsically, it contributes to understanding patterns of public discourse used by groups to improve their society through innovation. Extrinsicly, the theory is a forward step in constructing a general theory for movement analysis."
Introduction: A Summation

This chapter discusses the need for expanding the scope of rhetorical criticism beyond the single speaker approach to include the study of social movements. The political and social turbulence generated during the 1960s and 1970s convinced rhetorical scholars that further research was needed in order to discover the ways in which collectivities of individuals, through the use of languaging strategies, create, or attempt to create, a new social order.

A social movement that is reflective of the conservative rhetoric prevalent in today's society is the National Association for Neighborhood Schools (NANS), an anti-busing organization that advocates political activism, rather than violence, to stop court-ordered desegregation of the public schools. This study is a social criticism which employs a pluralistic methodology focusing on three key rhetorical theories: "The Rhetorical Situation" (Bitzer), "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality (Bormann), and "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements (Simons). The study concentrates on three primary questions: (1) What was the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools? (2) What rhetorical strategies are employed by NANS to create a rhetorical vision as a response to the situation? and (3) What rhetorical roles and problems are assumed by NANS' leadership?
Data for this study has been gathered from books, magazines, newspapers, NANS newsletters and bulletins, personal interviews, speeches, minutes from NANS meetings, and the NANS Statistical and Information Center. The survey of literature which is included in this chapter represents a cross-section of information related to segregation and the desegregation of public schools. The survey of literature pertaining to social movements includes those methodologies which focus primarily on language; however, other theories which focus on historical criticism (Griffin), establishment-conflict movements (Bowers and Ochs), and the innovational movement (Smith and Windes) are included to illustrate the diversity of social movements and the rhetorical perspectives from which these movements may be studied.
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CHAPTER 2

THE RHETORICAL SITUATION

Introduction

This chapter of the study focuses on the question: What was the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools?

In an effort to answer this question, this chapter will provide: (1) a brief description of the methodological approach to be employed as outlined by Lloyd F. Bitzer in his essay, "The Rhetorical Situation," (2) a brief overview of the ways in which the criteria for a rhetorical situation applies to the NANS, which is serving as rhetor in response to the exigence, (3) a descriptive analysis of the rhetorical situation employing the interactive elements of the constraints, the exigence, and the audience which are imposed upon the rhetorical situation, and (4) a final summary.

The Methodology. When addressing the question, "What is a rhetorical situation?" the critic is concerned with rhetorical discourse which is created as a response to a situation. The three constituents of a rhetorical situation are: (1) the exigence, an imperfection marked by urgency which is capable of being modified by discourse, (2) the audience, which consists of those individuals who
are capable of being influenced by discourse, thereby serving as mediators of change, and (3) the constraints, which include persons, objects, events, and relations which are part of the situation because they have the ability to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence.

According to Bitzer, general characteristics of the rhetorical situation are included in the following statements: (1) rhetorical discourse is called into existence by the situation; (2) the rhetorical situation invites a response that is fitting to the situation; (3) the situation, itself, prescribes the response that fits; (4) the exigence, the audience, and the constraints which make up the situation are located in reality; (5) rhetorical situations exhibit structures that are either simple or complex, and more or less organized; (6) rhetorical situations come into existence, then either mature or decay or mature and persist.

Application of the Criteria. Because a social movement may be an essential element of a rhetorical situation, it is important to establish the ways in which the criteria for a social movement, as the creator of the rhetorical discourse, can be applied to NANS. The perceived exigence being addressed by NANS is the issue of forced busing. The audiences which have the potential to modify the exigence consist of those individuals within the general American public who are opposed to busing as a means to desegregate public schools, the legislative branch of our government, Congress, and the judicial branch of our government, where final decisions
rest with the Supreme Court. It must be noted that while the Federal Judiciary has the greatest potential to modify the exigence, it is this audience which is least influenced by public discourse concerning the issue.

The constraints include such factors as: changing public opinion concerning the value of busing as a means to desegregate public schools; intensified activity to desegregate Northern urban schools; ideological shifts occurring within the society from a politically liberal to a more politically conservative stance; demographic location from the urban areas not only to suburban and rural area, but from the North to the "Sunbelt" region of the South and West, which, historically, is more politically conservative than the industrialized urban centers of the North; and the coalition of single interest groups into a politically powerful force within the society.

General Characteristics. The National Association for Neighborhood Schools was established to oppose the federal policy of "forced busing." This issue was of paramount concern in many Northern cities during the period covering the late 1960s through the early 1980s. This movement existed within a rhetorical situation which was highly complex in structure because the NANS is only one of many single issue movements to co-exist throughout the late 1970s and the 1980s. Even though each movement was addressing a different exigence, the strategy employed by all to effect change was the nationwide
unification into collectivities which would seek to change the social order by changing the political disposition of Congress, the White House, and eventually, the Supreme Court. In essence, the election of political Conservatives to positions of power would result in a more conservative governance of the country.

Effecting change through the ballot-box was a most fitting response to the situation not only because Americans had grown weary of the civil disobedience which prevailed throughout the late 1950s through the early 1970s, but also because the audiences attracted to these issues are composed of older, middle-class, politically conservative individuals who believe in law and order. To them, the "American Way" is to work within the established systems, as outlined in the Constitution, to change the inequities existing within the system.

As the rhetorical situation changes, it will mature, but it will continue to persist. The issue of school desegregation has pervaded the American society for more than a quarter of a century; although NANS' efforts will in all likelihood contribute to modification of the exigence, the problem of racial strife in America will continue for generations to come.

In summation, the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, as rhetor, is responding to a rhetorical situation. The situation consists of an exigence to be addressed, an audience which has the power to modify the exigence rhetorically, and constraints which influence the audience and the movement. NANS, as the creator of the
rhetorical discourse, provides a fitting response to a highly complex situation which is embedded in reality and which demands and invites discourse.

A Descriptive Analysis of the Rhetorical Situation

A Response to the Exigence. In August of 1976, in Denver, Colorado, a symposium was held on the topic of constructive alternatives to forced busing. Under the leadership of Dr. Ralph Scott, a professor of education at the University of Northern Iowa, this symposium (as well as others held later in Louisville, Boston, Detroit, and Nashville) was financed by the Pioneer Fund, "a tax-exempt foundation incorporated in 1937, for the express purpose of research into racial betterment." The day after the symposium ended, the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, under the direction of Dr. Ralph Scott, held its first organizational meeting.

This meeting was the result of a recognition by those community leaders long involved in the forced busing issue that unified and coordinated efforts are necessary to return control of the schools to the people and local administrators. It has long been apparent that the 'divide and conquer' tactics used by the proponents of forced busing cannot be effectively dealt with on a city by city basis. Only by unified efforts of all people in the cities involved can there be an effective effort made to stop forced busing and federal intervention in our schools.

Many of the incorporators of this organization would be listed among those named in the "Who's Who of the Anti-Busers," and includes representatives of major cities that have been forced to
desegregate their school systems. Touted as being the "most knowledgeable
community leaders in the United States on the issue of forced
busing," these leaders are concerned citizens that have formed
local groups in virtually every city faced with the outrage of forced
busing. NANS' purpose is to stop forced busing, as well as federal
intervention in the schools, either by Constitutional Amendment,
or any other means necessary to accomplish this objective. NANS does
not advocate violence, but instead channels the energies and
resources of its leaders into political action. "It is an organization that works through the law to change the law."7

Prior to the successful formation of NANS there had been at
least three attempts to mobilize a national anti-busing organiza-
tion: Jean Ruffra, former NANS President, attempted to build a
national coalition in 1971;8 Dr. Ralph Scott and Frank Southworth,
the first President of NANS as well as a co-founder of the organiza-
tion, attempted to establish a national anti-busing movement in
the early 1970s;9 and Louise Day Hicks, 'leader of Restore Our
Alienated Rights (ROAR), the South Boston based anti-busing organi-
zation, attempted to create a national organization in 1974. All
of these attempts to forge a national anti-busing coalition failed
because the vast majority of Northerners were not directly affected
by court orders to desegregate their school systems. As a result,
there was little widespread interest in the problems associated
with school desegregation. By 1976, however, the issue of desegre-
gation was impacting on major cities throughout the North and West
and there was a significant number of people who, realizing that their individual efforts to overturn desegregation orders had been fruitless, believed that mobilization into a national political force was the only way to address this exigence.

In order to appreciate more fully and to understand the shift in public attitudes that contributed to the successful nationwide mobilization of the anti-busers, it is essential to review the rhetorical situation in an effort to understand the interaction of the constraints. These constraints are divided into three categories: (1) public attitudes concerning desegregation and public schools, in general; (2) political and legislative activity related to modification of the exigence; and (3) Supreme Court decisions which sustained desegregation as a federal policy.

Public Attitudes Before 1971

Between the years 1963-1965, when some of the most intense struggles for civil rights were occurring throughout the South, opinion polls found that the public, particularly Northerners, saw action against discrimination as the most important question facing the country. As a result, Northern liberals, perceiving racial segregation to be a problem unique to the South but an embarrassment to a nation established upon the principle of equality for all people, supported Supreme Court decisions to eliminate the dual school systems of the South and stringent civil rights legislation designed to eradicate all vestiges of a dual society.
By 1970, however, public attitudes concerning racial equality were changing. This change can be attributed, in part, to the following events: (1) attention and energy was diverted from civil rights to the war in Vietnam; and (2) as civil rights activists, namely the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, began scrutinizing the North for civil rights violations, the election of Richard M. Nixon in 1968, indicated that a new political constituency was beginning to emerge. This constituency, which was often characterized as "the forgotten man," "middle America," or "the silent majority," was composed of liberals, moderates, and conservatives who coalesced in the sixties and then became frightened when the black man's quest for equal rights started hitting too close to home.\(^{12}\) Even though white Northerners were willing to accept blacks in their schools or to attend schools with blacks, the Gallup Poll reported that "86 percent were opposed to the busing of children to achieve racial balance and only 11 percent favored the busing of school children."\(^{13}\) In essence, the decade of the 1970s signified an end to liberalism and a reemergence of conservatism in social, political, and educational issues.

1971

Public Attitudes. By 1971, public support of school desegregation was beginning to erode and there was definite antagonism toward urban school desegregation. Throughout the decade of the 1970s, the Gallup Poll cited problems with discipline as the number one concern
During this same period problems associated with integration were cited often enough to place it second to discipline as the major problem confronting the schools. Between the years 1969-1973, it was not integration, per se, that was the main source of the trouble, but the means of bringing it about, namely, busing. In a national survey, "only 15 percent of whites thought that court ordered integration had a good effect on children in general and 60 percent believed it had a bad effect. Two out of three blacks believed the opposite." "In response to questions concerning busing, 76 percent of those polled were opposed to the use of busing to achieve racial balance, while only 18 percent favored the use of busing." White opposition to busing coupled with the demands of militant blacks seeking their own schools created a society wrought with unrest and confusion over the issue of desegregation. And in order to avoid the problems associated with the cities--declining tax bases and public services, discipline problems in the schools, race riots, etc.--whites began to flee the urban areas for the suburbs. This "white flight" was to intensify throughout the decade and lead to the creation of new problems.

The Supreme Court Addresses the Exigence. The actual issue of busing was finally addressed by the Supreme Court in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education. In a school system which already transported students in order to maintain a dual school system, the Court noted that the busing of students was "a normal and acceptable tool of educational policy" and therefore decreed that
"desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school." For cases which were to follow, the Court approved busing as an available tool for desegregation and emphasized that the neighborhood school assignment plan, which might on the surface appear to be neutral, was not necessarily acceptable.

The Swann decision was truly one of the most definitive actions taken on school segregation since the 1954 Brown decision, and it was this case which would have significant impact not only in the South, but in the North as well. Neither the public, nor President Nixon, who opposed busing to desegregate the schools, was pleased with this decision.

Also of significance, however, was the fact that the conservative Burger Court spoke with the same unanimous voice as the liberal Warren Court by making it clear that the last vestiges of the old dual school systems would soon be eliminated. The decision was also viewed by some as being indicative of the fact that Chief Justice Burger was charting his own course on school desegregation without regard for President Nixon's preference for the neighborhood school. But while the Court still had not provided a badly needed national norm for school integration, it did indicate that there was no such thing as accidental de facto segregation in the country. As a result, federal district court judges throughout the North concluded that the segregation they were examining was, in fact, de jure, and began to order city-wide busing programs in several Northern cities.
The North Responds to Busing. During the fall of 1971, except for a few minor incidents, massive desegregation, accomplished through busing, was carried out peacefully in almost all of the 2,700 school districts in the South. Ironically, the disturbances and resistance to desegregation plans were confined largely to the cities of the north such as Boston, Detroit, Pontiac, Seattle, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Los Angeles.

Pontiac, Michigan, which was one of the first Northern cities to desegregate after the Supreme Court ruled on the constitutionality of busing in Swann was the scene of one of the most violent protests to date. Ten buses were dynamited by members of the Ku Klux Klan and five youths were shot during the racial turmoil. Protest was led, in large part, by the National Action Group (NAG), a local anti-busing organization. In Boston, Louise Day Hicks was rallying the anti-busing forces around the neighborhood school. Turmoil in the "Athens of the New World" was just beginning.

In Congress, dim rumblings were also beginning to be heard relative to passage of a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the "forced busing" of students to achieve racial balance in the public schools. This was a policy that the President did not want, the public did not want, and the Congress did not want, but nonetheless, a program that Southerners had and Northerners were about to receive.
1972

By 1972, "busing" had become a national issue distinct from school integration of the 1960s. Major developments occurred between 1970 and 1972, a period that brought the first major urban court orders, the first decisions in the North, the threat of suburban desegregation, and a presidential campaign which emphasized the issue.

Public Attitudes. The question of forced busing emerged as one of the most volatile political issues of the year as opposition to busing became a respectable stance in the United States. In March, a Gallup Poll reported that "while only 3 percent of the parents of school-age children surveyed said they had been affected, 64 percent of Northern whites and 74 percent of Southern whites, and nearly half the small sample of blacks opposed 'compulsory busing.' However, 58 percent of Southern whites and 68 percent of Northern whites believed that schools should be desegregated." This incompatibility between a belief in desegregation and opposition to busing as a means of achieving desegregation was a major dilemma confronting the society.

Other national urban problems which were impacting upon school desegregation were increasing crime rates, housing decay, outward migration of jobs, increasing costs of public services, rising teacher militancy resulting in increased strikes, racial problems and decreasing tax bases. The problems intensified a population migration
to the suburbs. The public was also beginning to lose faith in the ability of the federal government to solve society's problems. Less federal interference was, therefore, being advocated.

Also acting as a constraint on public opinion was publication of an essay, by a major researcher, criticizing urban school integration. David Armor's research was (and continues to be) cited by busing opponents as proof that busing had failed. Armor concluded that school desegregation does not eliminate the gap between rates of academic achievement in the first year of the integration process and may, in fact, increase race consciousness among students. Since he believed that this finding differed from those presumably underlying the Brown decision, he opposed urban desegregation. This research provided sustenance for continuation of the public debate on the value of busing to achieve desegregation.

Public concern was also intensified when, in January, the Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal of a group of Negro and Mexican-American parents who were seeking a busing order for desegregation of Denver's public schools. It was to be the Court's first school busing case outside the South and it would determine what action, if any, that communities must take to eliminate de facto segregation.

Congress Responds to the Exigence. As desegregation cases were coming to the fore in Northern states such as Colorado, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Delaware, more and more Congressional leaders, pressured by their constituents, were being forced to join with their
Southern counterparts to oppose busing. Anti-busing legislation intensified after the Swann decision and continued throughout 1972. In the House of Representatives, the Judiciary Committee convened hearings to consider twenty-eight proposed anti-busing constitutional amendments which had been submitted. Henry Jackson submitted an amendment which read: "No person shall be denied the freedom-of-choice and the right to have his or her children attend their neighborhood school." The favored vehicle, however, was an amendment proposed by Rep. Tom Steed which read: "No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school." Both of these amendments had the potential power to eradicate all gains made in the area of desegregation.

Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Emanuel Celler, believed the busing debate constituted a national crisis. Rep. William McCulloch, also a long-time champion of civil rights, warned against "amending the Constitution to change a practice which was itself only temporary. He voiced his objection to the inflammatory and irresponsible statements against court rulings which, he said, had been predicated on a finding that the Constitution has been violated by agents of the state discriminating on the basis of race." Vice-President Spiro Agnew, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, and Republican Minority Leader Hugh Scott opposed a constitutional amendment. Agnew, who was opposed to busing, believed
that "these things are capable of being handled within the normal statutory framework and criticized what he thought was a Pavlovian reaction to use the amendment procedure whenever controversial issues arose." President Nixon, on the advice of Attorney General John Mitchell, announced that he would support an anti-busing amendment only if Congress failed to act on proposed legislative curbs. Nixon's major objection to a constitutional amendment was that it would take too long to adopt.

Busing foes supporting the Steed amendment believed that a constitutional amendment was the only way to stop court decisions which were making a shambles of the public school system. Arguing that it was a scheme of "social engineering" that the majority of people did not want and perpetrated by little more than ideological hypocrisy, advocates of the amendment included House GOP Minority Leader Gerald Ford and Senator Henry Jackson. Theirs was a minority view, however, and the amendment was eventually bottled-up in committee, temporarily gone, but not forgotten.

Presidential Candidates Address the Exigence. Politically, the debate on busing intensified in 1972, with the emergence of George Wallace as a strong presidential contender. Announcing his candidacy in January, in Tallahassee, Florida, Wallace said that "he alone in a field of fourteen Democratic candidates gave Florida voters a chance to protest the busing of their children out of neighborhood schools and the other intrusions of 'big government' into their private lives." Wallace also "beat the drums" on other
issues of the day that concerned Americans—pornography, lawlessness and violence, high taxes, waste in welfare, inadequate social security, high government expenditures, drug abuse, and foreign aid.

During this same primary campaign other Democratic leaders assumed various positions on the busing issue: Hubert Humphrey opposed forced-busing and busing children from good schools and neighborhoods to bad ones; as previously stated, Henry Jackson opposed busing; Edward Muskie resisted the issue throughout the primary but considered busing an undesirable but sometimes necessary tool to achieve desegregation; John Lindsey, George McGovern, and Shirley Chisholm, the party liberals, firmly supported busing as a way to desegregate until such times as integrated neighborhoods would eliminate the need for busing.

Wallace won the Florida primary of eleven candidates with 42 percent of the vote; he also won the Michigan primary with 51 percent of the vote, the Tennessee primary where he captured 68 percent of the vote, and he received 50 percent of the vote in the North Carolina primary. Wallace was clearly on a roll, orchestrating a one-issue sales campaign in areas that were friendly to his product. And even though his chances of winning the election were slim, Wallace was becoming a political threat for Richard Nixon who thought he (Nixon) needed the Southern votes to remain in the White House.

At the time Nixon needed a campaign issue which would divert the public's attention from the rising inflation rate and his inability to stop the Vietnam War. The issue to emerge could be
encapsulated in one word--busing. Prior to the Florida primary, Nixon announced that he had ordered a study to determine if a constitutional amendment was needed to prohibit busing for racial balance in the public schools. He reiterated his belief in the neighborhood school and in local control of the schools as well as his opposition to busing for racial balance. Nixon emphasized that urgent action was needed because, in several cases, the courts had gone too far, "creating confusion and contradiction in the law; anger, fear, and turmoil in local communities, and agonized concern among parents for the education and safety of their children." He cited thousands of letters that he had received from parents across the country complaining about the problems associated with forced busing and he urged the public to drum up Congressional support for two proposals he had submitted, "The Student Transportation Moratorium Act," which called for an immediate halt to all new busing orders by federal courts, and the "Equal Educational Opportunities Act," which would require every state or locality to grant equal educational opportunity to all minority persons. This meant that federal aid would be increased to improve the education that poor and minority children would receive in their own neighborhoods.

Nixon's proposal was endorsed by Gerald Ford and Secretary of HEW, Elliot Richardson, who emphasized the "'the fabric of the body politic was being torn by the almost unreasonable strain of the busing issue on the educational process.' Richardson also spoke of
the 'widespread belief' that remedies have been imposed that harm more than they help."^{31}

Congress Responds to the Court. While Nixon was in the process of presenting his proposals to Congress, Congress was in the process of debating a higher education bill. As the debate continued, U.S. District Judge Stephen J. Roth, ruling in the first metropolitan desegregation case heard in the United States, Bradley v. Milliken,^{32} concluded that the black school population of Detroit made it impossible to meaningfully desegregate Detroit city schools alone. Roth therefore established fifty-two suburban school districts and the city of Detroit as the designated desegregation area. Nixon called the Detroit order one of the most flagrant busing decisions in existence. The decision also aggravated anti-busing sentiment in Congress. As a result, many stringent anti-busing amendments were added to the higher education bill.

The higher education bill which finally emerged from both houses had three provisions: (1) all court orders would be stayed until all appeals were exhausted, or until January 1, 1974; (2) federal funds could be used for busing only if requested by a community and only if no risk to pupil health, safety, or education was involved; and (3) federal officials could not require or encourage local busing unless constitutionally mandated.^{33} Senate liberals hoped that the provisions in the compromise measure were so poorly worded as to be either meaningless or unconstitutional. The amendment, therefore, forbidding the spending of federal aid money for
busing was, in actuality, harmless. It was, however, a tactical victory for both sides. And Nixon, while criticizing its anti-busing provisions as being inadequate, signed it into law.

Nixon then pressured the Senate for passage of the "Student Transportation Moratorium Act" and the "Equal Educational Opportunities Act." Because there was concern about the constitutionality of these proposals as they related to the legislative's power to restrain the judicial branch, the Senate stalled debate for as long as it could. Finally, in October, feeling certain of a Nixon landslide victory over McGovern, most Senators seemed ready to support any bill. However, civil rights supporters, in an attempt to thwart a constitutional conflict between the branches of government, decided to use the old Southern delaying tactic of filibustering. Despite lobbying from the White House, the filibuster was successful and the session ended before any further action could be taken on the issue of desegregation. Another year had passed and school desegregation, while "scuffed a bit," was still intact as a national policy. Proponents of the defeated legislation and President Nixon vowed to revive anti-busing legislation in the new Congress.

1973

Public Attitudes. By 1973, public attitudes were shifting and becoming less favorable toward the public education system. In a Gallup Poll, "39 percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with their schools. In urban areas those dissatisfied reached 40 percent."
This same poll indicated that the more respondents knew firsthand about the public schools, the more favorable their views, the less interested and less well informed, the less favorable their views. More important was the fact that individuals who relied, in large part, on the media for their information were most critical of the public schools. Some of the basic assumptions related to desegregation which were expressed by officials and disseminated through the media included: busing is costly, consuming dollars that could be spent on educational improvements; busing damages the education of white middle-class students without helping minority students; busing produces increased racial hostility; busing speeds white flight and urban resegregation; and busing plans are arbitrary and irrational schemes imposed by federal judges with little or no interest in education. Busing, in short, was thought to be an expensive, irrational, disruptive, and a counter-productive policy of social engineering perpetrated by federal judges and hypocritical Washington bureaucrats.

Americans continued to support integration but rejected busing as a means of obtaining that integration. The dilemma remained: housing segregation was so severe that the only way to achieve integration in the foreseeable future in many communities was by busing; without busing, segregation would continue.

When asked if they believed that more should be done to integrate schools in the nation, "30 percent said more should be done, 38 percent said less should be done, and 23 percent said that there should be no
change from the present. Support for busing as a means of achieving integration dropped to 5 percent (9 percent of blacks and 4 percent of whites). The public continued to rate discipline as the number one problem confronting the schools and the complexities related to the problems arising from integration/segregation as the second most important problem. Because these two issues had received so much negative media coverage, public opinion had been affected.

Another public issue which had received so much publicity was that of "white flight" or the population shift from the cities to the suburbs. While the quality of the schools and forced busing were often cited as reasons for leaving the city, these reasons did not emerge as prime motives in a Gallup Poll. The reasons most often cited were escape from congestion, pollution, and crowded living conditions, fear of crime, a desire to get away from minorities, more desirable housing, and better educational opportunities.

*The Supreme Court addresses the Exigence.* It was the Supreme Court upon which attention was focused. Previously, in Northern cases it was argued that "racial isolation in the public schools, whether caused directly by school officials or not, unconstitutionally deprived black children of equal educational opportunity." In the cases that proved successful, the "NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Staff set out to show that existing school segregation was a result of State action by school authorities that, although not arising from segregation laws, had similar effect and
This argument was used in the first Northern desegregation case decided by the Supreme Court, Keyes v. School District No. 1 Denver, Colorado. The Court's primary task was to develop a workable definition of de jure segregation or dispense with the de jure-de facto distinction altogether. The outcome of Keyes centered around the detailed proof of intentional segregative acts of the Denver school board. Despite the fact that Colorado had never had a specific anti-discrimination clause in its Constitution, the actions of the school authorities were enough to establish de jure segregation. It was now clear that whenever official action had been taken that could have been foreseen to have a segregative effect, and heretofore had been considered de facto, was in fact de jure and therefore unconstitutional. Once guilt had been established in part of a district, the Courts could desegregate the entire system unless local officials could prove that the remaining segregation was not related to school system policies. The effect of Keyes was to end dualism--Northern style--and ensured that the North was to feel the intense desegregation pressure which the South had experienced for the past two decades.

1974: Twenty Years After Brown

Public Attitudes. Public attitudes toward the schools had not changed significantly in 1974; what was seen as a lack of discipline and problems associated with integration/segregation of the public schools continued to be major concerns of the American public. A major factor in the strong opposition of whites to busing was fear
of the reverse busing of whites into ghetto or barrio schools. "Fifty percent of the public favored a strict neighborhood school policy, but only forty-six percent opposed one-way busing." Research also indicated that white support for federal action to assure integrated schools was minimal, with significantly less than fifty percent of the population supporting federal intervention in educational matters. This desire for less federal intervention in all aspects of American life was precipitated in part by policies related to the Vietnam War and Watergate. Relative to Vietnam, "more than two-thirds of the public believed that the government had consistently lied to the American people over the past ten years"; and the unfolding events surrounding Watergate was contributing to the erosion of public confidence in the credibility of the federal government. These attitudes were contributing to an escalating belief in the concept of less government, not more.

The attack on busing was not without its ironies. School busing had been steadily increasing for decades, much of it resulting from the migration of white families into the suburbs and thinly populated areas. By the 1974 school year, approximately fifty-two percent of the nation's school children were transported. "Fifteen states, at public expense, transported students to private religious schools, often crossing city-suburban boundary lines. Such services were eagerly sought and energetically defended in the legislatures and courts." During the five years after court-ordered busing began, the annual increase in the nation's school bus fleet was exactly the same as during the previous five years; it was the
public reaction which had changed. And when this public heard President Nixon denounce "excessive forced busing" he was referring to approximately three percent, which were bused for purposes of desegregation, of the 21,000,000 school children who daily rode buses in the United States. As Roy Wilkins of the NAACP stated, "When the busing of white children to maintain segregation was in full swing it was O.K. Busing has only become an evil since it has been used for desegregation." 48

The Supreme Court Addresses the Exigence. By mid-summer, if attention had not been focused on Nixon's impeachment hearings, more discussion would have been given the Supreme Court's decision pertaining to metropolitan desegregation. Ruling on Milliken v. Bradley, the Court found evidence of de jure segregation in Detroit but, because it was not established that the suburban areas were guilty of contributing to Detroit's segregated system, disallowed the metropolitan remedy. 49

By refusing to include the suburbs in the remedy, anti-busing advocates believed that the Court was finally responding to the will of the people and the anti-busing fervor represented throughout the nation. The public also believed that the Nixon appointees were establishing a new national policy which placed more value on neighborhood schools and local control.

ROAR Responds to the Exigence. Aside from the events associated with Watergate and President Richard M. Nixon's ultimate
resignation from office, that event which received excessive media coverage both in the United States and throughout Europe was the desegregation battles which raged in South Boston.

When Boston began Phase I of its desegregation in the autumn of 1974, the greatest opposition was centered in the predominantly Irish-Catholic section of South Boston where leaders such as School Committee President John Kerrigan and city Councilwoman Louise Day Hicks, leader of Restore Our Alienated Rights (ROAR) fanned the flames of resistance by vowing to their constituencies that "it [desegregation] would never happen here." Believing that if there were enough public opposition the court order to desegregate would be rescinded, South Boston residents went into the streets to voice their disapproval of Judge Garrity's orders. Riots and violence occurred daily as black students from Roxbury attempted to enter South Boston High School. When Senator Edward Kennedy made a September appearance in South Boston he was harassed and threatened, barely escaping serious injury at the hands of the mob.

In October, Mayor Kevin White appealed to the White House for federal troops to assist in the enforcement of Boston's desegregation order. President Gerald R. Ford, an ardent anti-buser, publicly expressed his disagreement with the judge's orders and refused to send in federal law-enforcement agencies. White accused President Ford of encouraging resistance to the law of the nation and taunting the city into becoming another Little Rock. Many city leaders believed that Ford's response not only intensified the violence in
Boston, but also clearly established that national leadership related to the desegregation of schools was sorely missing.

Many Americans deplored the racial hostility and violence as depicted daily by the media. Desegregation of the schools accomplished by the use of busing was something that few people wanted, yet it remained a national policy. Therefore, the only way to change the policy was to change the Constitution. In the closing months of 1974, cries throughout the country were being heard for legislation which would prohibit school desegregation attempts or a constitutional amendment which would directly address this same issue.

1975

Public Attitudes. In 1975, perceived lack of discipline in the schools and the problems associated with integration/segregation/busing continued to be cited as the major problems confronting public education. A Harris survey\(^{51}\) reported that 74 percent of the respondents were opposed to busing children to achieve racial balance. The survey also discovered, however, that the children of many of the parents who responded critically were already being bused for other reasons and by a nine-to-one majority these parents reported that busing was convenient; seven in eight expressed general satisfaction with their children's busing. In general, the majority of Americans continued to favor busing as long as it was not for the purpose of racially balancing schools.
White Flight. National concern was also being generated over the problem of "white flight." "In the first half of the 1970s, 13 million people left the central cities, almost 10 million of them moving to the suburbs. Six million moved into the central cities during this period, about one-eighth of them black. Metropolitan areas as a whole experienced a net out-migration of 1.6 million people between 1970 and 1975." More than half of the loss was the result of movement to fringe settlements in counties next to urban areas, just beyond the suburbs.

The concentration of minority populations was most acute in the five largest cities of the United States—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Detroit. "These five cities served more than one-fifth of all the black and Latino public school students in the United States." The outflow of whites and the increasing number of minorities was resulting in the erosion of the white middle-class tax and employment base of the older cities. This produced not only spreading ghettos, but also severe financial strain which threatened the maintenance of basic public services, including the schools. Major urban areas were showing signs of economic decay which was coupled with a significant loss of political power as white movement to the suburbs increased.

Research which established a statistical relationship between desegregation and increased white flight was conducted by James S. Coleman, et al., who concluded that desegregation through the courts would, in all probability, result in
increased separation of blacks and whites. As white flight accelerated, the cities would be left with large black populations and fewer whites to be used for racial mixing. Therefore, Coleman concluded that desegregation which was resulting in resegregation was counterproductive.

While academicians debated the validity of Coleman's research, the general public, influenced by the media's analysis of the research, was even more convinced that the policy of urban desegregation through busing was an arbitrary and self-defeating process which worsened race relations and accelerated white flight. This same public, however, was not aware that in the vast majority of affected communities, desegregation had been accomplished peacefully.

The Courts Address the Exigence. Even though there was no support from the majority of the public or elected officials, the federal courts from the district level to the Supreme Court, held firm on the principle of eliminating unconstitutional segregation. In March, U.S. District Judge John H. Pratt ordered HEW to actively enforce desegregation guidelines in 125 school districts in sixteen Southern and border states and to take action against another thirty-nine school districts whose voluntary efforts had been unsuccessful.

In Wilmington (New Castle County), Delaware, which was to become the center for some of the most outspoken anti-busing leaders in the nation, the U.S. District Court ordered a metropolitan remedy to end segregation. And in April, the Supreme Court, determining that
white flight was not an acceptable reason for achieving anything less than complete uprooting of a dual school system, ordered the city of Indianapolis to desegregate, but denied a metropolitan remedy for that district. 58

Congress Responds to the Exigence. Bowing to pressure from an ever growing number of constituents opposed to desegregation, congressmen continued their attempts to pass anti-busing legislation. Early in the year "eleven constitutional amendments were filed in the House and Senate and an additional twelve bills which would limit the extent of busing for school desegregation purposes had been submitted." 59 Throughout the debates Coleman's argument that desegregation accelerates white flight was cited by sponsors of major amendments. Coleman, himself, was the principal witness at Senate hearings organized by busing opponents.

The most ardent anti-busing spokesman to emerge from the Senate was Joseph Biden, a Democrat from Wilmington, Delaware. Attacking busing as a "bankrupt concept" that violates the "cardinal rule of common sense," 60 Biden sponsored the first antibusing amendment ever passed by the Senate. Biden's leadership was the result of community pressure exerted by the New Castle County Neighborhood School Association which opposed the metropolitan desegregation plan.

Another Senator, Minority Whip Robert Byrd, was also successful in his attempts to win passage of an amendment which repealed part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. While these amendments would have little impact on national policy, the Senate votes were symbolically
important because they were indicative of the shift in sentiment towards desegregation and civil rights. According to Senator Hubert Humphrey:

The message is that the Senate, the last bastion of civil rights support, has now joined the President and the House in opposing desegregation of towns and cities across the North and West. The message to segregated children is that Congress is ready to destroy their constitutional rights, even though the machinery has not been used for six years and was severely limited by legislation just last year....The symbolic power of Congressional action is immense, often more important than specific legislative action...the action can only encourage supporters of segregation and increase the already immense pressures on the Federal courts.61

When the bill went to conference, the Biden amendment was struck, but the Byrd restrictions were retained and became law in 1976.

However, it was increasingly apparent that the defense for urban desegregation was crumbling on Capitol Hill.

**Boston and Louisville Respond to the Exigence.** The increased fervor on Capitol Hill to pass anti-busing legislation could have been directly influenced by the anti-busing furor continuing in Boston with Phase II of that city's desegregation plan. In May, ROAR meeting "with representatives from eight states and the District of Columbia laid preliminary plans for a national ROAR with chapters across America and a Washington lobby to push for a constitutional amendment against busing."62

In September, violence also erupted in Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky, when a metropolitan desegregation plan was implemented. Parents' organizations such as Save Our Community
Schools (SOCS) and Concerned Parents vowed that "antibusing parents are never going to give in. We have a war going...Boston will be small compared to Louisville." Kentucky Governor Julian Carroll was forced to call out the National Guard and the State Patrol in order to quell the violence.

The Public Responds to Boston and Louisville. The majority of Bostonians and the rest of the nation, in general, were growing weary of the violence associated with desegregation. It was time for the hysteria to end; violence only resulted in making a difficult situation even worse. Action for change, therefore, had to be directed through legal channels. The violence exhibited in Boston and Louisville did have significant impact upon other cities where desegregation suits were pending. Regardless of their position on the issue, citizens of these cities, for the most part, vowed that they did not want to become another Boston or Louisville. As a result, only legal means to prohibit desegregation were to be employed and peaceful compliance with court orders to desegregate became the norm.

1976

Public Attitudes. The public continued to rank integration/segregation/busing as the second most serious problem confronting the public schools. Pollsters found that a "75-7 percent majority of whites believed that blacks were not discriminated against in public education," and a poll conducted for Time magazine reported
that a "51-39 percent majority of the people surveyed favored a constitutional amendment which would prohibit busing for the purpose of desegregation.\textsuperscript{65}

Presidential Candidates Address the Exigence. By the time of the 1976 primaries, busing was a fact of life in many parts of the South and the issue was of secondary importance. And in many states the issue was academic because no cases were pending or there was almost no one to desegregate. Desegregation which occurred in Omaha, Dayton, and Milwaukee, meant that "new busing affected only 0.1 percent of U.S. students."\textsuperscript{67}

The early Democratic primaries did, however, bring forth new debate about busing. None of the candidates saw it as a positive solution to desegregation. Of the six candidates still active after the first few primaries, the most liberal, Morris Udall, spoke of an "emerging consensus" against busing and favored voluntary plans. Jimmy Carter praised the approach adopted in Atlanta where the NAACP accepted an arrangement which placed more black administrators in the school system rather than introducing a desegregation plan. Both Governor Jerry Brown and Senator Frank Church criticized busing; Senator Henry Jackson continued to propose legislation to restrict busing and former Governor George Wallace favored a constitutional amendment banning it.\textsuperscript{68}

The busing issue was most prominent in the Massachusetts primary where Jackson fought Wallace for the support of voters aroused by Boston's turmoil. "Jackson won the primary after running large ads
announcing: 'I am against forced busing,' and outlining his plan to remedy the situation."69 After results of the primary were analyzed it was evident that Jackson had not been able to capture the votes of the strong anti-busers from Wallace and that an anti-busing stance could cost the party support among liberal and minority voters.

In the Florida primary, the issue was turned against Jackson by Carter, who sought to eliminate Wallace as the principal southern candidate. Running in the state with the most extensive busing orders in the country, Carter claimed that "Jackson was 'exploiting racist feelings.' I don't believe that a candidate is going to be successful in this country who concentrates on that kind of emotional issue, which is divisive, which is a negative issue....I don't say he is a racist....But he exploited an issue with racist connotations."70 Carter won the primary by winning the votes of the state's blacks while holding moderate whites. He then became the dominant political figure in the South and the leading contender for the nomination. Carter's stance on the issue consisted of support for integrated education, a personal opposition to court-ordered busing and a preference for the arrangement in Atlanta, opposition to anti-busing amendments to the Constitution and support of desegregation orders by the federal courts.

After the Florida primary, little was heard of the busing issue during the remainder of the campaign. President Ford, representing
the Republicans, attempted to re-activate the issue during the latter part of the spring campaign. In May and June he made a series of widely publicized statements about busing and directed the Department of Justice to intervene in litigation to limit busing and to draft legislation for consideration in Congress. The result was the "School Desegregation Standards and Assistance Bill" which the President sent to Congress with the message that some of the courts "had gone too far and this slowed our progress toward the total elimination of segregation." Unlike the Nixon proposal presented four years earlier which produced significant controversy and was blocked only by a Senate filibuster, the Ford bill was sent to committee and never heard from again in either house.

**Congress Responds to the Exigence.** There were Congressional attempts to impose limitations on civil rights litigation by the Department of Justice (Dole-Biden amendment) and to end the right of lower federal courts to hear any cases dealing with education (Scott amendment), but these proposals were either tabled or defeated. Except for the final enactment of the Byrd amendment, no anti-busing amendment was passed by Congress during this election year.

One sign of the temporarily changing mood was the leadership of Senator John Glenn, who proposed legislation funding the development of magnet schools. Magnet schools would have special education programs which would encourage voluntary integration. This proposal, which was designed to give education systems more options in their
attempts to improve the quality of education, passed in both houses.

The most significant feature of the long drawn out battles concerning desegregation legislation was the willingness of large numbers of leaders to go against strong public opinion on behalf of a principle which was in defense of the law. Many Northern Democrats in the Senate and the House consistently voted against the national consensus, as did a number of Republicans. These individuals, it was believed, prevented a collision between Congress and the Supreme Court.

The political winds, however, were beginning to shift and anti-busing constituencies were growing weary of watching their elected representatives vote against their wishes on this issue. The emergence of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, the first national anti-busing organization, during this same year, was to have significant impact upon these congressmen and their voting records in future elections.

By 1977, the election of Jimmy Carter as President and a new administration made the issue of school desegregation uncertain. The 1977 session of Congress was the first in years without executive branch support of some kind of anti-busing legislation. In his first year in office, Carter sent Congress neither positive nor negative proposals related to the issue. When HEW attempted to revive desegregation enforcement, the White House did not intervene, nor did
the President say anything when Congress passed an amendment that stopped the effort. Carter drew criticism from Congressional leaders concerning his appointment of Attorney General Griffin Bell and his deputy, Peter Flaherty; but civil rights groups were pleased with his appointment of Drew S. Days, III, an assistant attorney general for civil rights. The appointment of Days, however, was strongly criticized by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools,

Public Attitudes. While the public continued to cite lack of discipline and the problems related to integration/segregation/busing as the most important issues confronting public education, there was greater concern expressed about the population shifts and the government's inability to solve problems. Two to three decades before it was believed that big city schools with large enrollments were better able to provide quality education than smaller communities. This belief powered the movement for regionalization and consolidation. By 1977, this attitude was out of vogue and decentralization was popular in government, business, and education, as well. In a Gallup survey, "68% of the population believed that schools located in small communities were better." This belief was one of the reasons that families with school-age children were leaving the cities for the suburbs and other small communities. Addressing this issue, Harold C. Fleming, President of the Washington-based Potomac Institute, Inc., predicted that "as society becomes more divided in
88

housing patterns and population trends, school segregation problems will intensify. Benjamin Hooks, Executive Director of the NAACP, acknowledging the problems with busing and white flight, emphasized that the problems would not mean a lessening of the organization's commitment to quality education, an end to racial inequality. Hooks believed that "busing as a means of social integration 'was not what we set out to do, but it has become the remedy ordered by the courts.' Therefore, the NAACP would continue its fight for quality education and an end to racism.

While the NAACP would continue its struggles, so, too would NANS, which was actively working to solidify support with arguments encompassing the entire spectrum of anti-busing sentiment: federal judges who order forced busing are destroying public education, community stability, local tax bases, aggravating the energy crisis, destroying the freedom of choice, distorting the Constitution, usurping legislative authority, aggravating racial tensions, committing segregatory acts (forced busing leads to 'resegregation), disregarding federal law (1964 Civil Rights Act, 1974 EEOA), and denying the vast majority of Americans, black and white, their civil rights. This newly formed organization was beginning to play a significant role not only as a clearing-house for anti-busing information, but it was also evolving into a strong political faction as well.

Congress Responds to the Exigence. As the honeymoon between Congress and President Carter was coming to an end, anti-desegregation legislation was again being proposed in Congress. Congressman
Lawrence P. McDonald of Georgia, a NANS supporter, introduced a bill which would eliminate federal court jurisdiction in desegregation related cases. This bill was bottled-up in the Judiciary Committee. As previously mentioned, Congress did pass an amendment to a bill which prevented HEW from using any of its fiscal 1978 funds to require busing of students beyond neighborhood schools. This amendment did not affect court-ordered busing.

William B. Roth, Jr. and Joseph Biden, both Senators from Delaware where metropolitan desegregation was to begin in Wilmington/New Castle County, sponsored a bill which was designed to require the court to find intentional discrimination before it could order busing for desegregation, limit busing to the extent necessary to achieve racial balance that would have existed if the intentional discrimination had not occurred, require any court ordered busing to be delayed until all appeals were exhausted, and require that all busing cases be heard by a three judge federal court. Certain provisions of the bill were deemed unconstitutional by Bell and Carter and this bill was also bottled-up in committee.

Rep. Ronald M. Mottl, of Ohio, introduced a joint resolution which, if passed, would have been the first step toward a constitutional amendment prohibiting forced busing. The resolution read: "Section I: No student shall be compelled to attend a public school other than the one nearest his residence. Section II: The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article, and to insure equal educational
opportunity for all students wherever located." Anti-busing leaders in the House attempted to force a vote on this resolution with a Discharge Petition, but failed to obtain enough signatures. The proposal languished in committee.

As the Congressional year came to a close, intense anti-busing legislation attempts were thwarted by liberal representatives and senators.

The Supreme Court Addresses the Exigence. Although the Court had not abandoned the principles of Keyes, indications of change in emphasis convinced some observers that a new national policy was emerging. "In its decisions, the Court concluded that it must attempt to impose a policy supported by no powerful political movement and never voluntarily adopted by any major American city. In an atmosphere of confusion and pressure, cases dragged on for years with appeals and remands up and down the judicial hierarchy." Decisions rendered in 1977 indicated that the Court might be wavering on its former policies; confusion intensified.

In two school related cases, Austin Independent School District v. United States and Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman, the issue of segregative intent was the major issue. In Austin, the Supreme Court vacated the judgment and remanded the case back to the Court of Appeals. Opponents of busing viewed this case as a significant victory and an indication that the Supreme Court was finally listening to the voice of the people. In Brinkman, the Supreme Court also ruled that the accumulated violations did not suffice to justify
a systemwide remedy and remanded the case to the district court for more specific findings. Because Dayton had instituted a systemwide remedy that plan was to stay in effect until the district court ordered the changes. Again, Brinkman served as an indication that the Supreme Court was backing down on its former policies.

Another case which would eventually involve the Supreme Court was being heard in Columbus, Ohio. In this case, Penick v. Columbus Board of Education, District Court Judge Robert M. Duncan found an intent to segregate on the part of school officials and ordered a plan which would remedy the constitutional violations existing within the system.

While opponents and proponents of school desegregation debated whether or not the Court was becoming more conservative in its decisions, there were those who believed that the Court was carefully and systematically refining its position on this issue; therefore, all future cases would be decided within the strictest limitations of the law.

1978

Public Attitudes. During 1978, the public continued to rank discipline as the major problem confronting public education. Preceded by the use of drugs and the lack of proper financial support of the schools, problems related to school integration/busing dropped to fourth place. In general, however, the public continued to believe that busing for the purpose of desegregation was a counter-
productive policy that should be stopped. To accomplish this goal, NANS was intensifying its political efforts to elect anti-busing advocates to various governmental posts. Mobilization efforts were facilitated by the fact that court-ordered busing plans were to be implemented in Cleveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, New Castle County, Lubbock, and Los Angeles; voluntary plans were to be implemented in San Bernardino, San Diego, Chicago, and Seattle. Ohio, alone had five cities which had been or were being investigated by the Office for Civil Rights: Akron, Lima, Princeton, Springfield, and Toledo; and six Ohio cities, Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Youngstown, were involved in various stages of litigation.

**Congress responds to the Exigence.** Congressional activists opposed to busing continued their attempts to pass legislation which would prohibit, or at the very least impede, desegregation attempts; desegregation advocates continued to thwart these legislative attempts. Congressman John Ashbrook, Ohio, introduced a resolution calling for the impeachment of U.S. District Court Judge Frank J. Battisti; this resolution was lost in committee. Ronald Mottl was continuing his efforts to obtain enough signatures on a Discharge Petition to force an anti-busing constitutional amendment out of the House Judiciary Committee. By October, 281 signatures had been obtained—fifteen signatures short of forcing a vote. Other attempts to pass legislation were also unsuccessful.
The Courts Address the Exigence. Aside from the Bakke decision which was related to affirmative action and admission into colleges and universities, the Court broke no new ground in desegregation. The U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the Penick decision and ordered Columbus to implement its desegregation in September. However, in a dramatic eleventh hour decree, Justice William H. Rehnquist granted a stay of the desegregation order until such time as the Court could conduct a complete review. It cannot go without saying that NANS was one of the anti-busing groups which actively sought this stay. Again, Rehnquist's decree further served to encourage the public that the Court was becoming more conservative on this issue.

1979

Public Attitudes. By 1979, the American public again perceived the problem of discipline as the most important issue facing the schools. The greatest change in public attitudes occurred in the area of integration/busing. For the first time in the eleven years that Gallup had been conducting the polls concerning public education, problems associated with integration/busing dropped to sixth place. In this same poll a significant number of those interviewed continued to cite government interference as a problem confronting the schools.

NANS Responds to the Exigence. It was the government interference in the schools as it related to desegregation that the National Association for Neighborhood Schools hoped to stop. NANS was becoming
more politically active during this year in preparation for the 1980 elections. In March, NANS leaders, Jean Ruffra, William D'Onofrio, William Moss and Kaye Cook, met with DR. Elizabeth Abramowitz, Director for Education and Women's Issues, to discuss the harmful effects of forced busing. These leaders then held a press conference which was followed by a meeting with Paul Weyrich, director of the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, who offered suggestions as to ways in which NANS might become a more effective national group. It was also becoming increasingly evident that mobilization of the conservative single-issue groups was beginning.

Congress Responds to the Exigence. The greatest anti-busing activity for the year occurred in Congress when after four years of unsuccessful attempts Rep. Ronald Mottl was successful in obtaining enough signatures on a Discharge Petition. In effect, this Discharge Petition allowed Mottl's proposed constitutional amendment, which would prohibit the use of busing to achieve racial balance even when intentional discrimination on the part of school systems was found, to by-pass the Judiciary Committee and go directly to the House floor for action.

Forces on both sides of the issue exerted pressure on representatives to support their positions. Opposition to the amendment came from the ACLU, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the American Federation of Government Employees, the AFL-CIO, League of Women Voters, Americans for Democratic Action, the National Bar Association, President Carter and Vice President Walter Mondale, Attorney General
Griffin Bell, and Reps. Peter Rodino, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and John Anderson. These opponents argued that the amendment would: "set a dangerous precedent by littering the Constitution with a 'detailed social policy' rather than a broad principle;" "be a terrible mistake to take away a remedy which may be used as a last resort to assure equal protection under the law for all Americans;" "re-open racial wounds and be a terrible thing for the United States;" "for the first time in history withdraw a remedy for violation of fundamental rights. It would re-segregate many school districts and annul the greatest progress which this country has made in the last two decades." Most arguments opposing the amendment were, in fact, centered around the concept of racial justice and a fear of "tinkering" with the Constitution.

Proponents of the amendment included the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, Lino A. Graglia, a constitutional law professor at the University of Texas and legal advisor to NANS, Rep. Barry Goldwater, Jr., Representatives John Ashbrook, Sam Devine, and Chalmers Wylie of Ohio, and Marjorie S. Holt of Maryland, among others. These proponents argued that: "the Mottl amendment would restore the situation that existed shortly after the Supreme Court issued its first major desegregation ruling in 1954....That was about people being able to send their children to neighborhood schools, which is what the amendment seeks to restore." "The issue is quality education, and how can you give children quality education when you are busing them all over the place?" "The Court
has been interpreting and reinterpreting its standards in this for years. It's time to wipe this confusing slate clean and give the nation a fresh start toward the color-blind goal of providing the best public education possible without regard to race or creed for any child who wants it." 94 "The court's action is contrary to the overall public interest." 95 "Court ordered busing is opposed by a majority of Americans, black and white, is enormously expensive and educationally counter-productive." 96 "The issue is that 'judiciary terrorism' is requiring busing as a tool of 'social engineering' against the wishes of a vast majority of Americans while Congress stands idly by." 97 "The amendment will take the federal judiciary out of school districts and give school systems back to local control." 98 "Forced busing will use virtually millions of gallons of gasoline....It is an inconvenience to families having children leave for school early and get back home late. It louses up athletic programs. Many times people move into a neighborhood because they want their children to go to school there." 99 In essence, arguments supporting the amendment centered around the concepts of the neighborhood school, cost factors, energy wastage, social engineering, resegregation, and local control of the schools.

After much controversy and heated debate, the proposed amend­ment, which needed a two-thirds majority to pass, failed with "95 Democrats voting for the amendment and 176 voting against it while 114 Republicans voted aye and 40 voted nay." 100 Eighteen of Ohio's twenty-three member delegation voted in favor of the amendment. 101
House supporters of the proposed amendment believed that failure of its passage would haunt its detractors in upcoming elections. Supporter Robert Dornan of California predicted that "ten to fifteen House members will not return to Congress in 1980 because they voted against the measure. Seats will definitely change...anti-busing amendments will be brought up for a vote at every opportunity." Rep. Barry Goldwater, Jr., disappointed by the vote, believed that "in the long term it may prove to be a blessing in that those members of Congress who voted against this may run up against the kind of voters I have in my district....They may have a lot of explaining to do." 

In the final analysis, there would be a great deal of explaining to do, but in 1979, another attempt to ban busing for the purpose of desegregation was thwarted. The diversity of opinion on this issue, however, was becoming increasingly narrow with moderate and conservative Republicans and Democrats finding themselves on the same side of the issue, that being the elimination of busing to achieve desegregation.

The Supreme Court Addresses the Exigence. Two of the most important Northern desegregation cases were decided by the Supreme Court on July 2, 1979. These cases, Brinkman and Penick, would indicate the future direction of the Court. According to Drew S. Days, Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights, the outcome of these decisions would affect "...200 school desegregation plans involving 2.5 million pupils in some of
Because Columbus and Dayton were so important to the future of desegregation cases, organizations throughout the nation filed amicus curiae briefs both in support of and against systemwide desegregation remedies. Proponents of desegregation generally argued that without these decisions favoring desegregation the protection of minority rights would be undermined and hopes for an integrated society would be abolished. Arguments presented by opponents to desegregation centered around the scope of an equitable remedy in determining the degree and extent to which a district should be desegregated.

The Court decreed that in Dayton a systemwide plan for desegregating the school continue and in Columbus a desegregation remedy was to be instituted in September of 1979. After the decisions were announced, Drew S. Days announced that the “Columbus case reaffirmed the court’s commitment to forward movement in desegregation cases...and that points of law clarified by the decision could lead to pro-busing court actions affecting such major cities as Austin and Houston, Texas; Cleveland, Kansas City, and St. Louis.”

Other cities which would experience the effects would be Dallas, Cincinnati, Akron, Lima, Toledo, Indianapolis, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other large cities in Michigan and Delaware. Any city in which official intent to segregate could be proved would be carefully viewed by the NAACP and the Departments of Justice and Education.
Again, it is important to note that while the Columbus case was an important court decision, it would not serve as the final word in a fluid society that is faced with new and ever changing political, social, and economic pressures and the accompanying shift in public attitudes and priorities. Nationally, as more and more Northern cities were being faced with the problems associated with school desegregation, anti-busing sentiment and organizational efforts were growing stronger and stronger.

1980

Public Attitudes. By 1980, problems associated with integration/busing had dropped to fifth place in Gallup's annual education poll. Government interference continued to be listed as one of the top twenty problems facing public education. The most dissatisfaction with public education was expressed by Northern blacks, mostly in central cities, while persons living in rural communities and small towns and cities gave the highest ratings to their schools.

The 1980 Census indicated that Americans were migrating not only from the central cities to suburban and rural areas but there was also significant outward migration from the large Eastern and Midwestern cities to the Southern and Western Sunbelt regions of the country. These population shifts were resulting in the continued problem of resegregation since the public schools in the central cores of some of the largest Northern cities were composed primarily
of blacks and other minority groups. Busing opponents continued to argue that busing was the chief cause of white flight. They cited cities "such as Detroit which was about 60 percent black in the early 1970s and which today (1980) is more than 80 percent black and Boston which was 60 percent white before busing and is now 60 percent black." With these data in hand, opponents and proponents of desegregation arrived at two separate and distinct conclusions: opponents continued to fight for the abolishment of this policy which was driving the white and black middle class from the cities; proponents of busing were taking stronger stances for cross-district or metropolitan busing in large urban areas.

The possibilities for cross-district desegregation occurring in the early years of the 1980s seemed remote, however, because the shift in population patterns was also being accompanied by a shift in political ideology. The social liberalism of the 1960s and early 1970s was being replaced by a trend toward conservatism in the 1980s. This New Right vanguard, which had troops fighting battles on various fronts, was generally in support of the family, capital punishment, nuclear power, retaining control of the Panama Canal, a stronger defense budget, public prayer in the schools, Laetrile, the FBI and CIA, and real estate growth. At the same time they were against busing, abortion, gay rights, welfare, public employee unions, affirmative action, amnesty, marijuana, communes, gun control, pornography, the 55 m.p.h. speed limit, day care centers, religious ecumenism, secular education, car pools, the Environmental
Protection Agency, and the Equal Rights Amendment. These single interest groups which were ensconced within organizations such as the National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC), Right to Life, Moral Majority, Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, Gun Owners of America, Christian Voice, and the National Christian Action Coalition exerted a great deal of political muscle in the creation of the Republican Platform for 1980 and in the overall campaign which resulted in the election of Ronald W. Reagan, an avowed anti-buser, as President and the defeat of some of the most liberal Democrats in the Senate: Birch Bayh, Frank Church, John Culver, and George McGovern. All in all, voters ousted twelve Democratic Senators and twenty-four Representatives, most of whom were identified with the policies of "welfare-state" liberalism, from office. This resulted in Republican control of the Senate for the first time since 1952, and cut the Democratic majority in the House by more than half. The "silent majority" to which Richard Nixon most often referred in the early 1970s had become the "vociferous majority" of 1980. It was the social liberals who had joined the ranks of the silent.

Congress Responds to Its "Mandate." It did not take long for the politically conservative tide to attempt erosion of social programs. The new administration was expected to eventually make changes in federal regulations pertaining to bilingual education, sex discrimination, affirmative action, and education of the handicapped in order to make them less costly and more flexible; but immediate action was taken on the issue of busing.
Responding to pressure from President-Elect Reagan, the Senate joined the House in passage of an amendment to the $9.1 billion appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the federal courts, and other agencies. This amendment would bar the Justice Department from using the appropriated money to "bring any sort of action to require directly or indirectly the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education as a result of being mentally or physically handicapped." The bill would make it impossible for the Justice Department to become involved in any action which would result in a busing order.

Proponents of the bill, most notably Senator Strom Thurmond, the incoming chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee (replacing Edward Kennedy), and Senator Jesse Helms argued that the election of Ronald Reagan, a busing foe, was a "mandate to end busing for racial reasons." Opponents of the bill argued that it would prevent the Justice Department from enforcing mandatory busing to achieve racial balance in the schools. President Carter, on the advice of Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti, said that he would veto the bill because it would set a dangerous precedent. "It would effectively allow the Congress to tell a President that there are certain constitutional remedies that he cannot ask the courts to apply.... I cannot allow a law to be enacted which so impairs the government's ability to enforce our Constitution and civil rights acts." Because President Carter had enough votes to sustain a veto, the anti-busing
provisions were deleted from the appropriations bill.

Helms and Thurmond, undaunted by this defeat, promised that Congress, supported by the Reagan administration, would impose busing restrictions soon after the White House and the Senate passed into Republican hands in 1981. Thurmond stated, "The Senate has spoken, the House has spoken, the people do not favor forced busing for racial balance."113 Helms stated that he would advocate legislation denying federal court jurisdiction over cases involving busing to achieve racial balance in the public schools. This would go much further than simply putting restrictions on the Justice Department in school suits.114

The 97th Congress would also see renewed attempts by Rep. John Ashbrook and Thurmond to move for an anti-busing constitutional amendment. With Thurmond as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee the amendment would at least get a hearing and with the Republican gains in the House, the possibility of passing such an amendment increased. Ashbrook, who had been successful in leading passage of amendments to spending bills to keep the Internal Revenue Service from closing down private schools that had opened in cities with busing programs, stated, "I think the election convinced them that people don't want things like busing."115 Many Americans believed as James J. Kilpatrick: "Busing is morally wrong. To cart children solely because of the color of their skins is racism, blatant and overt racism, precisely as evil as the racially segregated busing of 26 years ago."116 And as the anti-busing National
Association for Neighborhood Schools became even more instrumental in mobilizing the public and swaying opinion and Congressional decisions, the indications were strong that new directions were to be taken regarding the issue of desegregation and busing.

1981

The Reagan Administration Responds to the Exigence. At the time that anti-busers were gaining momentum to eliminate school desegregation, a study conducted by Catholic University's Center for National Policy Review found that seven cities which had been involved in metropolitan-wide school desegregation programs were experiencing a faster rate of residential integration than comparable cities in size, geographic location, and racial make-up. The study concluded that metropolitan school desegregation leads to housing integration which, in the long term eliminates the need for busing. There was no indication, however, that the results of this research would, in any way, influence the public to push for metropolitan remedies.

New data published by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights stated that "only 3.6 percent of the children who ride buses to school do so for the purposes of integration." This percentage of children was contained within three hundred school systems throughout the nation. Reagan administration officials, however, firmly held to the belief that court-ordered busing had "divided the people and retarded the development of a just society." Attorney General
William French Smith, speaking before the American Law Institute, pledged that the Reagan administration would seek "to engage in practical problem-solving and adopt measures that will realistically remedy the direct results of discrimination. That means the nation must end its overreliance on remedial devices aimed solely at achieving inflexible and predetermined mathematical balance."\textsuperscript{121}

Concurring with Smith, Secretary of Education, Terrel H. Bell, announced that his department would not actively press new suits for achieving school desegregation through busing.\textsuperscript{122} Bell did not oppose either a federal law or a constitutional amendment forbidding busing as a remedy for segregation. Smith and Bell were reflecting the viewpoint of President Reagan who campaigned on the belief that although he was "heart and soul in favor of the things that have been done in the name of civil rights and desegregation, he would support a restriction on busing."\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{Congress Responds to the Exigence.} Reagan's stance on busing was greatly welcomed by anti-busing congressmen who continued to press for legislation. The legislation proposed in this new session, however, was not unlike the proposals submitted in previous sessions. The House passed an amendment to a bill which would prohibit the Department of Justice from bringing any new lawsuits to force school busing for desegregation purposes.\textsuperscript{124} This was the same bill President Carter vetoed during his final days in office. John Ashbrook again submitted his proposal which would remove the jurisdiction of the lower federal courts over busing matters. If passed,
"the lower federal court orders that require busing would become invalid and local school boards would be free to end busing." This bill was bottled-up by Peter Rodino, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, where it would, in all likelihood, remain unless Ashbrook was successful in obtaining enough signatures on a Discharge Petition.

Meanwhile, Senator Orrin G. Hatch was holding hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee on possible anti-busing legislation. Because the climate of this committee had changed after Strom Thurmond, an avowed anti-buser, assumed the chairmanship, it was increasingly apparent that some type of anti-busing legislation would be passed if not in this session, then in 1982. The major constraint affecting passage in this session was that both houses were deeply entrenched in debate on Reagan's economic proposals. As a result, Senate Majority Leader, Howard Baker, wanted to postpone all legislative proposals related to social issues until the 1982 session.

California Responds to the Exigence. Perhaps the most definitive response, to date, to the exigence occurred in California when the (California) Supreme Court refused to consider the constitutionality of Proposition 1, which "sought to stop mandatory busing by bringing California law in line with federal law which prohibits court-ordered busing unless the segregation was intentional." The effect of this decision was the immediate dismantlement of the court-ordered desegregation plan for the city of Los Angeles. In essence, this was the first major victory for anti-busers in that this was the first time that an entire desegregation plan was abolished after
implementation. While this was the first, continuing efforts on the part of the nationally organized anti-busers served to indicate that it would, in all probability, not be the last.

The National Association for Neighborhood Schools
Addresses the Exigencies: A Summation

In order to attract an audience which could be mobilized and molded into an effective political force, the NANS had to modify several exigencies.

Overcoming the Credibility Gap. The first problem to overcome was establishing a credible image with the American public. NANS wanted to attract politically conservative, middle-class, patriotic, law-abiding, hard-working Americans who believed in representative government. However, prior to the formation of NANS, many anti-busing organizations were notorious for their advocacy of violence to stop court-ordered desegregation. As a result, the audience that NANS wanted to attract was somewhat hesitant to join any anti-busing group. To overcome this negative image, NANS not only created and disseminated the message that it was an organization that worked through the law to change the law, but NANS also invoked by-laws which prohibited violence in any form. The founders of NANS were so adamant about this that in the early years of its formation even peaceful demonstrations by NANS affiliated were prohibited. As this message of non-violence was propagated through small groups, cities, and the local media, NANS began to attract non-violent, law-abiding citizens into the organization. To gain political
visibility, congressmen were not only invited to become NANS members, but they were also kept abreast of anti-busing activities in their districts.

**Mobilization into a National Movement.** A second exigence which had to be addressed was the actual mobilization of anti-busing individuals and local organizations into an effective national unit. This was a two-phase process which involved education and networking.

In the first phase, the audience needed to be educated as to the exact nature of the problem and its solution. Earlier anti-busing activists, including many NANS affiliates, spent "a great deal of time and effort getting their views expressed through attorneys in court, filing amicus briefs, and a great deal of wringing of hands about the injustice of it all." This tactic proved to be completely ineffective as court-ordered desegregation continued to spread throughout the North and West. To attract members to NANS it was necessary to educate those faced with desegregation that busing was not going to be solved through the courts and, therefore, to attempt a solution through the judicial system was a waste of time. The audience had to receive the message that it was a long term battle which would be won only through political activism. This activism was designed to elect representatives to Congress who were sympathetic to the cause of anti-busing. And as more and more people realized that the judicial system was to a great degree immune from public sentiments and that the only audience which did have the power to change this federal policy was Congress, they began to exert more
pressure on their elected representatives to support anti-busing legislation.

In order to be effective, however, this pressure needed to be channeled into what was perceived by legislators to be a powerful political force representing not just a few disgruntled parents, but the vast majority of the American society. To accomplish this goal, NANS' leadership made concerted efforts to organize new affiliates in every city facing court-ordered desegregation and to encourage these affiliates to apply political pressure on their elected representatives.

This increasing number of organized affiliates also demanded the establishment of an effective communication network so that unrelenting mass pressure could be exerted simultaneously on all representatives. In effect, when an anti-busing bill was before Congress, the anti-busing forces could be immediately alerted as to the nature of the bill and then grassroots pressure could be exerted on the respective representatives to support the legislation. This increased effectiveness in communication is such that voting records of all congressmen on various proposals are distributed to NANS' constituencies. In this way close tabs are kept on representatives who do not support anti-busing legislation, thus making re-election difficult. Vulnerable pro-busing legislators have already been targeted for the 1982 elections.

This networking, however, extended beyond those organizations interested only in anti-busing and extended into the coalition of the
single-interest groups umbrellaed under various political and religious issues. The historical significance of this coalition, which has been previously discussed in this chapter, cannot be underrated. After the 1980 elections, an anti-busing conservative was elected President of the United States; liberals, who had strongly opposed anti-busing legislation in past sessions, lost control of the Senate and were replaced by more conservative legislators who would push for social reform in all areas of life; and the House was also becoming increasingly conservative in its political make-up.

**NANS Changes Its Image on Capitol Hill.** At the same time that the coalition with other single interest groups was occurring, NANS leaders were also attempting to change its image on Capitol Hill. Prior to 1980, NANS was somewhat hampered in its ability to persuade congressmen to vote for anti-busing legislation because it was perceived to be little more than parents, housewives, and/or mothers who were opposed to seeing their children sent away from their neighborhood schools. To change this image, NANS hired one of the top lobbyists in Washington, D.C., Richardson, Randall, and Associates, to spread the anti-busing word on Capitol Hill. The engagement of a professional lobbyist was a subtle announcement to congressmen that the National Association for Neighborhood Schools had grown from a small, unsophisticated, grassroots organization into a sophisticated, politically-adoit national movement representing millions of Americans; it was a voice that would be heard.
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CHAPTER 3

THE RHETORICAL VISION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the question: What rhetorical strategies were employed by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools to create a rhetorical vision as a response to a situation? In an effort to answer this question, this chapter will provide: (1) a brief description of the methodological approach to be employed as outlined by Ernest G. Bormann in his essay, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality"; (2) a description of the organizational structure of NANS; (3) a description of the rhetorical vision as response to the situation; (4) an analysis of the fantasy themes created by the NANS and contained within the rhetorical vision and the dramatis personae in the drama; (5) an analysis of the social setting which gave impetus to the rhetorical movement; and (6) a final summary.

The Methodology. When addressing the question, "What rhetorical strategies were employed by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools to create a rhetorical vision as a response to a situation?" the critic is concerned with the fantasy themes, public fantasy events
and the rhetorical vision which exist in a complex and reciprocal set of relationships within the movement.

Beginning with the assumption that words and meanings become social reality for those who participate in the rhetorical movement, the critic collects evidence and describes the narrative and dramatic materials that have chained out for those who participate in the rhetorical vision. These narratives or fantasy themes can be interpreted as a drama which mirrors the group's present situation and its relation to the external environment. These dramatizations are then worked into public speeches and spread across larger audiences and serve to sustain the members' sense of community, to impel them to action, and to provide them with a sense of social reality.

These composite dramas which catch up large groups of people in a symbolic reality are the rhetorical vision. The rhetorical vision which is constructed from fantasy themes that have chained out to the larger audience contains typical plot lines and \textit{dramatis personae} that have common meaning for those participating in the vision. For this reason, the rhetorical vision within a message is persuasive because it repeats what the audience already knows; it also serves as a coping mechanism for those who feel lost and hopeless. The rhetorical vision of a group also explains motives and the reasons that individuals collectively take action to alter their environment.

By illuminating the ways in which those who participated in the rhetorical vision related to one another, arranged themselves in social hierarchies, acted to achieve the goals embedded in their dreams and
were aroused by the dramatic action and the dramatis personae within
the manifest content of the rhetoric, a better understanding of the
rhetorical movement can be accomplished.

Structure and Organization of the National
Association for Neighborhood Schools

Since its inception the National Association for Neighborhood
Schools established a grassroots organizational campaign which directed
its membership appeals to middle-class America;

NANS is YOU— the average law-abiding, hard-working,
tax-paying citizen who is frustrated (and indeed,
angry) at being told what to do, when to do it,
how to do it—and then being told how much it will
cost YOU. Forced busing is just one federal
program which strips you of your money, your rights,
and in this case, your children. 2

This basic theme, which has been expanded over time, led to the estab­
lishment of affiliate organizations in thirty-eight states and a
membership of approximately 250,000. 3

Participation in this organization annually costs one hundred
dollars for an affiliate, ten dollars for an individual, and fifteen
dollars for a family. 4 NANS affiliates are also urged to contribute to
the NANS Lobbying Fund on an ongoing basis. NANS members receive a bi­
monthly bulletin informing them of anti-busing activities occurring
in cities throughout the country, pending anti-busing legislation in
Congress, and Congressional roll calls. With this knowledge, NANS
members are encouraged to apply political pressure on their elected
representatives in Congress.
To accomplish its goal of eliminating forced busing as a national policy, NANS has created an organizational structure and various divisions which address specific tasks. The Board of Directors consists of approximately thirty-plus individuals who represent states having NANS affiliates. Membership to the Board of Directors is achieved by appointment from those currently serving on the Board. The tasks of the Board are to establish the policies of the organization, approve affiliate memberships, and to inform individuals throughout the country about the organization. The Executive Board is composed of nine members who are also appointed by the Board of Directors. The purpose of the Executive Board is to make policy suggestions to the Board of Directors. The Directors then have the authority to either accept or reject the suggestions offered by the Executive Board.

The officers of NANS consist of President, First and Second Vice-Presidents, Secretary, and Treasurer. NANS officers and directors are always available to travel anywhere in the nation to meet with concerned citizens and to speak at public meetings in their efforts to organize grassroots participation for their cause. The organizational structure of the affiliates is patterned after the national structure.

NANS, which is incorporated as a tax-exempt lobbying organization, also has a Political Action Committee, NANS-PAC. NANS-PAC does not contribute funds to political candidates, but it does issue roll-call information to identified conservative candidates opposing probusing incumbents. In cooperation with candidates, NANS-PAC
distributes press releases to the media in states and congressional districts and assists candidates in the preparation of position papers on the busing issue.\(^5\)

In 1980, NANS acquired the assistance of a professional lobbying firm in Washington, D.C., Richardson, Randall & Associates, to disseminate its message on Capitol Hill. The lobbyist's efforts are coordinated with the grassroots activities of pressuring elected representatives to propose and endorse anti-busing legislation.

In an effort to maintain a constant flow of current anti-busing information, NANS also contains within its structure the Statistical and Information Center. The purpose of this office is to catalogue and re-distribute statistical data and information covering the entire spectrum of the busing issue—white flight, violence/lack of discipline, low achievement scores, expense, etc.; this is done "in order to counter the propaganda of the pro-busers--a very necessary NANS function."\(^6\) The Center also receives information related to the activities of the affiliates and then compiles and re-distributes this data to other affiliates throughout the nation. In this way, leaders and members throughout the country are kept abreast of events occurring within the "NANS family." NANS also publishes a letter entitled, "Forced Busing Facts," which is regularly sent to officials in all three branches of the federal government, major media, local and state officials, and others in positions of power and influence.\(^7\)

NANS' "credibility, viability, and respectability"\(^8\) have been established among the major national conservative organizations whose
representative journals now publish the anti-busing message. The Conservative Caucus, directed by Howard Phillips, regularly sends NANS information to its fifty state coordinators. The National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC), headed by Terry Dolan, founder of Young Americans for Freedom, distributes NANS information to conservative candidates across the nation. The Free Congress Foundation, a division of Paul Weyrich's Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, uses NANS remarks in its Political Report. The Conservative Digest, the monthly magazine published by Richard Viguerie, has printed articles by NANS leaders. The Review of the News, published by the John Birch Society, has printed anti-busing articles. And the Phyllis Schlafly Report has recognized the busing issue as having significance because it undermines the American family. It is through this networking of ideas and information that the conservative movement coordinates the various issues ensconced within its ideological framework.

The Rhetorical Vision as a Response to the Situation

The history of the United States has always been a great source of pride for the American people. For more than two centuries they have reveled in the fact that a small, but mighty, thirteen colonies had the courage and perseverance to stand-up and throw-off the tyrannical shackles of the most powerful nation of the world, England. American history is replete with examples of the little man--the underdog--who confronted the forces of evil and oppression and because
of his faith and fortitude defeated his oppressor. The underdog was victorious, according to these American myths, because he adhered to the moral principles which served as the bulwark for the nation: a trust in God, a strong commitment to and love for his country, a love of his family, and a yearning desire to be free.

From their earliest beginning, Americans demanded freedom from any form of governmentally imposed restraint. Excessive control exerted by a central government was to be avoided. Because the greatest threat to freedom was perceived as coming from a centralized, absolutist state, "the obvious course seemed to be to erect every possible barrier to centralized government control." As a result, when the founding fathers wrote the Constitution, many responsibilities of government were delegated to the states. One of these primary functions delegated to the states was the creation and sustenance of public school systems. Because the purpose of education in this new land was to reinforce the culture of the local community, it was imperative that the schools be locally controlled by officials who were held accountable to the immediate community.

Historically, the school was one of the most important institutions within the community because it was here that almost all activities were centered. "The school served as a surrogate family, the center of cultural diffusion, and a storage place for ideals." The school was also a bond between the family and the community: "through specific interpersonal relations there came into school the influences of family, class, church, business, government; the school
was a knot in the web of community life."

In general, the quality of education received by the children was directly related to the degree of local support provided by the community. There is, in fact, a correlation between the value that Americans place on education and their belief in and adherence to the Puritan work ethic. For most Americans, the quintessence of the American Dream was that hard work resulted in success, i.e., material rewards or the ability to purchase a nice home in a good neighborhood with good schools, which were the hallmark of a strong and stable community. These Americans worked hard to be able to live in a good neighborhood; they financially supported their schools with their tax dollars; and they played an active role in the affairs of the school-community. It is little wonder then that these upwardly mobile Americans came to adopt an attitude of "ownership" toward their neighborhood schools.

State, and more importantly, local community control over education remained unchallenged in the United States until the mid-1950s, when minority Americans began demanding their rights that were accorded them by the Constitution. Because black Americans understood that the key to upward mobility was education, they demanded reforms in the public education systems. To insure that all Americans were accorded their rights as set forth by the Constitution, the federal government became more involved in the educational affairs of local communities. The "Great Society" programs of President Lyndon B. Johnson's administration instituted sweeping reforms that were
designed to equalize educational opportunities throughout the nation. Local school districts which heretofore may or may not have addressed the needs of the various segments of their school populations were encouraged by the federal government to identify and address these needs; federal tax dollars were provided for this purpose. However, the infusion of federal monies into a local school district placed school officials in a double-bind: without the federal funds they could not provide the educational programs necessary to meet the needs of their students, but acceptance of the money also meant that there would be more federal and less local control over the educational system. To white middle-class Americans who, for the most part, controlled public education, increased federal control was viewed as federal interference; federal interference was in direct violation of the tenet that the powers of a centralized authority must be constrained and/or limited. Therefore, the government was encroaching beyond its defined limits when it became involved in the affairs of the local school communities.

Public tolerance for federal intervention reached its zenith when public school systems, particularly in the North, which were found to be intentionally segregated were ordered by the federal courts to implement racial balance programs designed to desegregate their school. Because many Northernns lived in racially isolated communities within a school district, the method employed to create a racially balanced system consisted of abolishing the traditional neighborhood school boundaries, pairing and clustering schools in non-contiguous
neighborhoods thereby creating a new school zone, and transporting students away from their immediate neighborhood school to their newly created racially balanced school. For many parents, loss of their neighborhood schools insured the destruction of that traditional bond which had always existed between the home, the school, and the community.

Opponents of this perceived attempt at "social engineering" labeled the process of transporting children from their neighborhood schools to racially balanced schools as "forced busing." The federal government, by encroaching upon the lives of private citizens and forcing them to abide by a policy which destroyed the very foundation upon which this society was built had exceeded the limits of its powers as granted by the Constitution.

School desegregation was not the only issue tearing at the moral fabric of American life. The social turbulence generated by the counter-culture of the 1960s and early 1970s brought with it a more liberated and in many respects a more hedonistic society. American youth emancipated themselves from the traditional mores of the Puritan ethic. Anti-Vietnam War protestors defied America's traditionally patriotic spirit by desecrating the flag, burning draft cards, and staging violent protests against the war; many of these young activists denounced their American citizenship and left the country rather than serve in the armed forces. Traditional Americans who had fought to protect and preserve this nation and the free world against Fascism were appalled at the behavior of these errant youths.
The "Sexual Revolution" was perceived as defying the sanctity of the American family. Women, liberated by advances in birth control technology, were able to assume more control over their reproductive functions. No longer believing the adage that "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world," they demanded and received their "right" to abortion on demand. Women also became more career-conscious and demanded equal rights in the market-place. Economic freedom also meant that women no longer needed the economic support of the male; this was a contributing factor in the rising divorce rate. While the nuclear family consisting of father, mother, and children was the accepted norm, there was also an increase in the number of single-parent and blended families, as well as couples living together without benefit of marriage. Women's rights and this new immorality were again perceived by traditional Americans as contributing to the destruction of the family.

Increased sexual promiscuity also resulted in an increase in teenage pregnancies and illegitimate births; venereal disease reached epidemic proportions. To assist teenagers with these problems, the federal government passed legislation which permitted abortions, the issuance of contraceptives, and treatment for venereal disease without the informed consent of parents. Increased aid to dependent children and welfare benefits also made it possible for more teenage mothers to keep their babies and to establish their own households. These government policies were perceived as destroying the rights of parents to make decisions which were in the best interests of their own children.
The acceptance of alternative lifestyles by this liberated society extended into the realm of sexual preference. Homosexuals, who had always been discriminated against in the areas of housing and employment, came "out of the closet" and demanded their civil rights as citizens. Gay communities sprang-up in large urban centers throughout the country. In some areas, these political activists carried the political clout necessary to influence the outcome of local elections. Traditional Americans were not only repulsed by this "rampant" homosexuality, which they viewed as a sin against God, but they were also incensed by the political strength of the gay communities and the way in which establishment politicians "courted the vote" of these "deviants," thus legitimizing their existence.

Other factors contributing to the perceived decadence and the ensuing demise of the American culture were drugs, pornography, an increased crime rate, lack of discipline and a lack of prayer in the schools, and a general absence of spiritual and/or religious guidance.

After more than a decade of experiencing the effects of this hedonistic society ruled by the priests of "secular humanism," the ever-increasing number of once-silent politically conservative, God-fearing, family loving, patriotic Americans could tolerate no more. Believing that the nation was being destroyed from within by the liberal policies of the godless "Left" and from without by encroaching Communism, they demanded the death of the old Order and gave birth to the vision of the new Order.
The Rhetorical Vision. The rhetorical vision for this new Order was that of a strong, morally incorruptible nation valiantly facing the future, while its roots were firmly embedded in the traditional values set forth by the founding fathers: a belief in God, a patriotic love of country, and a love for and belief in the sanctity of the family as the basic structure of a strong nation. In this vision, the human spirit would be free from any form of tyranny or oppression imposed by a centralized authority. And because all men were free, they had the opportunity (and the responsibility) to work hard, improve their station in life, and then to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. For the National Association for Neighborhood Schools this meant that they were free to purchase homes they could afford in socio-economically and ethnically homogeneous communities where their children would attend their locally-controlled neighborhood schools. In this way, the traditional bond between the home, school, and community would be re-established and the primary function of education--preservation of the culture of the community--would be fulfilled.

Fantasy Themes

The dramatic materials generated by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools provides evidence that the vision contains three major themes, each being essential to the rhetoric: (1) Americans are losing the freedoms that their forefathers fought so hard to achieve; (2) white Americans, perceiving themselves to be disenfranchised from the "system" determined that busing or forced racial
balance was a racist policy; and (3) through the united effort of all Americans, who were urged to become politically involved in the affairs of the nation, not only could busing be stopped, but America could return to those traditional values upon which it was founded.

The Issue Is Freedom. Americans have always taken great pride in their achievements of the past. The United States is a country which was conceived from a love of freedom and individual liberty and a hatred of tyranny and oppression. History is replete with the myths of noble warriors going into battle to fight for truth, justice, and the perpetuation of the American way of life. It is this panoramic vision of liberty and freedom, coupled with the struggles to attain and retain these freedoms when they have been threatened either internally or externally, that motivated many Americans in the past and continues to motivate them to take up the gauntlet and to give their lives, if necessary, to protect and preserve this nation and all for which it stands.

A typical dramatization of this freedom theme is found in a letter from the National Association for Neighborhood Schools to all parents of school-age children:

Throughout history, men have struggled and they have endured great suffering in order to win liberty and to preserve a better future for their children. In our own land, they struggled against the expression of a tyrannical king, often without food, ill equipped, and ill protected against the guns of the enemy and the brutality of the elements. They struggled onward when it would have been easier to lie down in the freezing snow
and to succumb to oblivion rather than take another step. Because they had courage, and because they had deep conviction, they won a precious prize of liberty, and the United States was born.

The slave on the cotton plantations of the South...The Jews in the Warsaw ghetto...the dead of all races, religions, and creeds buried in battlefields around the world. They all dreamed of a better tomorrow. They all struggled for their cause. Their spirits endured all manner of hardships. Then, when they had drawn their last breaths, their legacy was passed to the children, a legacy that each generation accepted as its own.

Now, we have inherited the fruits of our forefathers' victories, but we have also been charged with the sacred responsibility to carry on the struggle, in order to assure the future of our children, and to give meanings to the sufferings of our ancestors.

We need not suffer bloodshed or deprivation to meet our obligation. We need only to take the time to be informed, to remain vigilant against tyranny, to exercise the power of our votes, and to support those who work in our behalf....

Another aspect of the freedom theme that is contained within the vision focuses on busing as an atrocity because it takes children from their parents and forces them into involuntary servitude; this action not only violates their freedom, but it also violates God's moral law: to bus children away from their neighborhood schools for the purpose of achieving racial balance is viewed as a means to "deprive us of our children, their bodies and their minds." "Parents have an inalienable right not to have their children subjected to various forms of involuntary servitude—no matter how benevolently intended, no matter how clothed in the rhetoric of social ideals. This right is original to the parents, being delegated by the Creator, not an omniscient state."
Court-ordered busing violates the rightful authority of parents to make decisions concerning their children's education. Even though this issue is not explicitly addressed, according to the NANS it was guaranteed by Thomas Jefferson in the Constitution:

Thomas Jefferson wrote that, 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.' The natural rights of parents to control their children's education, while not explicitly mentioned by Jefferson, would certainly have been assumed as too obvious to mention.

"NANS is fighting for the rights of all our children. To those who believe our goal is impossible, I say, 'so was the goal of our Forefathers.' Lucky for us they weren't quitters." This concept of continuing to wage battle to regain lost freedoms and to protect the rights of the children won by the nation's forefathers assumes a greater significance when translated into symbolic events dramatizing this theme. In Boston, the Cradle of Liberty, approximately 4,000 anti-busers from throughout the nation joined in the Family March Against Forced Busing. During this march a modern-day tea party was held at the sight of the original Boston Tea Party. A gallon of colored water, representing the blood of the children, which would be shed because of forced busing was poured into the harbor. "For the sake of our children, our nation, and our proud American heritage we must never waver in our fight to free the children. God Bless America and God Bless NANS."

While America's forefathers fought tyranny and oppression in order to create a new nation, at various times throughout history their
descendants have been forced to fight in order to preserve these rights. In World War II, Americans went to battle to protect not only the United States but also the entire free world from the evils of fascism. By defeating the fascist regime of Adolph Hitler, the free world endured and was made safe for democracy. However, while the external threat of fascism was destroyed, the nation must again, "take up arms" against the internal threat of fascist policies and programs implemented by the government. According to NANS, "busing as a national policy is actually a fascist endeavor by the government." This fascist policy of forced busing was imposed upon the American people by "'left wing liberals and/or godless secular humanists', who seized control of public education from the Federal level on down." These left-wing, pro-busing bureaucrats then abuse these children by making them the guinea pigs for social experimentation and mind control throughout their formative years. The destruction of the lives of thousands of America's children who have been uprooted from their neighborhoods, their friends, and their security is dramatized by the message: "a child cries tonight because he or she will be forced on a bus tomorrow."

To the NANS, the fear of being forced on a bus is reminiscent of the fear experienced by Jews living in Nazi Germany during World War II. "The long, regimented rows of dreaded yellow school buses with their specially S.W.A.T. trained drivers stands as stark testimony to creeping fascism in a country which has too often bled in the name of freedom." This "insidious encroachment on personal liberty" could
have been stopped if the masses would have vociferously rejected the first proposal of forced busing. However, the public and its leaders remained passive "until their children had their feet on the big yellow bus. This same sort of mindless passivity brought the first of several million Jews to the doors of those drainless showers at Auschwitz. Passivity has always invited oppression."28

Coupled with the fear of busing as one aspect of creeping fascism occurring within the nation is an implicit allusion to encroaching communism which Americans must also be prepared to fight. Dr. Ralph Scott, founder of the NANS, perpetuates this theme in his public speeches which are presented in cities throughout the nation confronted with the issue of desegregating their public school systems. Scott refers to the social science generated by academicians and which proves that busing "works" as "the great lie," a term used by Russian Aleksandr Solzhenitzyn in his book The Gulag Archipelago:

I'm afraid we're slipping fast into the kind of thought control--and I don't mean to say that we are there yet--that Solzhenitzyn talks of when he talks of Russia....'The permanent lie becomes the only safe form of existence.' I think social scientists are engaging in betrayal when they refuse to call the shots as they are.

Let me assure you that on university campuses today, this [pro-busing] is the only safe form of existence when it comes to forced busing.... Soltzhenitzen sums it all up when he states, 'And the lie has, in fact, led us so far away from a normal society that you cannot orient yourself any longer. In its dense, gray fog, not even one pillar can be seen.'29
The belief that agencies of the government are deliberately lying to the people about the positive aspects of desegregation only intensifies the fear that this national policy of forced busing represents the evil forces of fascism and communism creeping into their lives. This fear encourages NANS members to mobilize to fight these violations of freedom, not on the field of battle, but in the legal and political arenas.

**Busing Is A Racist Policy.** Another fantasy theme subtly interwoven into the fabric of the rhetorical vision embodies a feeling of disenfranchisement on the part of middle-class whites who have strived for upward mobility, purchased homes in respectable neighborhoods with good schools and then perceived themselves to be the "victims" if their children were bused from these neighborhood schools. The essence of the American Dream has been that hard work results in rewards: the rewards being material possessions. However, the most important barometer for measuring success has always been the financial ability to move from the central city to the outer-core or suburbs. This upward mobility created environments in which the populations were relatively more "homogeneous ethnically and in social class than the population of the central cities, younger, whiter, better educated, and more prestigiously employed than the majority of the central city residents." They arrived only because of their own initiative and hard work; they are the workers and producers of
the society and they have achieved so that their children could have better lives than they. Therefore, any government policy, such as forced busing, which is viewed as a deprivation of their rights and a violation of their freedom to live where they choose, is perceived to be un-American.

Whites, who did not want their children bused away from their neighborhood schools also realized that this position might be misconstrued to mean that they were racists. Because racism is a violation of the concept of equality of all people as well as of opportunity, it is an un-American and un-Christian attitude. Therein lay a major conflict in values: "One of the myths is that if you oppose busing you're a racist...the opposition by using these terms, is attempting to isolate you from the mainstream of society." However, busing for the purpose of achieving racial balance was opposed by the majority of Americans who did not perceive themselves to be racists and who most definitely believed themselves to be in the mainstream of American thought. Therefore, the fantasy theme which then chained out into the larger audience not only resolved this conflict, but absolved any potential for guilt: "We are not a racist organization. We believe in quality education for all races and religions, but we also believe in retaining our freedom to send our children to their neighborhood school." The neighborhood school is important to a community because parents perceive themselves to have more control over their children's safety and well-being than if they are bused. A message from an anti-busing leader develops this theme:
...For those of you who have not yet born witness to the horrors of this bankrupt social experiment called Forced Busing I'll simply say this. You will probably never feel as useless as when parents bring you children who are so scared of going to school that they cry all night. Those children who have been assaulted, extorted, raped, and all the other unspeakable crimes that escalate and spread via a forced school bus.

...The tragic and bloody record speaks for itself....When the NAACP stops preaching and looking backward in hatred it will be a better world for all children. Till that day comes, never be afraid of being called a Racist or a Bigot because you fought to protect the children. Because you refused to offer up your children as sacrificial lambs on the altar of the N.A.A.C.P. or the A.C.L.U. doesn't make you a Racist or a Bigot. It makes you an American who cares about the welfare of the children. 34

Another dramatic incident which supports this theme appeared in The South Boston Marshall, the newspaper of the anti-busing organization in South Boston:

Busing is an immoral outrage because it takes white children who come from homes with presumably high cultural, ethical and moral standards and buses these children to ghetto schools where drugs, crime, and even prostitution are the order of the day.

I watched mothers crying on television the other night--crying because they do not want their daughters to be bused to ghetto schools where 'angel dust,' PCP, heroin are being utilized by ghetto youngsters.

How dare these so-called liberal judges tell mothers in America that their daughters are to leave a culturally advantaged school and be sent to a criminal area. If that is integration--it is wrong, wrong, wrong!35

Coupled with a concern (or fear) for the safety of their own children was the belief of white Americans (and an increasing number of minority Americans) that busing was a racist policy that was
degrading to blacks. According to James Kilpatrick, "...busing is morally wrong. To cart children around a city solely because of the color of their skins is racism, blatant and overt racism, precisely as evil as the racially segregated busing of 26 years ago." Another message conveying this same theme is that "busing is degrading to blacks; to say you're not getting a good education unless you're sitting next to whites...Chinese are convinced they don't have to sit next to whites to learn....The Jewish have their own schools...." Perhaps one of the more dramatic illustrations on this theme is one which recalled the past history of black people in this nation and established a correlation between busing and slavery:

Busing is as harmful to blacks as it is to whites. It puts blacks in chains and drags them off to schools they are not yet ready for. It makes blacks dependent on the government power structure. Blacks have been deceived about busing. Therefore we must make every effort to join with the black community and wage lawful battle against the common enemy.

Because busing was a policy that was as detrimental to blacks as it was to whites it served to enhance the fantasy theme that Americans had a duty and a responsibility to become actively involved in the struggle to restore lost freedoms and to insure a quality education for all children, but in the schools closest to their homes.

In Unity There Is Power. The final fantasy theme which contributes to the creation of the rhetorical vision was one of unity. Through the united effort of all Americans this atrocity of forced busing
could be stopped. Examples of dramatization found within the unity fantasy theme were disseminated in the NANS literature and in the public speeches of leaders:

It's an old cliche that you can't fight city hall
And, indeed, alone you cannot. But WE can. You
and I and hundreds of thousands of other NANS
members throughout the United States. No longer
can the pro-busing forces select target cities
without organized, professional opposition.
We are going to win this battle. We are going
to win and with YOUR help we will win it a little
bit sooner.39

* * * * *

Since the inception of NANS, our belief has been
that NANS could change the 'system' by working
through the system. We (this means YOU) have to
MAKE forced busing a National issue--it's up to
YOU to open the drapes and let the sunshine show
all the dirt they [pro-busers] are trying hard to
cover up.40

"We must marshall every effort--both political and social to force
this issue....Single issue politics, if that's what it takes--firm,
constant, and, if necessary, strident expressions of our views on
busing."41 Because the United States is a representative democracy,
there is no more powerful force than public opinion and organized
pressure; it is, in fact, the true "American Way." "Will forced
busing be stopped, and will that judgment 'roll down like thunder?'
Yes--but only if one person begins to organize local pressure, and if
this pressure is exerted on every branch of government at every
level."42 "Yes, Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, you can fight city
hall and win--together."43 "United We Stand--Divided We Bus."44
James Venema, a former NANS President, pictured Americans as soldiers valiantly fighting a war, not with guns, but with facts. According to Venema, as a national organization, the NANS had three important assets on its side: "the facts, the law, and the people.... Our most important task is to educate the public arming them with the facts and the law and then welding that vast majority of Americans opposed to busing into a single voice which cannot be denied." A NANS member best described this valiant effort of the anti-busers when she offered a poem commemorating NANS' first anniversary:

The opposition said, 'We'll use a court order forcing the bus'...but they did not reckon with the determination of us! Hundreds of thousands of Americans, proud we stand--to stop this horror creeping across the land. Strong Americans have now joined hands, to stop with an amendment this atrocity--in the name of NANS. NANS is here and justly will be the key to our children's freedom legislatively.

In summation, the three major fantasy themes which chained out for the NANS and contained within the rhetorical vision are: (1) busing is a violation of our freedom for which our ancestors fought and died and busing represents encroaching fascism and communism; (2) busing disenfranchises whites from the "system" and is as racist as the segregation it attempts to overcome; and (3) victory, which will result when busing is stopped, can be won through the united effort of all freedom-loving Americans.
The Dramatis Personae

The Protagonists. Because the issue of freedom is paramount in the rhetorical vision of the NANS, the protagonists in the drama are those freedom-loving Americans who are opposed to forced busing, but believe in progressive integration, God, the stability of the family, and the country. These Americans are so committed to these beliefs that they exercise their rights as citizens by joining NANS and becoming politically involved in the democratic process so that the traditional values upon which this country was founded would be restored. These protagonists are always portrayed as striving for the ultimate good of the society, searchers and explicators of truth, and dedicated, honest followers of the American Way.

Because racism is considered to be un-American and, in their vision, NANS' members represent all that is truly American, these protagonists present the image that they are not racists, but concerned parents:

I want to make our position clear. We are not a bunch of segregationists; we are not a bunch of rednecks; we are not a bunch of Ku Klux Klansmen; we are not a bunch of racists. We are just concerned parents--concerned about all children in Columbus and in the United States who have been or are facing forced busing.48

NANS' protagonists are also portrayed as having the faith necessary to accomplish their goals: "I'm out to change my world. You watch, you wait, and you'll see."49 NANS members also have far-reaching talents: "When the media and busing proponents discover the depth
of talent which we have assembled, they will realize that we mean business."

NANS members throughout the nation are identified and receive lavish praise for their accomplishments. One such acknowledgment was received by Kaye Cook, former President of NANS of Columbus and national secretary of NANS:

We are deeply grateful to Kaye Cook for her extraordinary leadership and achievements. She has set an example of personal courage which has been a source of strength to all NANS members and without which we might have accomplished nothing.

Valiant acts performed by valiant people are also recognized and praised. In one incident occurring in Corpus Christi, Texas, Barbara King and Vivian Guyer, two mothers, risked going to jail because their children were going to be bused away from their neighborhood school. Because the fantasy theme portraying NANS members as loving parents who assumed responsibility for the safety and security of their children is paramount within the vision, these two women, who would give up their own freedom to insure the freedom of their children, were, in essence, "madonnas" of the anti-busing movement.

Protagonists are also those individuals who oppose the tyranny of the federal judiciary. This judicial tyranny is no different from that of King George III:

That the people in South Boston (as well as others) have resorted to violence is regrettable. That they continue to resist the court's tyranny is admirable. Forced integration has all the trappings of a police state and those who resist are no less heroes than those patriots who resisted the tyranny of King George III, who, in 1776, also was the law.
Other recognized heroes include: Lino Graglia, "the man who beat forced busing in Austin, Texas--the Bailey of constitutional rights....

When we face the NAACP they have the big guns; so we have to have matching big guns;" Dr. Howard L. Hurwitz of the School Management Company and editorial writer for The News World, a conservative publication, who, on occasion has waived his usual $1,000 to $1,500 speaking fee for NANS; Dr. Ralph Scott, founder of NANS; James J. Kilpatrick, noted syndicated columnist who spreads the anti-busing message to a national audience; and politicians, educators, and religious leaders who speak out against the evils of forced busing.

Another group of individuals who receive special recognition by NANS consists of black leaders who oppose busing as a national policy. Included in this group are Derrick Bell, a Harvard law professor; The Black Silent Majority Committee, which joined NANS in the attempt to pass a constitutional amendment to stop forced busing; Professor Thomas Sowell, an economist at UCLA and a researcher for the Hoover Institute; Thomas Curtis, William Raspberry, "Tony Brown and a host of other black leaders who could remain silent no more." NANS leaders also praise the work of Marva Collins, "a dedicated black teacher fed up with federal regulation, left Chicago public schools and opened her own private school in Chicago's inner city...her students excel and they are not in a racially balanced setting...[proving] that there is no 'white magic.'"
These black protagonists who are opposed to busing give credence to the fantasy theme that busing is not a racial issue; it is as degrading to blacks as it is to whites. Recognition of these black protagonists is necessary to establish that busing is of great concern to all freedom-loving Americans everywhere, regardless of their color.

As a rhetorical movement, it is important for NANS to emphasize that its real strength is found within "our thousands of unnamed individual members who never get into the limelight, but work writing letters, making phone calls, recruiting members, and speeding the message of NANS....God Bless our unsung heroes, may one day the children of this nation know of their sacrifice." 62

While it is evident from the data generated by the NANS that the underlying theme within the drama is the triumph of goodness over evil, protagonists or actors in the drama are not abstracted conceptualizations of that which is good, but identified, realistic, individuals and/or institutions who are fighting the battles in the war of freedom. During its year of inception, however, NANS compared its battle against the established order with the Biblical story of David and Goliath. The NANS was the little David of American society with but little money and fledgling (but powerful) membership which set out to slay the mighty Goliath--the institutionalized power structure consisting of the Congress, the federal courts, the NAACP, and all other pro-busing organizations and individuals. And as little David slew the mighty Goliath, so, too, would the NANS conquer the established order.
Legitimate Acts Performed by the Protagonists. Conquering the established order or passing legislation to prohibit forced busing can only be accomplished through political activism. This political activism is designed to exert pressure on state and national legislators to pass a constitutional amendment addressing this issue or, in lieu of an amendment, to pass legislation which will either (1) prohibit busing, (2) deny the federal courts jurisdiction over cases pertaining to school desegregation, or (3) limit or prohibit the use of federal or state tax monies for desegregation purposes.

Changing the laws and/or passing a constitutional amendment requires grassroots activism. It is this political activism that is encouraged and praised as the legitimate acts performed by NANS members "who, as part of being good citizens, join together in groups and organizations to express our ideas on issues which are important to us." To mobilize the anti-busers into a powerful political force, the NANS use the same tactics employed by the political activists of the 1960s and 1970s: crystallize the issue, organize the masses around this one issue, exert pressure on congressmen and senators, and if they do not cooperate, elect representatives who will.

In this war of freedom, NANS members receive extensive instruction in "how to do battle" on this political front:

It has frequently been said that forced busing won't be stopped until buses are rolling in every city, nationwide. Though for the most part, Congress is sitting on its duff, that is the only vehicle that can stop busing. And Congress will not respond until ungodly political pressure is focused
on each and every Senator and Representative. THIS
IS YOUR JOB--today--tomorrow--next week--next year.
One postcard, one letter, one phone call--that
will not work. PRESSURE MUST BE CONSTANT, UNRE-
LENTING, AND TOUGH! 65

NANS members are also advised against accepting the argument that
Congress cannot stop busing because it is within the jurisdiction
of the federal courts.

NANS operates with the knowledge and conviction
that Congress backed and urged on by an informed
voting public, CAN STOP FORCED BUSING. Congress,
under our CONSTITUTION CAN confront and stop
the federal courts and CAN regulate and stop
the pro-busing federal bureaucracy. 66

It is important that NANS members be informed on the issue so
they are not fooled by the arguments of their elected representatives:

Do not be fooled by those politicians who will
tell you one thing and do the exact opposite.
When you hear the common cop-out....'I'm opposed
to forced busing, but...)' BUT WHAT! When your
Senator votes against a busing measure, YOU take
him to task, immediately! The time for pleas­
antly asking for cooperation is long past.
It is time to find out if we indeed have a 'repre­
sentative' form of government anymore. YOU TELL
THEM EXACTLY WHAT TO DO. 67

NANS members must not only actively involve themselves in the
battle, but they must also encourage others to participate:

It is essential to contact friends and relatives
in other areas. ALERT THEM, EDUCATE THEM, INVOLVE
THEM. Get them to join NANS. We need people in
every city, in every congressional district, and
we need them by the thousands. Most elected
officials listen to one thing--VOTES! To do...
PRESSURE, PRESSURE, PRESSURE. 68

NANS members also have the right and the responsibility to make their
opinions known:
Take pen in hand, two hours a week, and write letters...expressing YOUR views, opinions, interests, ideas, and opposition. We still have the right to free speech and the right, indeed, the responsibility, to challenge and oppose our officials and their policies. USE THESE RIGHTS WHILE WE STILL HAVE THEM!

NANS members are encouraged to get their state legislatures to:

(1) pass the American Legislative Exchange Council suggested resolution asking Congress to pass legislation removing federal court jurisdiction to order forced busing; (2) get their congressmen to sign the Discharge Petition to bring the proposed Mottl constitutional amendment to the House floor; (3) raise money for the lobbying effort; (4) donate their own money for the lobbying effort; (5) organize a NANS membership drive in their area; (6) flood letters to congressmen, senators, the President, and state representatives; (7) keep NANS' news releases, letters to the editor, forums, etc., flooding into their local media; and (8) vote pro-busing representatives out of Congress and anti-busing representatives in.

NANS leaders receive recognition for testifying before legislative committees and meeting with federal officials in Washington, D.C., lobbying on Capitol Hill, traveling nationwide to assist in the formation of new affiliates, providing expert witnesses at desegregation hearings, appearing on television and radio talk shows, and speaking-out in any other forum that would spread NANS' message to the mass audience.

NANS affiliates are also requested to establish and maintain close alliances with other pro-American and pro-children organizations
in their areas; "it is through this type of joint effort that NANS magnifies their efforts and strength."71 When important legislation pertaining to the busing issue is to be heard in Congress, the NANS nationwide phone tree is activated as well as the "phone banks of such groups as the Moral Majority and Christians United."72 In this way, all groups which are opposed to forced busing can exert pressure on their elected representatives.

While activities that relate to political involvement which keeps the issue alive are recognized and deemed praiseworthy, it is important to note that violence or activities that might result in violence are not acceptable. NANS by-laws specifically prohibit any NANS affiliate from engaging in any form of violent protest. As an organization that works within the law to change the law, only legally accepted forms of protest are tolerated.

Antagonists. The vision of the NANS also dramatizes antagonists--enemies or villains--either individuals or organizations within the society who are castigated because their liberal pro-busing beliefs are destroying the traditional values upon which this country was founded. Like the protagonists, the antagonists are not described in abstract terms, but are specifically identified as villains.

Those individuals who are most responsible for busing, and therefore readily identified as the villains in the drama, are the federal court judges who "are acting in a racist manner by treating children not as people but as blacks and whites."73 The NANS believe
that as long as liberal pro-busing judges sit in judgment there can be no justice for the children of our nation. The federal judges are, in NANS' view, depriving their children of their rights, but they are also viewed as being a powerful adversary: "The federal judiciary is our enemy. Never underestimate the power of the federal judges." Throughout the NANS literature, federal judges as a collective body are often depicted as being jackasses, imbeciles, or the Imperial Judiciary; on occasion, however, specific judges receive the brunt of NANS' vitriole. Congressman John Ashbrook introduced a resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives to have Federal Judge Frank Battisti (Cleveland) impeached. Ashbrook referred to Battisti as a "lunatic." Rep. Ron Mottl called Battisti a "villain." Accompanying Judge Battisti were the denounced villains, "Adolph" Garrity (Boston) and "Adolph" Gordon (Louisville). By clearly identifying the villains in the drama, the fantasy theme pertaining to freedom is sustained. Busing is, in NANS' perspective, "an unworking fiasco being forced upon the American people by federal judges who are becoming more bizarre with their orders. This represents judicial dictatorship. We look on it as a definite disenfranchisement of the people." Federal judges who ordered busing were:

PURPOSELY destroying public education.
PURPOSELY destroying community stability.
PURPOSELY destroying local tax bases.
PURPOSELY aggravating the energy crisis.
PURPOSELY destroying freedom of choice.
PURPOSELY distorting the Constitution.
PURPOSELY usurping legislative authority.
PURPOSELY aggravating racial tensions.
PURPOSELY committing segregatory acts (i.e., forced busing leads to resegregation).
PURPOSELY disregarding federal law (i.e., 1964 Civil Rights Act, 1974 EEOA).
PURPOSELY denying the vast majority of Americans, black and white, their civil rights.84

In concert with the tyranny of federal judges, who serve as dictators controlling the lives of freedom-loving Americans, are liberals and the powerful liberal establishment. Forced busing was, in fact, "dreamed up by power-hungry bureaucrats, pseudo-intellectuals, and fuzzy headed liberals."85 According to NANS' President, William D. D'Onofrio,

Busing literally brought home to millions of Americans the complete power over their lives which the liberal establishment now holds. More than anywhere else, it is in busing that we see the liberal establishment hypocrisy at its most blatant worst. And more than anything else, busing destroyed the myth that liberals represent the people against the wealthy and powerful...The anti-busing movement has learned that the liberals' hypocrisy, arrogance, and refusal to learn from experience on this issue are not accidental.86

The mind of the liberal is also maligned: "I swear there is something in the liberal mind that is wed to mayhem and failure. If a program doesn't work the liberal responds with a ringing 'More of the same!'...Its supporters are ready to ride it into the abyss."87 The motives of liberals are also questioned: "There's nothing quite as up-setting to me as to hear a white, rich liberal who can afford to put his children in private schools tell me how great these programs are going to be for me."88

Perhaps the greatest attack on liberals came from the fundamentalist New Right movements which transformed the terms "liberal"
and "liberalism" into synonyms for godlessness and immorality.89 Liberals then became secular humanists who are anti-God and anti-family, and therefore, threats to a moral society.

Another group closely allied with white liberals were black leaders who "share a social vision common among the white liberal elite with whom their lives are intertwined and from whom they receive the favorable publicity and financial support essential to their roles as black leaders."90 According to Professor Thomas Sowell, a black economist, these black leaders "become unwitting agents—Uncle Toms—of secularist liberalism that leaves the children of black parents at the mercy of the monolithic public schools."91 These black leaders represent such organizations as the "civil righteous" National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which according to the National Association to Protect and Preserve Freedom, "places integration higher in its hierarchy of values than freedom of choice. It subordinates the rights of parents to have their children educated in nearby schools to the dream of the NAACP of a totally forcefully integrated society of the future."92 The instigators carrying the yellow banner of forced busing are "the zealous lawyers of the N.A.A.C.P. who come into communities like carpetbaggers, file desegregation suits and collect enormous court-ordered legal fees."93 The NAACP legal brigade is accompanied by "pseudo-liberal newspaper editors—gutless poseurs who trumpet the cause of forced busing for the inner city while their children attend all-white schools in the affluent suburbs."94
Another enemy to be fought so that the traditional values of God, family, and country could be preserved is the National Education Association. NEA is composed of "ultra left wing liberals plotting to control America's politics through the process of sullenly brain-washing America's public school children."95 In reference to NEA's 1980 national convention, Robert DePrez, NANS First Vice-President, wrote to NANS leaders:

Every other speaker...talked of minority and homosexual rights. I heard little if any praise for preserving the traditional values of God, Family, and Country. I heard little of preserving traditional family values or improving opportunities both educationally and economically for all America's children.95

The NEA, as well as the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) receive extensive criticism from the NANS for openly endorsing the concept of equal educational opportunities which, to the NANS, is a euphemism for forced busing.

Agents of the federal pro-busing bureaucracy are also villainized by the NANS. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, depicted as being a "blackmail artist,"97 was accused of not only contributing to the disintegration of the public school system, but also of contributing to the problem of the disintegration of the family.98 The U.S. Commission for Civil Rights, "the federal government's chief propaganda arm on forced busing," was accused by NANS of lying and distortion in its reports on the success of desegregation.99 Refuting the fact-finding efforts of the USSCR in its 1976 desegregation report, the NANS wrote:
The public has grown accustomed to the exaggerated statements of the busing liberal, but this report tops them all and has to go down as the epitome of deceit. The impact that this report will have toward perpetuating court-ordered manipulation of schools and children against the will of parents of all races is atrocity enough, but the USCCR has committed a second atrocity of equal magnitude, that of using public office and public tax dollars to commit the premeditated deception of their fellow Americans in order to further and substantiate their own failing ideologies. 100

Other agents and agencies scorned by the NANS include pro-busing politicians, desegregation consultants who earn $1,000 a day, religious leaders, Chambers of Commerce and other organizations and individuals who support and encourage peaceful compliance with desegregation orders, the American Civil Liberties Union, the AFL-CIO, and the "misguided ultra-liberal national media which does not report the truth about NANS and busing."102

Symbols Are the Reality. Because the words or the symbols are the social reality for those participating in the movement, by clearly identifying the pro-busing villains in the drama and attributing to them the most ignoble of motives, NANS is employing a significant rhetorical strategy which has tremendous persuasive powers not only to attract the unconverted, but also to generate a sense of community from within the movement.

Kenneth Burke establishes the concept: "if any given terminology is a reflection of reality, by its very nature as a terminology it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function as
Deflection "directs the attention into some channels rather than others." When NANS re-names the agencies of the government it is creating a new reality. When federal judges are called jackasses, imbeciles, villains, and fascists they are no longer entitled to receive the respect to which by tradition they are entitled; when agents of the federal bureaucracy--HEW, USCCR--intentionally lie to the people, they are no longer entitled to receive the support of the people; and when political liberals are called hypocrites, arrogant, godless secular humanists, gutless poseurs, and Uncle Toms of secular liberalism, they become the forces of evil which must be eradicated from the society. These "terministic screens" also serve to emphasize the divisiveness within the society: liberals and the policies of the liberal elite are on the "Left"; God-fearing, patriotic, freedom-loving Americans (as the protagonists who will return this nation to its former state of greatness) are on the "Right." And true to their vision of creating a new Order, the "Right" will prevail when the protagonists, as brave and valiant soldiers motivated by a fierce determination to be victorious, join together and wage war against the evil forces destroying this nation.

The Scene

In order to understand the way in which the rhetorical movement fits into the scheme of history it is necessary to review the way in which various forces existing within the society inter-relate to create a somewhat complex social and political situation.
The later years of the decade of the 1970s marked a turning point for Americans. The celebration of the Bicentennial provided an opportunity to reflect upon the country's past accomplishments, but it also forced Americans to evaluate their present condition as they planned for the future. Americans had always taken great pride in the belief that the United States dominated the world economically and politically; however, events of the 1970s shattered that concept. The United States discovered the limits of its powers when it "lost a war for the first time, weathered the disgrace and resignation of a President, and watched helplessly as inflation eroded its dollar and the oil cartel held the world to ransom." The nation's mood reflected a sense of uneasiness, pessimism, and apprehension, not only for the present, but for the future as well.

It was also a time of tremendous social foment. "So many groups were pleading special causes that the political system was in danger of fragmentation." Exposure of corruption and scandal within the country's major institutions caused Americans to respond "with a distrust of big government, of most institutions, politicians, and the idea that public spending could solve all problems." However, even though they were disillusioned with the current state of affairs, Americans also maintained an optimistic belief that their problems could be solved. A new wave of patriotic spirit began to emerge as Americans rededicated themselves to the traditional values of God, country, and family in their efforts to recreate a country that was economically, politically, and socially more conservative.
The attempt to create a new order was precipitated by several events occurring simultaneously in the later portion of the decade: (1) emanating from middle-class America was a general dissatisfaction with the economic and social policies of the "Great Society" programs instituted by the liberal left; (2) conservative single interest groups emerged and coalesced into a powerful political movement; and (3) evangelical Christians mobilized and, joining forces with the New Right single interest political groups, became politically active in pro-American, pro-family, pro-life, and pro-moral issues.

Middle-class Dissatisfaction. The greatest fears of most Americans were centered around the problems associated with inflation, recession, and unemployment. Following the Vietnam War, run-away inflation convinced many Americans that the economic pie which had expanded throughout the previous decade was shrinking. Middle-class taxpayers who were the workers and producers of the society perceived themselves to be financially "squeezed" in order to support the "welfare state" policies of the liberal Left. Middle America also believed that the economic programs designed to create the "Great Society" did not work; "despite the investment of billions of dollars, poverty did not end, slums were not eradicated, bad schools got worse, and crime rates increased." Therefore, government programs which were being financed by the middle-class and which had not worked in the past should not be continued in the future. The time had come for a national fiscal policy that was more conservative.
Coupled with rising inflation and the "shrinking economic pie" was a white backlash against affirmative action programs for minority groups. Whites believed that they were being discriminated against as a matter of public policy and they became increasingly resentful of government programs that advocated and encouraged what they perceived to be "reverse discrimination." Liberalism and civil rights had gone too far when middle-class Americans believed that the door leading to the fulfillment of the American Dream was closed to them. The policy, therefore, had to change.

Renewed Interest in Ethnicity. Along with the economic issues plaguing middle-America, two factors which also contributed to the political re-orientation of attitudes were a renewed interest in ethnic identification and the migratory patterns of the population. Americans no longer perceived themselves to be a "melting pot" nation with a minimal emphasis upon racial, ethnic, or religious distinctions, but rather they more realistically perceived themselves to be a collection of separate ethnic blocks with their own particular concerns. They reaffirmed a pride in their ethnic origins and in the belief that their ancestors had come to this country, worked hard, and through their own initiative succeeded in making the American Dream a reality. Therefore, these ethnic Americans who placed a high value upon individual responsibility, equality of opportunity, personal freedom, and limited government were also becoming increasingly antagonistic toward a highly centralized government that was placing undue emphasis on the special interests of particular minority groups.
Throughout the decade, migration patterns occurred that seemed to indicate that "Americans did not want an urban society—or at least they did not want to live largely in metropolitan areas of high density." 111 As a result, two significant demographic trends developed: (1) people and jobs shifted from the urban areas of the North and Midwest and settled in the South and West; and (2) settlement of areas beyond the suburbs created new outer suburbs extending into sparsely populated rural areas. These new migrants "felt more independent of society in general, less inclined to support centralized government, or to join a labor movement, or to be sensitive to the plight of the poor left behind in the central cities—-even if their own life was one of substandard existence in a mobile home along a dirt road." 112 In essence, this scattered society with its authentic roots embedded in the traditional values of hometown America was also a more conservative society.

The Emergence of "Single Issue" Politics. The second major factor which turned the political tide away from the liberal Left and toward the conservative Right was the emergence and coalescence of conservative single issue movements into a powerful political force. People were turning to special-interest groups on an unprecedented scale; "politics focused on one issue at a time, with no room for compromise. Political action committees raised more money than either major party and then lobbied congressmen for favors to earn the funds." 113 "In the words of the best-selling self-help book, everybody was 'Looking out
Kenneth Boulding described it as a "creeping meanness of spirit," and Frank Mankiewicz, chief of National Public Radio, described it as being a "new selfishness without guilt, sort of a smugness that says, 'You can haul up the ladder, I'm on board.'"

Precipitated by the belief that liberalism was associated with give-aways, prolific public spending of people's hard-earned tax dollars, the deterioration of the family unit and traditional values, and a weakening of the national defense, small town inhabitants, conservative Catholics, and working class whites who Richard Nixon, in 1972, labeled as the silent majority, became as politically active as the civil rights and anti-war protestors of the previous decade.

The political momentum and power of these grassroots, single-interest groups were not fully realized until they were mobilized under the conservative umbrella of the New Right. Playing on the theme that government intrudes too much in the lives of Americans, the vision of the New Right was to return America to the traditional values upon which this country was founded: rugged individualism, equality of opportunity, personal freedom, limited government, and a strong national defense that would restore America's supremacy in world affairs.

One specific agenda of the New Right that is pertinent to the vision projected by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools is the basic reformation of the public education system. These reforms include:
1) Restoring the neighborhood school tradition by ending forced busing to achieve racial balance in schools.
2) Requiring the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the U.S. flag as a public school ceremony.
3) Restoring prayer (at least Bible reading) in the school.
4) Ending the mingling of sexes in sports and other school activities such as physical education classes.
5) Ending sex education that includes acceptance of abortion, premarital sex, and homosexuality.
6) Excluding gay teachers from schools.
7) Examining textbooks and school library books which are obscene and vulgar and prohibit their purchase and use in schools.
8) Assisting parents who send their children to private and parochial schools with tax credits, or tax deductions, or vouchers that would permit choice of school.
9) Ending secular humanism (Godlessness) whereby children are not taught right from wrong but are encouraged to adopt only those values that suit them.
10) Re-emphasizing basic skills so that children can benefit from study of solid subjects.

Reformation of the public education system was only one small example of the changes the conservatives hoped to make in American life as they worked for the creation of the new Order.

Spreading the Belief. The conservative landscape, which was brought into sharp relief by the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan as President was, like its liberal counterpart, made up of an "extensive and well-financed network of think tanks in Washington and New York [the Heritage Foundation, Institute for Contemporary Studies, the National Legal Center for the Public Interest, the American Enterprise Institute, the Hoover Institute, the Cato Institute, and the
Institute for Humane Studies], national magazines, organizations that crank out research on dozens of public-policy issues or spread the conservative message across campuses and activist legal groups that help corporations fight government regulations."\textsuperscript{119} Leopold Tyrmand, who, as editor of the \textit{Rockford Papers}, is part of the conservative network, describes it as a "'second culture' which has developed its own system of communication by way of newsletters, periodicals, scholarly journals, lecture circuits, and academic organizations."\textsuperscript{120} For the decade of the 1980s, the ideas of the liberal Democratic Left were replaced by a vision of a better tomorrow as generated by the conservative Republican Right.

\textbf{The Mobilization of Christian Evangelicals.} The third major factor which contributed to a more conservative ideological landscape was the activism of Christian Evangelicals in the political arena. The evangelical community which historically maintained a belief "that the road to salvation lay in the Bible, not the ballot box became convinced that fiercely held conservative values of God, country, and family were threatened by a rising tide of what they called 'secular humanism' sweeping across the country."\textsuperscript{121}

Under the guidance of the New Right architects, the long-apolitical Evangelicals forged a union around four broad commitments: pro-life, pro-traditional family, pro-moral, and pro-American. According to Jerry Falwell, leader of the highly visible and vocal Moral Majority, "America is in a moral crisis--America has violated some
principles. Unless the country reverts to those principles, Americans will lose their freedom, the 'basic moral law.'

Evangelical Christians, who generally subscribe to a literal interpretation of the Bible and the Biblical interpretation of creation, charged that public schools were Godless and advocated Bible reading and prayer in public classrooms. They were also opposed to court-ordered busing, the Equal Rights Amendment, civil rights for homosexuals; they sought abolition of the Department of Education, less government involvement in their private lives, a strong national defense, support for Israel and "anything else that related to the sovereignty of this country."

To advance their cause(s), these Christian fundamentalists "transformed the terms 'liberal' and 'liberalism' into synonyms for godlessness and immorality." Their goal is to eradicate humanism, which in the fundamentalism view is a "narrowly defined anti-Christian creed that denies God, glorifies self-indulgence and preaches everything from Darwin's theory of evolution to socialism and pornography." According to Falwell, "with the influence of humanists in government, the media, and public education, secular humanism has become the religion of America. It has taken the place of the Bible. We must remove humanists from public office and replace them with pro-moral political leaders." The apocalyptic message became the rallying cry of a diverse group of right-wing political and religious groups throughout the nation.
After the 1980 elections, liberal politicians were reeling under attacks from these single interest and religious factions and they faced additional challenges in the future. However, research surveys indicated that what is perceived to be a "moral majority" is, in fact, an intensely religious minority with a penchant for activities that make them politically influential. Just as it was the disenchanted who were the most vocal in the '60s and '70s, the minority of the intensely religious and strongly moralistic are the doers, the talkers, the joiners, and the voters in their communities. They do not necessarily represent the majority American viewpoint on all issues. However, because of their intensity and fervor they have been able to construct a vision for a new society. Whether or not they have the ability to sustain the vision and to reorder society remains to be seen.

Fantasy Themes and the Rhetorical Vision of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools: A Summation

This chapter focuses on the question: What rhetorical strategies were employed by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools to create a rhetorical vision as a response to a situation?

NANS' organizational structure and the movement's communications network with other organizations within the New Right are described. The rhetorical vision of the NANS and other movements ensconced within the New Right is that of re-creating a strong, morally incorruptible nation valiantly facing the future while its roots are firmly
embedded in the traditions of the past. It is a nation that honors and adheres to the traditional values established by the Founding Fathers: a belief in God, a patriotic love of country, and a belief in the sanctity of the family as the basic structure of a strong nation. For NANS, the vision also encompasses the right to live in socio-economically, ethnically homogeneous communities where the children attend the locally-controlled neighborhood school. In this way, the traditional bond between the home, the school, and the community would be re-established and maintained.

The fantasy themes contained within the rhetorical vision are: (1) Americans are losing their freedoms that their forefathers fought so hard to achieve; (2) white Americans, perceiving themselves to be disenfranchised from the "system," determined that busing or forced racial balance is a racist policy; and (3) through the united effort of all Americans, who are urged to become politically involved in the affairs of the nation, not only could busing be stopped, but Americans could also return to those traditional values upon which the nation was founded.

Contained within the fantasy themes are the **dramatis personae**. Protagonists are the God-fearing, patriotic, freedom loving Americans who join forces and wage war against the evil forces destroying the nation. The antagonists are the agents of the liberal Left or "secular humanists" who advocate desegregation as a national policy but who, in actuality, are destroying this nation from within.
In order to understand the rhetorical vision and its representative fantasy themes, it is necessary to understand the scene in which the vision occurs. The attempt to create a new order was precipitated by several events occurring simultaneously in the later part of the 1970s: (1) there was general dissatisfaction, particularly among the middle-class, with the economic and social policies of the "Great Society" programs instituted by the liberal Left; (2) conservative single issue groups emerged and coalesced into a powerful political force; and (3) fundamentalist evangelical Christians mobilized, joined forces with the New Right single issue movements and became politically active in pro-American, pro-life, and pro-moral issues. These groups collectively exert pressure on Congress to pass legislation favoring their stance on particular issues.

Whether or not these groups have the capacity to sustain the rhetorical vision and create a new Order is difficult to determine at this point in time.
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CHAPTER 4

A LEADER CENTERED CONCEPTION OF PERSUASION
IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the question: "What are the rhetorical requirements, problems, strategies, and dilemmas faced by the leader(s) of a social movement?" To answer this question, this chapter will provide: (1) a description of the methodological approach to be employed as outlined by Herbert W. Simons, in his essay, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements"; (2) a brief discussion of the methodology employed to gather data; (3) a profile of four leaders of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools; (4) a discussion of the requirements which the leaders of NANS had to meet in order to create a rhetorical movement; (5) an analysis of the problems encountered by the leaders of a social movement and the rhetorical strategies they employed to overcome these problems, including the dilemmas they encounter as leaders of a movement; and (6) a final summary of the chapter.

The Methodology

leader-centered conception of persuasion in social movements which focuses on the intentional symbolic acts of those who lead social movements. A social movement must fulfill the same functional requirements as more formal collectivities. These imperatives constitute rhetorical requirements for the leadership of a movement. Conflicts among requirements create rhetorical problems which, in turn, affect decisions on rhetorical strategy. Therefore, the primary rhetorical task of the leader, and of the strategies he employs, is his capacity to fulfill the requirements of the movement by resolving or reducing rhetorical problems.

By combining concepts offered by Smelser and Turner and Killian, Simons defines a social movement as an uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstitution of social norms or values. Simons also focuses on reformist and revolutionary movements. While both reformist and revolutionary rhetorics both seize upon conditions of deprivation or on sharp discrepancies between conditions and expectations, the reformist urges change or repair of existing laws and the revolutionary insists on the establishment of a new order and a vast regeneration of values as necessary to smite the agents of the old and to provide happiness, harmony, and stability.

Even though a social movement is not a formal social structure, it is, nonetheless, obligated to fulfill the same functions; therefore, like the heads of private corporations or government agencies, the leaders of a social movement must meet a variety of rhetorical
requirements: they must attract, maintain and mold workers into an efficiently organized unit; they must secure adoption of their product by the larger structure; and they must react to resistance generated by the established order. The leaders of social movements can expect minimal internal control and maximal external resistance. Unlike business corporations which can induce productivity by means of tangible rewards and punishments, social movements can only rely upon the social commitments of their members. At best, the movement's leadership controls an organized core of the movement, but exerts relatively little influence over a larger number of sympathizers on its periphery. Shorn of the controls that characterize formal organizations, yet required to perform the same internal functions, harassed from without, yet obligated to adapt to the external system, the leader of a social movement must constantly balance inherently conflicting demands on his position and the movement he represents. How he adapts strategies to meet these demands is a primary basis for evaluating his rhetorical output.

A leader can be placed on a continuum which identifies the moderate, intermediate, and militant types of strategies, each with its own appropriate tactics and styles. The moderate leader, being the embodiment of reason, civility, and decorum, gets angry but does not shout, issues pamphlets but not manifestos, inveighs against social mores but always in the value language of the social order. His devil is a condition; it is not the person he is seeking to
influence. The moderate adapts to the listener's needs, wants, and values, speaks his language, adjusts to his frame of reference, and reduces the psychological distance between his movement and the larger structure.

While moderates assume, or pretend to assume, an identity of interests between the movement and the larger structure, militants act on the assumption of a fundamental clash of interests. Where the moderate employs rhetoric as an alternative to force, militants use rhetoric as an expression, an instrument, and an act of force. Militant strategists seek to change the actions of their primary targets as a pre-condition for changes in attitudes. By means of direct action techniques and verbal polemics, militants threaten, harass, cajole, disrupt, and intimidate. The employment of intermediate strategies can be viewed as efforts to obtain the respective advantages of each while avoiding the disadvantages. However, conflicting rhetorical dilemmas derive from conflicting rhetorical requirements: (1) militant tactics confer visibility on a movement while moderate tactics gain entry into decision centers; (2) for different reasons, militants and moderates must both be ambivalent about successes and failures; (3) militant supporters are easily energized while moderate supporters are more easily controlled; and (4) militants are effective with power-vulnerables while moderates are effective with power-invulnerables. To avoid the dilemmas, the leader of a social movement may employ intermediate strategies which combine militant and moderate patterns of influence.
The key to success of any movement may be the leader's capacity to embody a higher wisdom, a more profound sense of justice, to stand above the inconsistencies by articulating overarching principles. In the final analysis, the majority of contemporary movements all seem to require combinations of militant and moderate strategies.

**Method Used to Gather Data.** Data compiled for this chapter came from the sources used in the previous chapters, such as the NANS Bulletins, newspaper articles, and letters contained in the files of the NANS Statistical and Information Center. Additional data for this chapter were obtained by interviewing four NANS leaders: William D. D'Onofrio, current NANS President; Robert DePrez, NANS First Vice-President and Director of the Statistical and Information Center; Kaye C. Cook, NANS Secretary and former President of NANS of Columbus; and Jean Ruffra, former NANS President.

After these individuals consented to be interviewed, a list of questions was prepared and sent to each and an interview was scheduled. Because D'Onofrio resides in Wilmington, Delaware, the questions were sent to him and he recorded his answers on a tape which had been provided. The remaining three interviews were personally conducted and while the basic list of questions was unchanged, additional topics relevant to the issue were often explored. Complete transcripts of these interviews can be found in the Appendix.

It should be noted that there was very close communication between D'Onofrio and Cook and between D'Onofrio and DePrez concerning the interviews and the content of the questions. Rather than send his
taped reply to me, D'Onofrio sent his tape to Cook who then listened to his answers prior to her interview. D'Onofrio and DePrez discussed their lists of interview questions. The effect that this comparison of questions and answers had on the outcome of the interviews is uncertain. But it does serve to emphasize the fact that NANS leaders are very careful to orchestrate a cohesive, unified message to the various audiences they address.

Personal Profiles of NANS Leaders

William D. D'Onofrio. William D. D'Onofrio, who is currently serving his second term as the fifth President of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, became actively involved in the anti-busing movement when a metropolitan desegregation remedy was ordered for Wilmington/New Castle County, Delaware. D'Onofrio, a self-employed independent insurance agent, was, and continues to be, active in the Political Action Committee, the local anti-busing organization in Wilmington, which is a NANS affiliate. On the local level, D'Onofrio worked closely with James Venema, NANS second President. Because of his interest in politics and desegregation, it was only natural that he would become active in the anti-busing movement on the national level.

Prior to his advancement in the position of president, D'Onofrio served as the Legislative Chairman and the First Vice-President. As Legislative Chairman, one of his tasks was to create a voting profile pertaining to anti-busing legislation of every congressman in the
United States. He also worked closely with Rep. Ronald Mottl to prepare the wording of the Mottl constitutional amendment which was debated on the House floor in 1979. D'Onofrio is also a registered lobbyist in Washington, D.C., for the anti-busing movement.

Believing that defenders of forced busing (as he prefers to call it) are "fanatics or perpetrators of nonsense," D'Onofrio believes his major activity is to "bring every possible elected official's stance on the issue to his constituents" so that they can use their right to vote as the ultimate weapon to stop this public policy of forced busing.

A political Conservative, who is inspired by a dislike for liberals, D'Onofrio seeks to establish an entrenched conservative concern in the Establishment in government "just as the liberals have done with their ilk for decades." To accomplish this end, he also serves as the Delaware State Coordinator for the Conservative Caucus and as Chairman of the Delawareans Against Salt II.

D'Onofrio believes that he became a NANS leader because he was "willing to hang in there." By his own admission, "I always did have a way with words and the people in the anti-busing movement apparently liked what I said." He attributes his success as a spokesperson for the movement to a "belief in our system of representative government and an absolute awe of the Constitution as it was written by the Founding Fathers." He also has a deep feeling for people who are bewildered by what their government is doing to them. "This gives
me a sense of purpose that others perceive and admire."^{12}

D'Onofrio perceives his greatest strength as a leader to be his candidness—a willingness to say and do what others are less willing to say and do, to shoot from the hip. "I call this going for the jugular of the opposition."^{13} He perceives his greatest shortcoming to be the fact that he is a terrible public speaker who lacks charisma as a personality trait.

His involvement with NANS has taught him that as an individual he can have an impact. He has also learned that while far too many people live in a very confined segment of their own world, other people are vibrant, tough, and determined citizens. His involvement with NANS has brought the realization that the establishment is a "cynical, self-aggrandizing, power-conscious, self-righteous, and sinister monolith. It is agonizingly slow in facing up to its failure and negative impact and the harm it has had on the community."^{14}

The only ethical dilemma D'Onofrio has experienced is "the knowledge that some of the people I am trying to discredit or even destroy in terms of their careers are basically decent people, despite being advocates or perpetrators of a disastrous social policy."^{15} This dilemma is resolved because he feels that he is on the right side of a serious issue. "If I am going to have to worry about the ethical dilemma, I am just not going to be effective and I am going to wind-up compromising myself and compromising the people who depend on me."^{16}
As an individual who can have an ultimate effect on society, he hopes to be a "tiny part of what you might call a ripple effect. As a leader of a group like NANS I could add to the velocity of the ripple, thus influencing the velocity of succeeding ripples." 17

Kaye C. Cook. Kaye C. Cook has been involved with NANS since 1977, when Columbus, Ohio, was ordered to desegregate its public school system. On the local level, she established the first direct NANS chapter in the United States, NANS of Columbus. She served as President of NANS of Columbus until 1980. She has also served as the Membership Chairperson for the state of Ohio and as editor of the NANS Bulletin. Currently, she is Secretary of the national association and is a member of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors. In March, 1981, she moved from Columbus to Fredericksburg, Virginia. This relocation afforded her the opportunity to become an active lobbyist on Capitol Hill for NANS.

Cook grew up in the South and saw cities that were taken over by the federal courts. Therefore, when Columbus became involved in desegregation litigation she knew that it would be a futile effort to try to stop the implementation of a desegregation plan locally and she began searching for a national anti-busing organization that was also non-violent in its basic philosophy. Cook found out about NANS from a neighbor who saw an advertisement in a Cleveland newspaper. Cook wrote to NANS, later perceived members of the movement to be sane, responsible, intelligent people who believed as she did and she joined.
Needing a spokesperson for NANS in Columbus, leaders of the movement contacted her and encouraged her to become more deeply involved.

Cook believes that people must be educated to the fact that busing is a national not a local problem, but once they are educated on that fact they become strong NANS members. Even though she had no intention of becoming an anti-busing leader when she got involved, Cook has become an articulate spokesperson for NANS. She attributes this to the fact that she has always been articulate. She was on the debating teams in high school and college and by her own admission she has always been "rather sharp-tongued." She describes herself as a rebel who has always had her own language and speaking styles. She has also been able to project a good image to the media and is not afraid of having television cameras pointed at her because she formerly worked for a television station in Raleigh: "The camera doesn't scare me; it doesn't intimidate me. I know how to use it because I learned that in the past." Cook also believes that when anti-busing groups first organized in Columbus, the local media saw NANS, compared NANS with the other group, perceived NANS to be the more moderate group and consciously said, "If we get the people to follow her, she's not going to lead them in a fight in the streets. If we follow this other outfit, they might very well wind-up burning the buses." As a result, the local media were very receptive to her.

As a leader, Cook says that her greatest strengths are that "I am articulate. I am intelligent, I think. I am gutsy. I don't get
intimidated very easily and for this job that is the best way." She also believes that it is necessary for a leader of a social movement to have a strong ego. After a presentation before the pro-busing AFL-CIO, she was called an egotist by a member of the audience. She responded that she was not concerned about her ego, "But there are times I worry about turning into a masochist." She perceives her shortcomings to include a lack of patience and tolerance as well as a dislike for "nitty-gritty organizing."

Her involvement with NANS has taught Cook that as an individual she can have an effect on society and she can make a difference. She has also learned that "you cannot trust the establishment; it's going to screw you." Members of the establishment in Columbus are "lying through their teeth when they say busing is working when it isn't."

Cook believes that the cooperation and patience of her husband and children have helped her in her role as an anti-busing leader. And even though she does not yet know the ultimate effect that she might have on society, she at least hopes to have a positive effect on her children. "I hope that I am teaching them that you can fight for what you believe in without having a quick victory. That it is a victory just to fight for your beliefs and to do it the way it ought to be done."

Although she has enrolled her children in private school, Cook emphasizes that the most difficult problem she has ever encountered as a leader was watching the buses roll on the first day in Columbus'
desegregation plan was implemented. "I cried. I felt hopeless. I felt frustrated and I started feeling apathy. It was the burn-out syndrome." With help from D'Onofrio and James Venema, who had also experienced burn-out, she realized it was a natural feeling, but she took time out of the movement and did not become active until the following spring. She has since learned to pace herself and has adopted the philosophy that "if it does not have to be done today, it can wait until tomorrow."  

Robert DePrez. Robert DePrez was Chairman of the National Organization to Restore and Preserve Freedom, an anti-busing organization in Louisville, Kentucky, when he was contacted by Dr. Ralph Scott and invited to attend the first anti-busing symposium in Denver, Colorado, in August of 1976. Scott had identified DePrez as an anti-busing leader in Louisville because of papers and articles he had written on the busing issue. Among these publications are The Anti-Busing Bible and the N.A.P.F. (National Associated Press of Freedom) which DePrez edits and publishes. While attending the symposium, DePrez not only saw many old friends he had met while traveling around the country on behalf of the anti-busing movement, but he also met many new people who were seriously interested in stopping forced busing on the national level. The formation of NANS was the result of this symposium.

As a charter member of NANS, the First Vice-President, and the Director of the Statistical and Information Center, DePrez believes
that NANS is the organization which is attempting to solve the problem in the appropriate manner. NANS can provide the expertise, as well as the academic credentials, to prove that busing is wrong. "We're the people who are in the halls of Congress meeting with members of the President's staff, and politically involved to bring about change in this country. We are not the people standing out on the street corners throwing bricks at windows."\textsuperscript{28}

When metropolitan desegregation was ordered, Louisville/Jefferson County became a hot-bed of anti-busing fervor. Along with recruitment efforts of the Ku Klux Klan and the Nazi Party, there were twenty-three anti-busing organizations competing for membership. After the excessive violence and confrontations which occurred in Louisville, DePrez decided that there had to be a better way to institute change. He was instrumental in establishing a newspaper, getting out the facts, and getting people involved in this way instead of head-to-head confrontation. Eventually, he believes, people saw that he was trying to do things the right way and the majority of them joined his group, Concerned Parents.

Even though he opposes violence, DePrez is a strong advocate of the freedom guaranteed by the Constitution and he has been arrested twice for defending these rights. Both arrests resulted in unanimous acquittals. After the second arrest, DePrez filed charges of U.S. civil rights violations against the county police department and at the time of the interview he was waiting for the case to be heard.
DePrez has been involved in the human and civil rights struggles since the 1950s; he marched in Washington, D.C., to help bring about civil rights for all people and he, like the other leaders interviewed, is concerned with people who view his anti-busing stance as an indication of the fact that he is a racist. However, because of his past stance on civil rights and because he has been successful in getting his message across to the audiences he has addressed, he has been invited to speak to members of the black community, including the Black Muslims in Louisville.

Serving as a former president of a United Auto Worker's Local contributed to DePrez's skill as an organizer and as a public speaker addressing mostly blue-collar workers. However, when he became a NANS leader he was somewhat intimidated by the fact that he was one of the few members on the Board of Directors without a college degree (he has a high school GED). He also perceived his lack of academic credentials as a drawback in public debates or discussions with psychologists and sociologists who possessed such credentials. He has overcome this problem by carefully studying the issue, committing facts and statistics to memory and being "armed" with more information than anyone else. After he participated in a televised debate he would analyze his weaknesses and "beef-up on that area because I didn't know all I show know." He has also received and accepted constructive criticism of his written communication so that he could improve upon weaknesses in his writing style.
DePrez perceives his greatest strength as an anti-busing leader to be the support provided by his wife and children who have worked with him. This has been a great asset because others in the movement have been forced to withdraw because their activities took too much time away from their families. His involvement with NANS has taught him that he can accomplish more than he ever thought he could. He has learned that there are many caring, sincere people in this country. His involvement has taught him that "politicians are in it for a buck—what they can get for themselves. Basically, the majority of politicians are very selfish and very self-motivated people." DePrez believes that vote-trading and political favors amount to little more than "one hand washing the other and the American people are stuck in the middle. It's a rotten system."

As an individual, the ultimate effect he would like to have on society is the establishment of the voucher system in education. He believes the voucher system will provide true educational equality for all children. At the time of the interview, his children were enrolled in a private Christian school and he has been active in the Christian school movement. He is also an active member of the Moral Majority in Louisville.

On August 9, 1981, I received a note from Mr. DePrez stating that because of personal problems he was no longer able to devote the kind of time to NANS that he had for the past five and one-half years.
Jean Ruffra. Jean Ruffra has been involved in the anti-busing movement since 1971 when she and others attempted to start a national organization. This attempt failed because, at the time, desegregation was occurring only in the South and Northerners were not interested in the issue. She did, however, persist in speaking out on the issue and was co-founded of Save Our Community Schools (SOCS), an anti-busing organization in Louisville, Kentucky.

Ruffra believes her mission in life is not only to stop forced busing, but also to insure that "every child--black, white, Chicano, any foreign child who comes to this country--has the opportunity for a good education." Because of this commitment she campaigned and was elected to a seat on the school board in 1974, representing the southwestern area of Jefferson County; she then became well known throughout the area as an anti-busing school board member.

Ruffra, like DePrez, attended the symposium in Denver and became a charter member and co-founder of NANS. She served as President of NANS in 1978-1979, and is currently on the Board of Directors. She is also a member of several Democratic clubs and civic organizations in her community; she continues to be active in the PTA because she still has children in school; and she is active in the Order of the Eastern Star and the Moral Majority, as well as SOCS. In 1979, she campaigned for the State Senate, but lost "by a small margin to a two-term incumbent."

When she was President of NANS, Ruffra traveled throughout the country and spoke about the turmoil and riots which occurred in Louisville. She was not proud of those riots, therefore, her purpose
was to persuade individuals that the only way to fight court-ordered busing was through Congress and the courts—not in the streets. Her purpose was to get NANS recognized as a viable organization, "not as a fly-by-night, money-grabbing, street-marching group," but a responsible group which worked politically to solve the problem.

Because of the violence in Louisville, Ruffra and DePrez both have been "through the war." When busing started, Ruffra not only received threatening phone calls, but her life and her children's lives were threatened. The threats became such a problem that she considered resigning from the school board. She remained on the school board, but in order to insure their safety, she placed her children in Catholic schools. They have since returned to the public schools.

Ruffra credits much of her success as a leader to an understanding husband and her children who supported her in her activities. Her ability as a public speaker was the result of a natural progression through the Chairs in Eastern Star, where she had to memorize extensive speeches, to president of the PTA, to leadership in SOCS, where she made her first national presentation before Senator Sam Ervin's Judiciary Committee hearings on desegregation, and then on into NANS, where she traveled throughout the country addressing various audiences. As a NANS leader, her greatest challenge was in overcoming the negative images of activist, racist, bigot, and/or radical. She believes that she was successful in overcoming these negative stereotypes and that people now perceive her to be an individual who cares about the education of all children.
As a leader, she perceives her greatest strength to be that she is not afraid to meet and debate the opposition. Ruffra also believes that she is a good listener in that she will listen to the arguments set forth by the opposition. Her involvement with NANS has taught her that "if you dedicate yourself and if you make up your mind that you can accomplish something, you can do it." She used to think that the establishment was a lost cause, but has learned that "the wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the most oil." City hall can be beaten, but "forcing your way in will not get it. You have to be earnest; you have to be sincere; and you have to get right to the point. You also need to provide alternative proposals to legislation."38

Ruffra hopes that through her involvement with NANS she has given other people the incentive to speak up and to work and fight for what they believe: "I hope that when busing ceases, people will say, 'She worked as hard as she could; she did all that she could.'"39

As the second female president of NANS, Ruffra also provides additional insights into the manner in which women, as presidents of organizations, are perceived: "If you have a woman president, you're not as strong an organization as if you've got a man's name up there. And I disagree with that very much. I think we can do just as great a job and I think it was proved that Joyce and I did." Ruffra believes that at the time she was president she probably worked more hours than the male presidents. "I would sit here and type my own letters and answer all the mail I received. I did my own. Joyce did her own. They (the men) have had women do it for them."41 Generally
opposed to the Equal Rights Amendment, Ruffra states that that is one part of the movement she can agree with: "If I can hold this job as president, I should be respected for this job as president."42

Perhaps because of the conservative nature of the movement, women are not viewed as capable leaders on the national level (although they occupy many leadership positions on the local level). When Ruffra resigned as President of NANS in 1980, the following statement appeared in the NANS Bulletin: "Jean has been in the trenches of the war against busing for many years, and we certainly wish this courageous housewife and mother [emphasis mine] well in her continuing battle to bring sanity to public education in Jefferson County."43

Ruffra is now employed full time and does not devote as much time to NANS. She does, however, remain active in local and state politics.

**Rhetorical Requirements of a Leader**

We are closer than ever to crossing the pro-busing 'goal line' and scoring an end to forced busing. The opposition is digging in for a vicious 'goal line stance.' Our 'ball carriers' (those friends in Congress who are the strongest anti-busers) may be stopped in their tracks because of weak spots in a 'front line' composed of the majority votes we need (and should have) among their colleagues. The opposing 'team' of pro-busing senators and congressmen, fanatic although outnumbered, is being goaded into further efforts by the shrill screaming of its 'fans' in the liberal media and civil rights stands. Our 'front line' is nervous and intimidated. Meanwhile, what should be a strong section of our own 'fan' support--the Reagan Administration--which came to the game vowing to root our team on is not vocal enough and appears intimidated by the other
side's 'fans.' BUT WE STILL HAVE THE LARGEST ROOT-ING SECTION—you and I and all the rest who oppose forced busing. We must root louder and stronger. We must make our voices heard! 44

As the 97th Congress was preparing to resume its activities in the autumn of 1981, it was somewhat appropriate for William D'Onofrio, President of NANS, to begin a late-summer Bulletin with the preceding message which compared the anti-busing movement and its attempts to pass legislation with a football game—middle-America's autumnal pastime. It is, perhaps, a simplified method of persuading NANS followers that even though anti-busing sentiment prevails within Congress and the Reagan Administration there is still a great deal of work to be done before the goal of stopping forced busing is achieved.

One of the primary tasks of the leader(s) of a social movement is to insure that the troops or followers do not retreat before the battle is won. In order to accomplish this task, the leaders of a movement face three rhetorical requirements: (1) they must attract, maintain and mold workers into an efficiently organized unit; (2) they must secure adoption of their product by the larger society; and (3) they must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.

Earlier Attempts to Mobilize. The concept of mobilizing for the purpose of employing legal action to prohibit school desegregation is not unique to the NANS. In July of 1954, only one month after the Supreme Court's landmark Brown decision, the first White Citizen's Council was established in the state of Mississippi. This group adopted two basic policies: "(1) to recruit its membership from the same
community levels as the leading civic clubs, and (2) to employ only 'legal means' of resistance." This movement mushroomed throughout the South, as groups with names such as the Georgia States' Rights Council, the North Carolina Defenders of States' Rights, the Society for the Maintenance of Segregation, and the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberty organized with the desire to create an image of respectability and legality, eschewing violence as a means of achieving their end. Their motto was "segregation forever" and their goal was to stop all attempts to integrate the public schools in the South.

These groups were unsuccessful in achieving their goal; and there was no attempt to organize a national movement around this issue because desegregation was perceived to be a problem unique to the South. Northerners were, in general, unsympathetic towards the South and refused to become involved. In 1971, when Louisville was threatened by a desegregation suit, Jean Ruffra and others involved in Southern desegregation attempted to form a national organization, but desegregation continued to be perceived as a Southern, not a Northern problem. By 1975, opposition to desegregation had intensified as cities throughout the North and West were found to have segregated school systems. Groups opposed to court-ordered racial balance programs organized in every community confronted with the issue. As independent groups they were unsuccessful in their attempts to stop the implementation of desegregation programs. As more and more cities were faced with desegregation litigation, there was a growing
realization that local organizations, working independently, were ineffective and unified and coordinated efforts were needed if court-ordered desegregation was to be stopped.

By 1976, the time was right for these local leaders and groups to be forged into a national collectivity. Two men, who combined their political and educational expertise, were primarily responsible for forging this coalition: Frank Southworth and Ralph Scott. Frank Southworth had served on Denver, Colorado's board of education when Denver was ordered to desegregate its public schools and he was also a member of Colorado's House of Representatives from 1972-1974. Southworth was (and is) a wealthy real estate investor who was well-versed in the political system and conservative ideology. Ralph Scott was also active in conservative Republican politics. In 1972, he lost the Republican nomination for the U.S. Senate and two years later unsuccessfully campaigned for governor of the state of Iowa under the banner of the American Party. Although Scott had been active in politics, his recognized expertise was in the area of education. He was director of the Educational Clinic at the University of Northern Iowa and author of The Busing Cover-Up, a book which, according to Scott, exposed the myths about forced busing. Scott's research and academic credentials enhanced the credibility of the symposia on alternatives to forced busing which he and Southworth sponsored.

Scott and Southworth invited anti-busing leaders from local communities throughout the country to their first symposium in Denver; many of these leaders attended with the specific intent of establishing
a national anti-busing movement. These individuals were not only leaders of anti-busing groups, but they were also, in many cases, school board members, city council members, and/or successful business or political leaders of their respective communities. As conservative Americans who subscribed to the traditional American value system it was their desire to create an organization which would attract others with similar beliefs. Because political activism is ingrained within the American conscience and because desegregation was a political issue, this organization would employ only legal and political methods to effect change.

These anti-busing leaders were also confronted with a credibility problem. After the riots in Louisville and Boston, anti-busing groups, as a collective body, were viewed with suspicion and distrust and therefore avoided by middle-class Americans, who opposed busing, but who also opposed street violence even more. These Americans did not wish to become actively involved in an anti-busing movement which had the potential for violence. This problem was addressed by creating a positive name for the organization and by developing a very strict set of by-laws. The selection of a name was important because it would determine the way in which this organization was to be perceived by the general public. The name had to represent that which was positive rather than negative. And while these individuals were opposed to forced busing, they were also in support of the neighborhood school. This newly formed organization was therefore labeled the National Association for Neighborhood Schools.
Persuading the American public that the organization eschewed violence would be a more difficult problem to solve. However, because these local leaders were aware of the problems which arise in cities facing desegregation, they worked for many hours formulating a set of by-laws which addressed every possible contingency. Local organizations wishing to affiliate with the national movement were forced to adhere strictly to these principles. In this way, problems which might arise were averted and NANS was provided with the opportunity to gain recognition as a credible, non-violent, political action organization.

Attracting, Maintaining, and Molding Workers into an Efficiently Organized Unit. Once a strictly defined program for political activism on a national scale was established, it was necessary to attract individuals into the national movement and to mold them into an efficiently organized unit.

In order to gain recognition, these first NANS leaders returned to their local communities and "spread the word" about NANS. Local anti-busing groups were encouraged to affiliate. Congressmen and senators were invited to become members so that they would become aware of the existence of a national anti-busing organization. Members of the Board of Directors from various states would assist one another with ideas as to effective methods of communicating their message to the people, gaining free publicity from the local media, and attracting
members. Whenever possible they appeared on local radio and television programs. Advertisements were (and are) placed in local newspapers and letters to the editors of local newspapers were written to let people know that NANS was a national movement addressing the issue of forced busing.

In cities faced with the issue of desegregation, NANS leaders contact anti-busing leaders or groups in that area and attempt to "sell them on the NANS method of solving the problems, thus setting up an affiliate." NANS provides them with literature for door-to-door distribution throughout the community. These newly formed local groups seldom have access to updated information related to the issue, expert witnesses for court testimony, or speakers well-versed on the topic and they, therefore, usually welcome NANS involvement. NANS leaders then organize a mass rally so that they can address a mass audience. They also strive for extensive press coverage by the local media. In this way, visibility is achieved.

The most active NANS affiliates are those that are currently involved in litigation and/or the development of desegregation programs. These individuals and groups are easily energized and prepared to fight the anti-busing battles. By instilling within these individuals the philosophy that busing is a national not a local problem, there are no quick and easy solutions to the problem, and the issue can only be solved at the national level, these individuals vent their frustrations by becoming political activists.
According to D'Onofrio:

We strive to show them that they are not isolated in their battles and that other communities are having the same problems. That beating busing is a step-by-step proposition, but we are making steady progress. That other communities have had success in beating out unsympathetic elected officials or getting an official to change his tune out of fear for his political career. Also, we try to impress upon people that Congress can stop busing any time it wants....As soon as we have an anti-busing majority in the Congress of the United States, we can stop busing.51

In concert with the argument that Congress does have the power to stop busing, NANS leaders usually provide extensive data which clearly establish the facts that forced busing will destroy the public schools in the local community: the quality of education will decline, white flight will result in a reduced tax base and resegregation, discipline problems will intensify, students' safety and security will be threatened, racial hostilities will be accentuated, and the traditional bond between the home, school, and community will be destroyed. These arguments which appeal to the fears that individuals have about desegregation are effective. As Ruffra emphasizes, "I think once we told them this story, not only about what happened here (Louisville) but what's happened in every community where busing has been implemented, these people felt they had to organize, not as a street-marching group, but as a group that would work through their congressmen."52 Cook believes that local people have to be educated on the issue, but once they are educated they become strong NANS members.53
So that NANS is perceived by the established structure as a viable organization, it is necessary to mold the members into an effective work unit. NANS relies solely on the work of volunteers. With the exception of the paid lobbyist in Washington, D.C., all work is performed on a voluntary basis. This means, in essence, that the leadership exercises very little control over the majority of the membership. There is, however, a central core of dedicated, hard-working people within the hierarchy of the national association as well as dedicated individuals performing various tasks on the local level. These individuals serve on the Board of Directors and the Executive Board, edit and publish the bi-monthly Bulletin, provide information to NANS-PAC, handle the membership applications, research data pertaining to problems in the local districts and forward this information to the Statistical and Information Center for redistribution to other leaders throughout the nation, and/or lobby their congressmen and senators on the issue. Because NANS members cannot engage in any form of violent protest, they are encouraged to vent their frustrations by exerting pressure on their legislators in Washington, D.C. In NANS philosophy, there is no more powerful force than public opinion and organized pressure.

NANS leaders do admit that it is difficult to keep people involved and working. "Everyday activities such as jobs, family problems and concerns, and recreational activities inhibit involvement."54 Perhaps Cook most accurately describes the problems encountered by a local leader attempting to construct an efficiently organized unit:
You run into people who love being appointed to a committee so they can go out and say they are involved, but they don’t do anything. More often, you will find people who want to head up a committee just for the sake of heading up a committee, but they don’t want to do anything....But the ones that I am most suspicious of are the ones who seem sincere and they seem like valuable people to help in the beginning and then little by little you find out it is not really the 'cause' they want to help, it is really themselves they want to help. They want to run for some kind of political office, or they want their name in the paper, or their face on TV. Those we have weeded out. Sometimes that weeding-out process just had to be a matter of taking the bull by the horns and getting the job done.

I am sure there are some people who did not renew their memberships because of my straightforwardness, but that is okay; we got others in their place.55

DePrez believes that individuals will continue to participate as long as they think they are accomplishing their goals. But it is important to remind them that they are making progress; otherwise, they become disinterested.56

There are two major problems which NANS leaders must face concerning their membership: white flight and burn-out. NANS members, being the most ardent spokespersons against busing, are usually the first to either leave the city or place their children in private schools. When this happens, they lose interest in the movement. Burn-out is also a tremendous problem on the local and national levels, but particularly on the local level where leaders work too long and too hard and are then forced, for health or psychological reasons, to withdraw from the movement. It is therefore incumbent
upon leadership and the movement to constantly replenish the supply of workers. Without this replenishment process, the movement will die. As long as cities continue to be engaged in court-ordered desegregation programs, the NANS will be provided with a source of potential leaders and followers who, because they are new to the movement, will be highly energized and active.

**Fund Raising.**

We need money. We need to rent buildings for meetings, to bring in outside speakers, and to pay for printed materials we hand-out. We want to hold a raffle. We'd like to raffle a TV, but we don't have one. So we're asking you to mail in your Buckeye Stamps. Maybe we can get a TV to raffle.57

Every movement or organization must have operating capital and NANS is no exception. Funds are needed for the printing of literature, travel, postage, and telephone expenses, legal advice, speakers, and office supplies. NANS has a dues structure--$100 for an affiliate, fifteen dollars for a family membership, and ten dollars for an individual--but dues do not provide enough money to cover expenses for the national organization. Members are therefore encouraged to raise money by holding bake sales, garage sales, selling buttons, t-shirts, or bumper stickers, holding raffles and dances, or donating a few extra dollars for the lobbying fund out of their own pockets.

In 1979, NANS chapters and affiliated groups were encouraged to raise $1,000 each to be used as "seed money" to hire a professional fund-raiser, using the direct mail approach;58 these funds would have been used to establish a Washington, D.C., office and a paid staff.
NANS affiliates did not support this venture and, to date, there is no
Washington office. In 1980, NANS did engage the services of a profes­
sional lobbyist who charges approximately eighty dollars an hour for
his services. Funds, therefore, are constantly being solicited for
this cause:

The NANS lobbying fund continues to be supported
mainly by a small percentage of NANS affiliates
and members...DID YOU EVER STOP TO CONSIDER WHAT
WOULD HAPPEN IF EACH AND EVERY NANS MEMBER DONATED
JUST A COUPLE DOLLARS EACH MONTH? LET'S TRY IT!

Funds are also needed to cover the postage and printing expenses
of the newly-created NANS-PAC. While NANS-PAC does not contribute
directly to political campaigns it does distribute nationally the
busing roll call voting records of members of Congress, endorse anti­
busing opponents of pro-busing congressmen, and advocate the defeat of
pro-busing candidates. Under federal law, funds for NANS-PAC cannot
be solicited from individuals who are not NANS members. Individuals
wishing to contribute to NANS-PAC are encouraged to join NANS and then
to include additional contributions for NANS-PAC or the lobbying fund.

It is evident from the NANS literature that newly formed NANS
affiliates provide the greatest amount of financial support. But,
similar to individual involvement in the movement, this support begins
to wane as busing becomes a reality and people lose interest in the
issue. NANS leaders must therefore emphasize the importance of finan­
cial contributions when the affiliates are young, energetic, and ready
to give.
The NANS receive no financial support from the establishment and leaders are very often angered that their tax dollars are used to support organizations that advocate peaceful compliance with desegregation programs. Perhaps one of the more poignant examples of NANS' financial dilemma is expressed in the following news item:

It appears that $400,000 in federal tax dollars and/or donations is not enough to keep the Metropolitan Columbus Schools Committee (MCSC) in the propaganda business. MCSC appeared before the Columbus City Council to ask for a grant of $25,000 to keep the group operating for another year. NANS members appeared before city council to protest, but the 'emergency' measure passed.

***

...We will sponsor a bake sale/craft sale at the next general meeting as one means of raising funds.

Securing Adoption of the Product. As a reform movement, the NANS advocate a change in existing laws and procedures related to desegregation/court ordered racial balance of the schools. Change in current policy can be accomplished in one of three ways: (1) Congress and the states can pass a constitutional amendment which prohibits the transportation of students for the purpose of achieving racial balance; (2) Congress could pass a law which forbids federal courts from hearing desegregation-related cases; or (3) Congress can amend appropriations bills which forbid the Justice Department from becoming involved in desegregation litigation which might result in court-ordered busing.

Because the majority of the Americans do oppose the transportation of students to achieve racial balance, it would seem that the NANS would have little difficulty securing adoption of this program for
change. However, Congress as defender of the established order, must consider long-term consequences of any legislation it proposes; and each of these alternatives has serious long-term consequences for the nation.

A constitutional amendment would certainly solve the problem, but it is viewed as the most undesirable alternative. Attempts to pass a constitutional amendment have been unsuccessful for the following reasons: (1) not only would a constitutional amendment conflict with the equal protection provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, but also a national debate in state legislatures on such an emotional issue as busing would intensify racial hostility throughout the nation; (2) political Conservatives, by nature, do not favor an amendment because they do not believe in tampering with the Constitution; (3) an amendment is opposed on the grounds that it "ignores the facts of school segregation, constitutional law, and educational quality;" and (4) a constitutional amendment is unacceptable because it would "set a dangerous precedent by littering the Constitution with a 'detailed social policy' rather than a broad principle."

In lieu of a constitutional amendment, NANS believes that under Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, Congress "has the authority to stop forced busing by a simple majority vote legisla-
tion." In essence, Congress can pass legislation which prohibits the federal courts from hearing desegregation-related cases. In order to more fully understand this concept it must be placed in an historical perspective. The last Congressional attempt to restrict the
courts occurred in 1958, when many members of Congress, dissatisfied with Supreme Court decisions, sought to take cases away from that Court. "The major vehicle was a Senate bill sponsored by Senator Jenner of Indiana, which came to bear his name. The Jenner bill failed, but the idea of throttling the courts dies hard." According to the American Bar Association, "Its 1980s reincarnation shows how ephemeral are the issues of one period when compared to the principle of judicial independence. Today, such things as abortion, busing, and 'voluntary' school prayer are to be removed from the Supreme Court's ken." In April of 1981, testifying on behalf of the American Bar Association before a House subcommittee to oppose the current attempts to curtail the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, Edward I. Cutler stated, "If Congress is free to pick and choose what the Supreme Court can hear, constitutional government and freedoms seem to be precarious." It is an enduring concept of American jurisprudence that the Supreme Court's "role in the federal judicial structure is to be the final arbiter on legal and constitutional issues." This concept should not be tampered with by legislation enacted because of transitory dissatisfactions with judicial decisions.

In 1981, the Reagan Justice Department has not only determined that the latest anti-busing amendment sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms is unconstitutional, but also that congressional efforts to withdraw federal court jurisdiction over certain matters are unconstitutional. The NANS and other conservative groups disagree with
the Reagan Administration's interpretation of Article III, Section 2, and continue to pressure for passage of this legislation.

Appropriations bills with attached amendments prohibiting the Justice Department's involvement in desegregation litigation have also met with little success. In 1980, this issue was debated in Congress and Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti stated that it was a dangerous precedent to allow the Congress to tell a president that there are certain constitutional remedies that he cannot ask the courts to apply. Carter threatened to veto the entire appropriations measure if the amendment was passed; it was, therefore, deleted from the appropriations bill. In June, 1981, the Justice Department appropriations bill, which included the same language as the 1980 amendment, was again debated. Senator Lowell Weicker successfully led a filibuster against the measure and the anti-busing amendment was pulled from discussion. This debate, however, continues in Congress.

Currently, however, the Justice Department is not assuming an activist role in desegregation-related cases. In August, 1981, the Justice Department decided not to seek desegregation between Houston and twenty-two of its suburbs and it postponed Chicago's mandatory busing plan for two years, thus providing the board of education the opportunity to develop other, less controversial, measures to achieve desegregation. This may be the greatest concession the Justice Department is willing to make regarding the issue. And President Reagan, though clearly opposed to court-ordered racial balance, is being advised by his aides to remain uninvolved in any debate concerning the
Reagan has been criticized by the NANS for not pressuring for anti-busing legislation; but Reagan's stance only serves to emphasize the complexity of an issue to which there are no simple or expedient solutions. And until a remedy can be found that is in the best interest of the entire nation, the established order must, by its very nature, resist NANS' program for change.

Reacting to Resistance Generated by the Larger Structure. Reacting to resistance generated by the established order is a problem which has confronted NANS leaders since the inception of the movement. NANS leaders have, however, been successful in some of their attempts to reduce this resistance.

Prior to the 1979 House debate on the Mottl constitutional amendment when anti-busing forces garnered enough signatures on a Discharge Petition, which allowed the amendment to by-pass the Judiciary Committee and go directly to the House floor for debate, Congress perceived the anti-busing movement "as merely a group of parents soap-boxing on an issue." Senators "snickered and compared the anti-busing activists to the little old ladies who lobby to make the marigold the national flower." Because of this image, little attention was given to the movement. Legislators also attempt to avoid the issue because of its racist overtones. Many legislators perceive busing to be a "'no-win' issue; damned if they vote for and damned if they vote against." Therefore, even though some anti-busing legislation has been debated in both houses of Congress, the
general tactic has been to make every attempt possible to bottle-up all busing related legislation. Before the 1980 elections, these attempts were generally successful because the House and Senate Judiciary Committees were controlled by the Democratic liberals, Peter Rodino and Edward Kennedy, respectively. However, in 1981, Strom Thurmond, an ardent anti-buser, assumed chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee and promised that anti-busing legislation would not only be debated, but would also pass in the Senate. Currently, because of the conservative make-up of both Houses, anti-busing legislation is being openly debated.

While some of the success of gaining recognition can be attributed to NANS' grassroots activism to elect anti-busing legislators in the 1980 elections, NANS also acquired a more sophisticated method of communicating its message. On the advice of Paul Weyrich, director of NCPAC, NANS hired a Washington lobbyist to represent the movement on Capitol Hill. Hiring the services of a professional lobbyist was done, according to D'Onofrio, "because we have to play the game. We need representation on Capitol Hill to back-up our traditional grassroots work. We have been semi-bashful, inexperienced, ordinary citizens." D'Onofrio believes that the lobbyist has been instrumental in making NANS a household word on Capitol Hill.

In a memorandum to D'Onofrio, Clarence Randall, the NANS lobbyist, states: "Only a few years ago, politicians attacked the anti-busing forces, now they are a part of it. Much of the credit for this
attitude change belongs to NANS.\textsuperscript{80} NANS' task now is to convince the anti-forced busing advocates in Washington that they are the majority with enough political power to eliminate forced busing. To accomplish this end, Randall is now coordinating all anti-busing legislation and mobilizing support for legislation in both houses of Congress. The lobbyist has also made it possible for NANS leaders to be informed of floor debates on the issue so that constituents can be notified to exert pressure on their congressmen to support anti-busing bills. With this capacity to exert increased constituent pressure on their legislators, NANS leaders have reduced much of the resistance which Congress has exerted against anti-busing legislation. In the future, with a new administration, a Republic Senate, and a House looking over its shoulder at an electorate wanting it to move right, the anti-busing groups have moved into the mainstream of American politics. They may eventually get the votes to end busing.\textsuperscript{81}

Although NANS has experienced some success in overcoming resistance generated by Congress, the leaders have not been as fortunate in their dealings with the Internal Revenue Service. NANS, itself, is established as a tax-exempt membership organization, but NANS members are not permitted to deduct donations from their tax returns. NANS is also attempting to establish a new unit, the NANS Educational Foundation, a tax-exempt organization "which will educate the public on aspects of the anti-busing movement while benefiting from tax deductible contributions from individuals."\textsuperscript{82} The IRS has refused to take action on this request; NANS members are therefore urged to contact
their anti-busing senators and representatives and ask for their assistance in expediting this request with the IRS. 83

The established order also resists NANS activities by refusing to donate funds to the movement. NANS funds must come from private individuals or conservative organizations, but organizations which have as their goal the peaceful implementation of desegregation plans usually receive full funding from government or private grants. Leaders of NANS resent this inequity and the fact that their tax dollars support a program they oppose, but they have been unable to correct this injustice.

Local NANS affiliates have often been very successful in their attempts to receive media coverage of their activities, 85 but the national media, for the most part, refuse to recognize NANS. An attack on the media, appearing in a 1978 NANS Bulletin, summarizes NANS' position on this problem:

The pro-busers and the national media delighted in the fact that Boston anti-busers lost in last November's election...and reporters and commentators made no bones about saying that busing as a political issue was dead.

Certainly we can expect nothing better from the liberal, pro-busing national media. Their absolute ignorance of the issue transcends even their one-sided reporting.

To expand a well-known slogan, we could say that the national media reports all the news that's fit to print or air--so long as it's all pro-busing. 85

In 1979, NANS members were encouraged to write letters to the producers of the Phil Donohue Show and exert pressure on them to do a show on the busing issue. NANS leaders, however, emphasized that
"experience has shown us that he can do a pro-busing show and then
tell us he's done a show on busing."\textsuperscript{87} James Venema, former NANS president, indicts the media: "the media is the most powerful molder of public opinion and they have sold their soul and ours to the highest bidder--mainly the pro-busing fanatics."\textsuperscript{88}

NANS leaders must exercise great care when NANS affiliates are involved in peaceful demonstrations. On several occasions, organizations such as the Nazi Party or the Ku Klux Klan have infiltrated the marches, received media coverage, and given NANS a bad image.\textsuperscript{89} Robert DePrez discussed this problem with Walter Cronkite and Cronkite stated, "It's not the man on the soap box, it's the man who throws the rock that gets the coverage."\textsuperscript{90} DePrez believes that NANS is trying to do things credibly and honorably, but the news media continue to ignore the movement; if NANS went out and created racial disturbances, the media would be there to cover that.\textsuperscript{91}

D'Onofrio emphasizes that the media establishment, especially the major media, have been unmoving in their attitude toward NANS.\textsuperscript{92} "We used to do a great deal of wheel-spinning trying to crack the media. The realization now, like the rest of the conservative movement, is that we have to be essentially our own media, working from the grassroots up to discredit the establishment."\textsuperscript{93} NANS news network of information covering the entire anti-busing spectrum extends to the President and select members of the administration, all U.S. senators and representatives, Supreme Court Justices and other select judges, all state governors, major media, and other influential persons
throughout the nation. Therefore, according to NANS, "none of those mentioned can claim ignorance of NANS, nor can they claim lack of knowledge with respect to the TRUTH about forced busing." 

While there are those who have knowledge of NANS, know the truth about forced busing, and agree with NANS' position concerning the issue, their reactions are, nonetheless, pseudosupportive. The opening statement of this section which compares NANS' struggles with a football game indicates that the Reagan Administration is not being vocal enough in its opposition to forced busing. This is a difficult problem for NANS to address; in 1981, the Reagan White House is taking no position on legislation pertaining to any of the social issues. President Reagan's lack of involvement in the busing issue has been a disappointment to NANS leaders.

Rhetorical Problems

Opposition to school desegregation has existed since 1954, but NANS as a national organization created to address the issue is only five years old. Because the movement has not yet achieved its purpose, leaders are being very careful not to let the movement disintegrate. The movement has not yet lost sight of its ideological values nor has it become preoccupied with power for its own sake. NANS is just beginning to gain recognition from the established structure because the movement has carefully adhered to the strategies and tactics of political activism that are necessary to accomplish its purpose; the ideology of the movement has not been diluted. NANS is concerned with
Ethical vs. Expediential Considerations. In their efforts to avoid the possibility of that future dilemma, NANS leaders must make choices between ethical and expediential considerations. When NANS leaders go into a city involved in desegregation litigation, they are often confronted by individuals who lack an awareness of the complexity of the issue. These individuals are angry, frustrated people searching for a solution to their problem. Very often, on the legal advice of a local attorney, they have been convinced that their case is unique and with enough money, the problem can be solved through the courts. Many times, they are so frustrated that they are prepared to voice their protest in the streets. NANS leaders must then persuade these individuals that (1) violence or street protests do not solve the problem; (2) the problem has never been solved on the local level by the courts; and (3) the only permanent solution to the problem is
through long-term political activism that stops busing on the national level.

NANS leaders are quick to point out that the problem can be addressed through responsible political activism, which is the only acceptable means of addressing the issue, and they want only those individuals who adhere to that philosophy as NANS members. NANS leaders assure these individuals that the movement is not associated with racist or leftist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan or the Communist Party. Leaders also inform these individuals that they will be joining an organization which has affiliates in thirty-eight states and a membership of 250,000.

It is too early to predict whether or not the leaders are promising what they cannot deliver, but it is possible that they are exaggerating the actual membership of the organization. In its first year of existence, NANS listed its membership at 400,000. However, NANS changed from an affiliated group structure to a direct chapter structure and, according to Cook, this affected NANS' membership. When interviewed in 1980, DePrez was uncertain as to the exact number of NANS affiliates in existence. Ruffra, on the other hand, was certain that there are affiliates in about fifteen to twenty states. Ruffra "was guessing at the figures," but believed that when she was president, NANS had a national membership of 2,100-2,500. D'Onofrio refused to provide membership data because, when discussing NANS' strength, it is misleading to talk in terms of dues-paying members or working affiliates.
My thinking here is that what the opposition doesn't know will hurt them and not us. It will keep them glancing over their shoulder, so to speak. Our real membership strength lies in the membership of our affiliate groups. You should also refer to my comments on affiliates in terms of non-affiliate groups.

The important thing is impact among the nation's population and not by the numbers of members. We are in a very nice position in the anti-busing movement. Unlike other issues, upwards of eighty or ninety percent of the people in this country are against busing. Therefore, a few people--just a few people active in the movement--can have a tremendous impact because of the tremendous number of people who are against forced busing.108

By refusing to provide specific membership data and by emphasizing that NANS represents approximately eighty to ninety percent of the population (a figure supported by most public opinion polls), D'Onofrio is not only attempting to win the battle of perceptions--in that "it is not what is actually true that counts, but what is perceived to be true,"109 thereby forcing Congress to take action on the issue--but he is also avoiding the practical problems which might arise from engaging in deliberate deception to the membership and the established structure. He avoids the need to invent rationalizations for his deception through a new rhetoric of justification or apology.

Chapter Three provides a complete analysis of the ways in which NANS' ideology defines that which is ambiguous in the social setting, structures anxiety, fosters in-group feelings, and articulates wish fulfillment beliefs about the movement's power to succeed. A previous section of this chapter, "Securing Adoption of the Product," emphasizes the possible long-term consequences if NANS' alternatives to
stop forced busing are adopted by the established structure. NANS leaders, therefore, while privately acknowledging the difficulties in accomplishing their objectives,\textsuperscript{110} sometimes engage in oversimplification when addressing the membership.

Another aspect of the problem relating to ethical dilemmas is that what may be perceived by an outsider to be an ethical dilemma is not perceived by an insider or leader to be an ethical dilemma. Addressing this problem, Cook stated that she would never tell a blatant lie because that would damage her credibility and the credibility of NANS. However, if the situation occurred in which she might present data that was not entirely accurate she would act as if she knew what she were talking about. If anyone called her on it she would respond by telling them that she just "said it differently."\textsuperscript{111}

DePrez emphasized that he never has deliberately felt the need to distort or exaggerate messages: "I'm a firm believer that anytime you do that it's going to come back to haunt you. I don't believe in fooling people. I don't ever want them to come back and say Bob DePrez lied to us."\textsuperscript{112} Perhaps DePrez does not deliberately lie when addressing NANS audiences, but the following statement does serve to indicate that he sometimes resorts to distortion:

I've made this statement several times; I want to confront the NAACP in front of the American people. I want to expose this bunch of hypocrites for what they're doing to the black children of this nation. I want to ask them to explain how even the pro-busing U.S. Department of Education says that forty-two percent of black seventeen year olds are functioning illiterates. I want them to explain those academic achievement scores that have gone downhill...after the busing issue...
I want to kick them right in the teeth because they've hurt black children in this country and I don't think if busing was stopped today that the full ramification of what they've done twenty years from now wouldn't still be felt. These kids are going to be parents. What kind of parents are they going to be with the type of education that the NAACP has forced them into in many of these situations?

If I wanted to do one thing in my life it would be to get the NAACP in front of the American people and show them up for all the harm they've done to the children of this country, both black and white.  

While the purpose of this study is not to refute the arguments presented by NANS leaders, it should be noted that there is a degree of distortion and half-truths in NANS' messages. DePrez attacks the harm that busing and the NAACP has inflicted upon black and white children. However, research studies indicate that (1) desegregation has not affected white achievement scores positively or negatively; (2) evidence for blacks is less conclusive, but most studies show that black children do better in predominantly white classrooms than in most black ones, particularly if integration begins early; (3) desegregation, where it has been implemented to a great degree, has not eliminated the large gap in achievement between whites and blacks; (4) black achievement scores are consistently better in the South than in the North; and (5) black children who are integrated under mandatory plans do better than those who are integrated under voluntary plans.

Although DePrez attributes an increase in the illiteracy rate to busing, there are other factors that also impact upon this issue. Television, ineffective teaching methods and programs, a society that
is inherently anti-intellectual, and an overall shift in public values as they relate to the importance of reading also contribute to the problem of illiteracy which confronts this nation. It is therefore an exaggeration to establish a direct cause-effect relationship between desegregation and increasing illiteracy/declining test scores.

In concert with declining achievement, NANS establishes a direct correlation between busing, white flight, and a declining tax base, all of which lead to a bankrupt school system. It is true that when desegregation plans are first implemented in a city, white flight intensifies. But, as discussed in Chapter Three, whites have been moving from the city to the suburbs since World War II. And because of their own upward mobility and implementation of fair housing laws an increasing number of blacks are following this same pattern. It is this middle-class flight, or the fulfillment of the American Dream, which has resulted in a declining tax base. (One positive aspect of this outward migration is the increase in residential desegregation, a hoped for by-product of school desegregation, which will eventually eliminate the need for desegregation/busing programs.)

Although middle-class flight may contribute to a decline in a city's tax base, it must also be noted that northern urban areas, where desegregation is most likely to occur, are no longer being supported by a strong industrial base. Industry is moving from the Northern and Midwestern urban areas and relocating in the Southern and
Sunbelt regions. Because industrial relocation and the implementation of desegregation plans often occurred simultaneously, it is somewhat shortsighted to establish a direct cause-effect relationship between busing and a declining tax base.

Tax-payers, themselves, are in, in part, responsible for bankrupting a school system. In many school districts throughout the country, taxpayers are voting against school operating levies and often cite their opposition to busing as the reason for their non-support. However, the current economic mood of this country is anti-tax. Voters are not only refusing to support an increase in their taxes, but they are also supporting propositions which reduce their taxes. At the same time that the public is demanding a reduction in their taxes on the federal level, it is highly unlikely that they will vote to increase their taxes on the local level. Opposition to busing becomes a convenient excuse (rationalization) for voting against any tax levy related to the schools.  

In conclusion, even though NANS leaders say that they do not feel the need to engage in exaggeration or distortion when addressing their audiences, they do tend to present arguments consisting of half-truths. However, because NANS leaders believe that they are presenting nothing but the facts and the truth, they do not experience an ethical dilemma. A judgment as to that which is ethical and that which is unethical, therefore, becomes a matter of perception.
Organizational Efficiency vs. Membership Needs. Leaders of social movements must constantly seek a balance between achieving organizational efficiency and meeting membership needs. NANS by-laws serve as the guidelines for the organization and resolve many problems which might develop. NANS advocates a system of participatory democracy; leaders, therefore, have found it necessary to address membership needs.

When interviewed, Cook, Ruffra, and D'Onofrio all cited a specific problem related to affiliates in Louisville and Boston. NANS eschews any form of street demonstrations or protests, but these two affiliates believed that the anti-busing movement needed to be more assertive so as to attract attention to the issue. This matter was discussed in depth at a national board meeting. A resolution was finally passed which stated that NANS would not endorse any marches or demonstrations, but if members felt the need to hold marches in their own communities, they were to do it as individuals, not as members of NANS. In this way, membership needs were met and NANS' credibility did not suffer.

In 1978, when Ruffra was president, there was also some membership dissatisfaction with NANS. In an effort to discover what members would like to see from NANS, a questionnaire was sent to all NANS leaders and a random selection of the general membership. The results of that survey and leaders' responses were:
1) Increasing membership: more face-to-face recruiting, door-to-door canvassing, and neighborhood coffees.

2) Regarding a national thrust: NANS leaders should be available to testify before state general assembly committees, as well as all congressional committees that are concerned with forced busing. (We are available to testify at all state hearings--just ask.)

3) On the question of money: we need a professional fund raiser and tax exempt status. (We are looking into a revision in the guidelines for tax exemptions--we may be able to qualify under these new guidelines.)

4) Concerning the Executive Committee: we should have Executive Board meetings every six months and set clear and reachable goals (i.e., three mos. goals, six mos. goals, etc.).

5) On the basic question of how to achieve the long range goal of stopping the buses from rolling nationwide--there were only two avenues suggested by everyone: (A) a national test case and/or (b) a constitutional amendment.

6) On priorities for general members: general members should make themselves responsible for educating themselves on the issue; however, some of the new members are fighting the wrong people, such as their local school board, or local mayor, or local anybody. Their thrust should be nationally in Washington. Also, NANS affiliates should stress the name NANS more and put more emphasis on NANS membership than on local groups. (Ed. note: This seems to indicate a need for more local affiliates to reconsider changing their name to NANS of ____________.)

7) In regard to the Board of Directors: we should try to have the National PTA pass a resolution endorsing a constitutional amendment. Since most of our board members are either school board members or educators, it was felt this could best be handled by them.
8) As to what general members could do on their own: local clubs that members belong to might be persuaded to pass resolutions endorsing a constitutional amendment. If passed, introduce it at the national convention. According to Ruffra, the survey provided members with the opportunity to voice their concerns and it also provided leadership with insights as to the focus of the movement.

Because of timing, some problems which arise must be addressed immediately by NANS leaders, particularly the president. However, if there is adequate time for participatory decision-making, rather than call an Executive Board or a Board of Directors meeting (which involves excessive expense), leaders are contacted by letter or phone and asked for their input. NANS' policy is that the majority prevails. In this way membership needs are met and a certain degree of organizational efficiency is achieved.

Organizational efficiency is perhaps achieved in another manner. NANS is controlled by a Board of Directors; these directors are appointed by existing directors. The Board of Directors appoints members from its own body to serve on the Executive Board. These two groups then elect the president for the national association. Although matters of policy and direction are discussed at national meetings, the infrequency of these meetings provides the president with a great deal of latitude in implementing decisions and in creating new initiatives for the new organization. Efficiency is achieved because the decision makers determine who the decision
makers will be. But as long as the general membership perceives the national leadership to be addressing their needs, this semi-closed organizational structure is acceptable.

**Role Expectations vs. Role Definitions.** Leaders of social movements must face discrepancies between role expectations and role definitions and must often appear to be what they cannot be. A leader is expected to be consistent, but he must be prepared to renounce previously championed positions; this is a problem which NANS leaders have confronted.

When the organization was first established, NANS paid a great deal of attention to court cases--filing *amicus* briefs and expending effort in getting NANS' position expressed by attorneys in court. This approach proved to be a waste of time and money and NANS changed to a strategy of political activism. Members of local affiliates, not being totally educated on the issue, believed that they could stop busing in their local communities through the courts and they expected NANS financial and legal assistance. Only when their attempts were unsuccessful did they accept NANS' reasons for lack of involvement and accept the strategy of political activism. For those affiliates wishing to engage in court litigation, NANS provides a list of expert witnesses and tells them who to contact for advice in preparing their case. Other than supplying references, NANS does not get involved.
Audience Adaptation. The greatest difficulty encountered by NANS leaders was convincing the public that busing was not a race issue, that NANS was not a racist organization, and that NANS believes in desegregation, but is opposed to forced busing. By very skillfully diverting the issue away from race, thereby focusing on the issue of freedom to attend the neighborhood school, incorporating social science evidence which supports NANS' position that busing has harmful effects upon children and the community, and establishing their credibility as a responsible organization which is concerned about the education of all children, NANS leaders have been successful in attracting membership. This is also an important strategy when addressing various audiences simultaneously. NANS leaders convey a unified message. The goals of the organization are clearly established and the strategies and tactics for accomplishing these goals are clearly delineated. Problems which might arise are, therefore, minimized. NANS leaders have not been forced to engage in any sort of major compromise concerning the issue. But the organization is still young and the extent of NANS' power to influence the established structure is not yet known.

Diversity of Leadership. Movements require a diversity of leadership types. As a theoretician, Dr. Ralph Scott was instrumental in launching the movement. As an academician, Scott's thrust was to help change the thinking in the education establishment. However, "people in NANS, not being educators, could not get quite as involved
in this aspect as Dr. Scott might have wished." Therefore, Scott "stepped back" and the movement was carried forward by political activists.

Cook, DePrez, and D'Onofrio take great pride in the fact that NANS has hard-working leaders with specialized skills which further the goals of the movement. Ruffra believes that Venema was, perhaps, the most charismatic of the NANS presidents. D'Onofrio admits that he is a terrible public speaker, completely lacking in charisma. However, D'Onofrio's expertise is in the area of political organizing; he is well versed in politics and the way in which the political system functions. That knowledge serves as a powerful leverage not only in his position as president, but also for the movement as well.

Perhaps the greatest internal division within NANS occurred when the two women, DeHaven and Ruffra, served as presidents. Ruffra described DeHaven as a "very sincere person, but she had not experienced the same type of problems the others had so she could not speak from a personal background." This might have diminished her effectiveness as a leader. Cook described Ruffra as an "interlude in NANS who was suffering from burn-out when she (Ruffra) took the job and who experienced conflicts because she was more of a system-oriented person." When addressing audiences across the nation on the issue, Ruffra did recount the turmoil which occurred in Louisville, but she might have been somewhat ineffective in gaining visibility of the movement on a national level. Because DeHaven and Ruffra served
consecutively, it may very well be that these women experienced tremendous problems in establishing themselves as strong leaders. When membership perceives the leadership of a movement to be weak there is a greater opportunity for internal divisions to occur. Currently, D'Onofrio is perceived to be a very energetic, capable, and knowledgeable leader who has had a tremendous impact on other leaders and the movement as a whole.

**Rhetorical Strategies**

NANS leaders cannot be described as employing the sweet and reasonable rhetorical strategies of the moderate, nor are they the violent revolutionaries employing militant rhetorical strategies. Rather, NANS leaders have adopted the intermediate strategies, thereby obtaining the advantages while avoiding the disadvantages of each strategy.

As intermediates, NANS leaders issue pamphlets and manifestos, inveigh against "the bankrupt social policy of forced busing," but in the value language of the social order. Their devil is not only the condition they seek to change, but also those persons they seek to influence to support anti-busing legislation. They assume an ultimate identity of interests between the movement and the larger structure, employing rhetoric as an alternative to force. NANS leaders seek to change the actions of their primary targets--the voting patterns of congressmen and senators--as a pre-condition for change in attitudes. Confrontational tactics, such as demonstrations, are rejected for the
highly preferred rhetorical confrontations with agents of the estab­lished order.

The adaptation of intermediate strategies makes it necessary for leaders to address the dilemmas which result from conflicting rhetorical requirements.

Gaining Entrance to Decision Centers. Because NANS leaders do not advocate the use of militant tactics, the movement lacks visibility on a national level. This lack of national media exposure has been previously discussed, but it is a very serious dilemma for the leaders and it is a problem that they have not yet solved. However, NANS leaders do have some access to decision centers. In many local communities involved in desegregation litigation, NANS leaders confer with school administration officials and serve on city-wide planning councils. Admittedly, in many cases, this is an attempt on the part of the established order to diffuse the movement, but access is, non­theless, gained.

NANS leaders have also met with officials in Washington, but from the NANS' viewpoint, these meetings have not always been successful. In 1977, leaders met with representatives from the Carter Administration. This meeting was negotiated for three months and NANS leaders agreed to meet with staff members only if a meeting with President Carter was to be arranged for the future. After the meeting was held, the leaders were told that Carter would not meet with them.
In 1979, leaders met with Dr. Elizabeth Abramowitz, Carter's Domestic Policy Staff White House Advisor for all education policies, in what was described as a "fruitful meeting." Again, a request to meet with the President was made. Carter, however, refused to meet with NANS leaders throughout his entire term in office. NANS interpreted Carter's refusal to meet with them in the following manner:

Jean Ruffra, since her election as NANS President, has been trying to arrange a meeting with President Carter. NANS has been told, in effect, that President Carter simply doesn't have time to bother with an issue (forced busing) that is on the minds of millions of Americans. His time is spent in meetings with gay rights leaders, civil rights leaders, Black Congressional Caucus members, Socialist leaders, Communist leaders, women's lib leaders, etc. Small wonder he doesn't have time for an issue that effects millions of Americans.

Although they never met with Carter nor Attorney General Griffin Bell, in 1977, NANS leaders did testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee to oppose the nominations of Wade H. McCree and Drew S. Days to the U.S. Department of Justice. The appointments of McCree and Days were approved. In 1978, NANS representatives testified against the reauthorization of the U.S. Commission for Civil Rights before a sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The USCCR was reauthorized.

NANS leaders believed that the election of Ronald Reagan as President would give them access to the White House. As of August, 1981, Reagan continued to deny NANS' request for a meeting, preferring them to meet with Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell, instead. NANS'
1981 response to Reagan is reminiscent of the 1979 response to Carter:

President Reagan has met with such proponents of forced busing as the NAACP and the Urban League. He has lowered his office to meet with radicals from the 'gay rights' and militant feminist movements. Yet, while the overwhelming majority of the American people oppose forced busing, he has refused to meet with leaders of NANS, the foremost national anti-busing organization. In June, 1981, NANS leaders testified before the Constitution Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the negative effects of city-suburbs forced busing in New Castle County, Delaware. After this hearing, a meeting was held with Morton Blackwell, a Special Assistant to the President who serves as a liaison between conservative groups and Reagan's advisors. NANS leaders, with the assistance of Senators Strom Thurmond and John Tower, sought the appointment of Lino A. Graglia--"a long time friend of NANS, impeccably credentialed, and armed with a strong conviction that the courts have stood the Constitution on its head"--as Asst. Attorney General for Civil Rights. This appointment was rejected by Attorney General William French Smith, because, according to NANS, Graglia lacked credibility with blacks and liberals and Smith lacked the political courage to confront these groups.

While NANS leaders have gained access to decision centers, it is evident that they have not been entirely successful in their attempts to influence the formation of public policy. However, NANS' lobbyist, Clarence Randall, has been successful in his attempts to
organize anti-busers and an anti-busing legislation strategy on Capitol
Hill. In a February, 1981, letter to D'Onofrio, Randall wrote:

I have met with my busing strategy group. The players include the offices of Mottl, Bafalis,
Ashbrook, Collins, Fiedler, Stenholm, the Minority Whip, and the Republican Study Committee. I am
confident that this vehicle will allow for a more thorough yet concise plan of operation on all
busing legislation before the House. Each of the participants brings something unique to the
group and as I said I look for good things to come. I will be working to set up the same operation in
the Senate and will be meeting with Thurmond's people...134

Randall has served in this capacity for one year; it is therefore
difficult to predict the impact that he will have on legislators.
But he has been significantly more successful, to date, than NANS
leaders, working alone, have had.

Responding to Success. As a movement which believes the estab-
lished structure is conducive to change, NANS leaders must provide
evidence of success in order to maintain their following. Although
complete success will not be achieved until forced-busing as a
national policy is stopped, NANS leaders believe the movement has
been successful in several ways. In 1976, not long after its forma-
tion, NANS engaged in a debate with the USCCR; the debate was taped
for broadcast over public television. NANS leaders "successfully put
the USCRC [sic] on the defensive and undermined their arguments"135
and declared themselves the winner of this debate:

We were so successful that one of the USCRC Com-
mmissioners admitted to Frank Southworth that NANS,
indeed, had won....NANS now has unquestionable
credibility! It seems almost inconceivable that a fledgling organization (2 1/2 months old) was able to organize and bring to fruition, a debate on national television with an agency of the federal government. What do we do for an encore? Perhaps several pro-busing U.S. Senators or even several federal judges who have taken advocacy positions outside the courtroom might rise to the challenge.136

In a 1977 address to NANS, entitled, "A Year of Progress--A Year of Victories," President James Venema stated:

NANS has developed a momentum in just 12 months which is beginning to change the course of history with respect to forced busing. Step by step, we are having a devastating impact on some 45 years of liberalism and some 23 years of court precedent. It has taken the pro-busing fanatics that long to carefully construct their flimsy 'house of cards.' And it has only taken NANS one year to at least blow the roof off, exposing their web of deceit to the nation.137

Another success for the NANS was related to the 1979 House debate on the proposed Mottl constitutional amendment which would have stopped forced busing. Even though the measure failed, the fact that enough signatures were obtained on a Discharge Petition, thus allowing the amendment to be debated by the full House, was in and of itself a major accomplishment.138 It also set the stage for the future by putting all members of the House on record for the 1980 elections.139

Overcoming Apathy. As previously discussed, NANS' supporters are easily energized when their cities are initially confronted with desegregation; however, apathy soon prevails after plans are implemented and those parents who strongly oppose busing either move or find alternative education for their children. NANS leaders have not been able
to overcome the problem of apathy, nor have they been successful in mobilizing the vast majority of the American public who oppose forced busing, but as "lip-service adherents," cannot be depended upon to perform the work of the movement.

Affecting Power-Vulnerable. Elected officials--congressmen and senators--are the most vulnerable to pressure tactics exerted by NANS. NANS hopes to make busing an issue in every congressional district in the nation. Even though busing is not a significant issue in every congressional district or state in the nation, it is a significant issue in those areas that are involved in desegregation litigation and in those cities which have court-ordered racial balance programs in effect. In these areas where it is an issue, legislators are subjected to intense pressure from their constituents who are, in all likelihood, being tutored by NANS leaders in effective ways of "doing battle."

NANS-PAC has been instrumental in distributing the voting records of congressmen and senators on anti-busing legislation to the media and constituencies in an effort to target pro-busers for defeat in upcoming elections. In a January, 1981, message to NANS leaders, D'Onofrio targeted the pro-busing congressmen who would be vulnerable in the 1982 elections and NANS members were encouraged to work for their defeat. In this same message, however, NANS indicts the "ultra liberal" National Committee for an Effective Congress for releasing a list of conservative targets for 1982; this "hit list" was composed
primarily of anti-busers. According to D\'Onofrio, "It is up to us in NANS to protect our friends in Congress; whenever and wherever we can, by countering liberal attacks on them." 

Working alone, NANS, for the most part, does not have the political strength to defeat pro-busers. NANS\' strength is bolstered by the coalition of single-interest conservative groups ensconsed within the New Right. In reference to this coalition, D\'Onofrio states: "We could never dream of having enough actual NANS affiliates to do what NCPAC will be doing for our movement by using what we have compiled against congressmen." Because of this conservative trend in American political thought, liberal congressmen are very vulnerable to political pressure exerted by these conservative groups working in unison to advance their particular causes.

While attempting to persuade these legislators to support anti-busing legislation, NANS leaders must take care so as not to prompt any backlash. During the 1979 debate on the Mottl amendment, tremendous pressure opposing the amendment was exerted by organizations such as the ACLU, NAACP, AFL-CIO, League of Women Voters, and the National Bar Association. This debate placed many legislators in a precarious position because they were opposed to forced busing, but they also opposed an anti-busing constitutional amendment. After this debate, NANS leaders were advised by their supporters to seek other remedies.

In an effort to avoid a backlash by the movement's supporters, NANS leaders are advised by the lobbyist to avoid any unnecessary
notoriety towards members of Congress. Referring to his success in organizing a busing strategy group with members of the House, Randall states:

I am rather pleased with the fact that I was able to get the above mentioned offices together. Although one would expect this to be no mean feat, there are turf problems even with the busing issue. I am therefore asking for your cooperation that the group receive no notoriety whatsoever as this would surely kill the effort. Every office involved knows that NANS is responsible for getting the group together but let's not make the mistake of giving the impression that we are running the show--EVEN THOUGH IT IS THE TRUTH! 143

D'Onofrio made the following reply to Randall:

Please elaborate on what you mean by 'notoriety' and we will try to comply. I cannot possibly foresee any NANS 'badmouthing' of Mottl and Ashbrook. As for others, it is difficult, if pressure is to be applied publicly to members of Congress, not to involve them in a little notoriety. 'NANS style.' We'll do our best not to. 144

NANS leaders, as well as the leaders of other conservative causes, must take great care that their tactics do not actuate backlash reactions from the power-vulnerables.

NANS has always been successful in attempts to influence power-invulnerables, mostly whites who believe they have been the victims of busing programs. The majority of blacks, on the other hand, generally supported desegregation programs, even if their children did bear most of the burden. (Black children were generally bused for more years and for greater distances than white children.)
By 1979, however, more blacks were beginning to publicly voice their opposition to forced-busing. According to Derek A. Bell, a black former civil rights attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, "In the South, busing was sometimes effective as a means of forcing school authorities to provide equal educational opportunity. But now that the focus of busing has shifted to large urban areas, it is counterproductive." Blacks continue to support integration, but believe that schools in black communities should be improved so that white parents, who also see the benefit of integration, are encouraged to send their children to those schools.

In efforts to stop forced busing, the Black Silent Majority Committee advocates an anti-busing constitutional amendment. In Dallas, the Black Coalition to Maximize Education is seeking an end to busing in that city. In 1981, in North St. Louis, before the implementation of busing plans, black parents were organizing a petition drive calling for an end to court-ordered busing and an improvement in the quality of the schools in their own community. These attempts by members of the black community to stop court ordered racial balance programs and to engage in political activism to improve their own community schools are encouraged by NANS leaders. This lends credence to the arguments that anti-busers are not racists and that being against busing is now, in fact, a respectable position.

The Intermediate Strategy. By employing intermediate strategies to accomplish the goal of the movement, NANS leaders must be
prepared to accept both the advantages and disadvantages that accompany
the combination of the moderate and militant strategies. An inter-
mediate strategy can be dangerous because, according to Simons, it
may end up antagonizing everyone. NANS leaders must exercise
cautionso that their language and rhetorical appeals are not per-
ceived as devilish tricks. As previously mentioned, leaders have been
advised by the lobbyist to mollify their attacks on legislators; even
Cook believes that many times, NANS' rhetoric has "turned people
off." And while leaders have been granted access to decision
centers, their input has largely been ignored by the established
order.

NANS leaders must also exercise care that they closely adhere
to the position that forced racial balance programs have contributed
to a decline in the public education in this nation and for this
reason the policy should be changed. Many NANS leaders and agents
of the New Right are strong advocates of the "voucher system," a plan
which, if implemented, would in all probability destroy public educa-
tion. Leaders must therefore be somewhat ambiguous as to their
ultimate goal for education in this society.

Finally, NANS leaders and the leaders of the conservative move-
ments must exercise care so that they do not end up antagonizing
everyone. It is very possible that the American public, which is by
nature rather moderate on social issues, will backlash on some of the
conservative issues.
"Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements": A Summation

It is incumbent upon leaders of a social movement to fulfill the rhetorical requirements if the movement is to succeed. In order to attract middle-class Americans to the anti-busing movement, NANS leaders formulated policies which eschewed violence, but encouraged political activism at the local level so that the issue of forced busing was addressed at the national level. Highly energized members are attracted to the movement when desegregation litigation begins, but lose interest after desegregation plans are implemented.

Although the majority of Americans are opposed to court ordered racial balance, NANS leaders have been unsuccessful in securing adoption of their product by the established order. Resistance to either a constitutional amendment, legislation which would prohibit federal courts from hearing desegregation related cases, or prohibiting the Justice Department from becoming involved in desegregation related cases is generated because of either the unconstitutionality of these measures, the undesirability, or the serious long-term consequences each would have upon the nation.

While NANS leaders have experienced some degree of success in reacting to resistance generated by Congress, they have been denied tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service. Unlike "pro-busing" organizations, NANS receives no federal or private grants to further its cause. The greatest source of resistance is generated by the national media, which has never recognized the existence of NANS.
NANS leaders have not solved this problem, but they have created their own communications network which extends beyond the movement's membership into the single-issue organizations of the New Right.

Leaders must also make choices between expedient and ethical considerations. NANS leaders engage in political activism which is socially acceptable. They do tend to exaggerate the actual membership strength of the movement, preferring to say that they represent the viewpoint of the majority of Americans. Leaders also engage in oversimplification of arguments related to the issue, blaming low achievement scores, white flight, declining tax bases, etc., on the evils of forced busing. They articulate the movement's power to succeed, give vent to anxiety and frustration experienced by the members, and legitimize privately held feelings. Members are encouraged to participate in decision-making, but NANS' Board of Directors and Executive Board make almost all important decisions affecting the movement.

NANS leaders are consistent in their positions, having denounced only the policy of not involving the movement in court litigation. Because NANS leaders exercise great care in presenting a consistent message to the various audiences they address, they avoid conflicts which otherwise might arise.

NANS has a diversity of leadership styles. Ralph Scott, as an academician and theoretician, launched the movement, but the political activists now carry it forward. A conflict among leadership occurred
when Ruffra was president, but that was resolved. Leaders strive to minimize internal divisions, preferring to exert their energies on the implementation of their ideology.

Employing intermediate rhetorical strategies to accomplish their goal, NANS leaders suffer the advantages and disadvantages of each. While the national media denies the movement visibility, NANS leaders do have access to decision centers, having testified before various committees and met with Presidential Aides. However, allowing access to decision centers is sometimes done more to mollify leaders rather than to consider seriously their proposals or testimony. Hiring a professional lobbyist has enhanced NANS' access to congressmen and senators.

NANS leaders usually advertise their failures as successes in that even though they fail to achieve a specific goal—the Mottl amendment—they come closer by acquiring more votes than in previous attempts. NANS' greatest influence is with the members of Congress, as elected officials; they are the power-vulnerables leaders are attempting to persuade. Other members of the establishment, with the exception of the fundamentalist Christian leaders who are against busing, generally avoid NANS. NANS is most influential with power-invulnerables, both whites and blacks, who have little to lose by acting on their own self concerns. There is an increasing number of blacks who oppose busing, preferring that money be spent to upgrade their neighborhood schools.
NANS' strength is enhanced by the coalition of single-interest conservative groups forged under the umbrella of the New Right. In this way, conservatives unite and exert intense pressure on Congress for passage of legislation related to social issues. All of these conservative movements employ intermediate strategies to accomplish their goals. Many of their inconsistencies in thought and reason are strongly overshadowed by articulating the overarching principle of rebuilding a social order which honors and adheres to the traditions of the past—a belief in God and his teachings, a patriotic love of country, and a love and belief in the sanctity of the family as the basic structure of a strong nation.
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A social movement that reflects the conservative rhetoric prevalent in today's society is the National Association for Neighborhood Schools (NANS), an anti-busing organization that encourages organized political activism on both the grassroots and national levels to stop court-ordered desegregation of the nation's public schools. As an anti-busing movement NANS is worthy of study because it is a social movement whose strategies and tactics have evolved and matured with the times. Since 1954, when the United States Supreme Court, ruling in Brown, decreed that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal and ordered the abolishment of dual school systems throughout the country, school desegregation has been one of the most salient social issues confronting the public.

White resistance to desegregation which was tantamount in the South during the 1960s moved North during the 1970s. Street demonstrations, riots, and protests were not uncommon as Northern whites voiced their objections to the implementation of desegregation plans. After the riots which occurred, most notably, in Boston and Louisville, Americans became concerned about confrontations which endangered the safety and well-being of their children. The violence
oriented anti-busers had created a negative image for themselves, and as much as people opposed desegregation, they had reached a point where they opposed violence even more. Many wished for a peaceful resolution to the problem; a non-violent form of protest that was acceptable to the American people was needed. The National Association for Neighborhood Schools answered that need in the most American way possible--through political activism designed to change the current laws regarding school desegregation/forced racial balance programs. Legal and political activism are the major strategies employed by NANS and almost every other social movement that is currently active in the early 1980s. Therefore, this movement, as well as its relationship to the social and political milieu in which it occurs, is worthy of study.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the rhetoric of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools in an effort to contribute information to our knowledge of the rhetoric of collective behavior, both theoretically and in terms of assessing the role of rhetoric in the society. This study is a social criticism which, according to Karlyn Campbell, "appraises contemporary acts before all the consequences are known." Because NANS has not yet accomplished its goal of ending "forced busing," a social criticism is, indeed, appropriate at this time.

Employing a pluralistic methodology, this study is centered in three essays which concentrate on key rhetorical theories which have
significance for the study of a social movement: Lloyd F. Bitzer's "The Rhetorical Situation;" Ernest Bormann's "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," and Herbert W. Simons' "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements." Relative to these essays, the study focuses on three primary questions: (1) What is the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools? (2) What rhetorical strategies are employed by NANS to create a rhetorical vision as a response to the situation? and (3) What rhetorical roles and problems are assumed by NANS' leadership? Before discussing the results and claims relative to this critical inquiry, it is appropriate to review briefly each of the preceding chapters.

Chapter I ("Introduction") discusses the need for expanding the scope of rhetorical criticism beyond the single speaker approach to include the study of social movements. Background data related to the social upheaval occurring in the South after the first desegregation order in 1954 to the turmoil occurring in the North when desegregation plans were first implemented in the early 1970s is provided. Evolving from this protest was the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, a movement which employed only non-violent strategies to address the issue of school desegregation/forced busing. Major questions upon which the study is focused are raised, the methodologies employed in the study are described, and scholarly literature related to social movements and school desegregation are discussed.
Pertinent information regarding the collection of data from both primary and secondary sources is also provided.

Chapter II ("The Rhetorical Situation") addresses the question, What is the nature of the rhetorical situation faced by the National Association for Neighborhood Schools?" This chapter applies the criteria of a social movement as an essential element of the rhetorical situation and chronologically discusses the interactive elements of the exigence, the audience, and the constraints which impact upon the situation from 1971 to early 1981. The exigence being addressed by the NANS is the issue of forced busing. The audiences which have the potential to modify the exigence fall into several categories. The primary audience being addressed consists of those individuals within the general American public who are opposed to busing as a means of desegregating the public schools. Members of this audience are primarily white, middle-class, patriotic, law abiding, hard working Americans who believe in representative government and neighborhood schools for their children. Through political activism, the primary audience seeks to persuade Congress to pass legislation which would eliminate forced busing as a national policy. Congress, therefore, serves as a major audience being addressed by the movement. A third audience, which has the greatest potential to modify the exigence, but which is least influenced by public opinion is the Federal Judiciary, most notably the Supreme Court. This audience has been unresponsive to the rhetorical strategies of NANS.
The constraints imposed upon the situation include: changing public opinion concerning the value of busing as a means to desegregate public schools, intensified activity to desegregate Northern urban school systems and opposition to court ordered racial balance, ideological shifts occurring within the society from a politically liberal to a more politically conservative stance; demographic relocation from inner-city urban areas not only to suburban and rural areas, but also from the North to the "Sunbelt" regions of the South and West, and the coalition of single-interest groups into a politically powerful force within the society.

The National Association for Neighborhood Schools, which believes in working through the system to change the system, exists within a rhetorical situation which is highly complex in structure because it is only one of many single-issue movements to co-exist throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s. Through their collective and unified efforts of effecting change through the ballot-box they are responding in a manner befitting a situation which is embedded in reality and which demands and invites discourse. NANS is the first national movement that has been successful in attempts to mobilize a constituency which systematically addresses the issue of forced racial balance/forced busing.

Chapter III ("The Rhetorical Vision of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools as an Agent of the New Right") focuses on the question, "What rhetorical strategies were employed by the
National Association for Neighborhood Schools to create a rhetorical vision as a response to a situation?" Perceiving a general decline in morality, increased federal interference into their private lives, and a general destruction of the traditional American values upon which this nation was founded, the once-silent, God-fearing, family loving, patriotic Americans could tolerate no more and demanded the death of this hedonistic society ruled by the priests of secular humanism and gave birth to the vision of a new Order. The rhetorical vision of the NANS and other New Right movements is the re-creation of a strong, morally incorruptible nation valiantly facing the future while its roots are firmly embedded in the traditions of the past. In their vision, the nation adheres to and honors the traditional values set forth by the founding fathers: a belief in God, a patriotic love of country, and a belief in the sanctity of the family as the basic structure of a strong nation. For the NANS, the vision encompasses the right to live in socio-economically, ethnically homogeneous communities where their children are free to attend the locally-controlled neighborhood schools.

Fantasy themes contained within the vision are centered around a loss of freedom and the fear of encroaching Communism, a belief that busing is more of a racist policy than the segregation it seeks to eradicate, and a belief that through political activism busing can be stopped. The rhetorical vision and its representative fantasy themes exist in a complex social and political situation. In the
later portion of the 1970s and the early 1980s, Americans reflected a sense of uneasiness, pessimism, and apprehension about the present and their future as a nation. But even as they were dissatisfied with the current state of affairs, Americans remained optimistic that their problems could be solved. A new wave of patriotic spirit began to emerge as Americans rededicated themselves to the traditional values of God, country, and family in their efforts to recreate a country that was economically, politically, and socially more conservative. The attempt to create a new order was precipitated by several events occurring simultaneously: (1) emanating from middle-class America has a general dissatisfaction with the economic and social policies of the "Great Society" programs; (2) conservative single-interest groups emerged and coalesced into a powerful political movement; and (3) evangelical Christians mobilized and, joining forces with the New Right single interest political groups, became active in pro-American, pro-family, pro-life, and pro-moral issues. The rhetorical vision of the new Order is propagated by the conservatives' own communications network which is described as being a "second culture," disseminating its message by way of newsletters, periodicals, scholarly journals, lecture circuits, and academic organizations.

Chapter IV ("A Leader Centered Conception of Persuasion in Social Movements") addresses the question, "What are the rhetorical requirements, problems, strategies, and dilemmas faced by the leaders of a social movement?" This chapter analyzes the rhetorical requirements which leaders must meet if the movement is to be successful:
attracting members and molding them into an efficiently organized unit, securing adoption of their product by the larger structure, and reacting to resistance generated by the larger structure. Highly energized members are attracted to the movement when desegregation litigation begins or plans are being implemented, but these individuals lose interest after the implementation of desegregation. NANS leaders experience some difficulties in keeping their membership energized to work for a long-term solution to the problem. Although the majority of the American people oppose court ordered racial balance programs, NANS leaders have been unsuccessful in securing adoption of their program for change. This is due, in large part, because NANS advocates legislation which has severe long term consequences for the nation. NANS leaders also encounter resistance: the movement is ignored by the national media, the Internal Revenue Services refuses to grant tax-exempt status, and Congress generally attempts to thwart legislative attempts to address the issue.

Leaders must also make choices between expedient and ethical considerations. While NANS leaders strictly adhere to a program of political activism, they do exaggerate the actual membership strength of the movement and distort arguments related to the issue. Members are encouraged to participate in decision making, but major decisions are made by the executive bodies of the organization.

By adopting intermediate rhetorical strategies to accomplish their goal, NANS leaders suffer the advantages and disadvantages of both the moderate and radical rhetorical strategies. They gain
entrance to decision centers, testifying before Congressional com-
mittees, but their input is rarely acknowledged. They have sought
meetings with Presidents Carter and Reagan, but these requests have
been ignored; leaders have been forced to meet with Presidential
Aides, instead. The movement has engaged the services of a profes-
sional lobbyist and he has experienced greater success in gaining
access to decision centers on Capitol Hill. Leaders are constantly
confronted with an apathetic membership and "lip-service adherents"
who cannot be depended upon to perform the work of the movement.

NANS' greatest influence is with the power-vulnerables or elected
officials. A great deal of time and energy is expended to publish
the voting records of congressmen on anti-busing legislation. NANS
members are encouraged to make forced busing an issue in every con-
gressional district throughout the nation. However, even among power-
vulnerables, NANS leaders must take care not to create a backlash.
NANS has always been successful in recruiting power-invulnerables,
mostly whites who perceived themselves to be the victims of busing
programs, but an increasing number of middle class blacks are also
beginning to voice their opposition to court ordered racial balance
programs. Members of the black community are now demanding that the
schools in their own communities be upgraded and improved.

NANS' strength is enhanced by the coalition of single-interest
conservative groups forged under the umbrella of the New Right.
All of these conservative groups employ intermediate strategies to
accomplish their goals. Many of their inconsistencies in thought and
reason are overshadowed by articulating the overarching principle of re-building a social order which honors and adheres to the traditions of the past. NANS wishes to re-establish the traditional bond which exists between the home, the school, and the community.

Conclusions

After completing the research and analyzing the rhetoric of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools, a general conclusion can be drawn that a language-based historical study, focusing on the shared-symbol-as-social dynamic, can best account for what appear to be the intrusive, intuitive (and therefore stubborn) 'facts' of events contributing to continuity and change in human affairs. A study of NANS, as a social movement has value because, according to Brown, the communication historian seeks to improve the field's collection of "naturally" occurring (i.e., non-'operationalized') communication events. A language-based study also makes it possible for the critic to understand the ways in which symbol users can both organize and disorganize their relationships with one another and to analyze "the symbolizing which underlies the intuition that symbol-experiencing offers a trade-off between the efficiency of making the present, the not-here, the not-now, and the not-yet observed, on the one hand, and the blinding of selective perception, on the other." In this way, historical communication studies seek generalizations that depend upon the similarities of total communication occurrences across time.
A historical study focusing on communication also provides insights into the ways in which symbolization accounts for human interpretations of reality. Symbols such as freedom, traditional American values, patriotism, founding fathers, liberal versus conservative, forced busing, and God fearing Americans become generalized reality for NANS and serve to determine the behavior that is prompted by the "reality-created-by-the-name." From this perspective human communication can be viewed as the driver of history, thus demonstrating its irreplaceable role in human affairs. To study a social movement as a potential microcosm of societal process with a focus on symbols and the relationships they abstract and reify is to study the flow of history on communication-as-social dynamic. This study of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools serves as a transition between historically-based studies and historical communication studies which emphasize the way in which man orders his view of himself, others, and his world through the use of reifying symbols.

A second conclusion which can be drawn from this study is that language not only determines the structure of a social movement, but also that language style develops that which is unique to the community which shares the rhetorical vision. An analysis of the rhetorical vision and its representative fantasy themes which chain out to public audiences provides insights into NANS' perception of the world and serves to define motives, behavior, norms, roles, and expectations of those who participate in the vision. By understanding that NANS members perceive busing to be a fascist, racist policy which can be
eliminated only through political activism, not street violence, their behavior and political fervor can be anticipated and understood. To understand NANS' fear that Americans are losing their freedoms provides insight into the vision which encompasses the desire to return to the "good old days" when the country was strong and men's lives were free from federal interference. In essence, in order to fully understand the movement, it is necessary to understand the rhetorical vision of those who participate in that movement. Currently, Bormann's rhetorical vision/fantasy theme analysis is perhaps one of the most promising rhetorical methods for the study of social movements. This method of analysis contributes to rhetorical theory and to communication history because the focus is on language or human communication as the driver of history. Rhetorical studies concentrating on the stylistic elements of language as people, sharing a common vision, attempt to create a new social order should, therefore, be encouraged.

A third conclusion which can be drawn from this study is that the National Association for Neighborhood Schools has been successful in attempts to educate the public to believe that court ordered racial balance programs or forced busing does not have to be an accepted national policy in the area of public education. It might also be concluded that NANS' programs for changing the existing policy will not be adopted. However, because of the intense political pressure that has been exerted, agents of the established structure are currently addressing the exigence. The Justice Department, under
under President Reagan, is no longer pressing for court ordered busing, but is making attempts to insure that minority schools are brought into parity with other schools. The plan for the future will probably entail equalization of schools within a district and open enrollment for those students wishing to attend schools outside their immediate neighborhoods. There is a possibility that this is the establishment's method of co-opting the issue; nonetheless, NANS has been instrumental in forcing the establishment to respond to the exigence. Further research related to this movement might focus on NANS' response to the Justice Department's proposed plan for addressing the exigence of forced busing in an effort to discern: (1) if the movement has been co-opted by the establishment, (2) if the movement continues to work for a more permanent solution to the problem, i.e., a constitutional amendment or legislation which prohibits the federal courts from presiding over desegregation related cases, or (3) if the movement changes goals completely and works for implementation of the voucher system.

It could also be concluded that NANS' current status as a recognized anti-busing movement can be attributed, in part, to the coalition of the conservative single-interest political movements and the evangelical Christians ensconsed within the New Right. The impact that these movements working collectively in re-shaping the American political and social scene for the early 1980s cannot be underestimated. However, without their united efforts, it is doubtful if
any of the pro-family, pro-strong national defense, pro-morality
groups would be experiencing their current degree of success as they
attempt to return Americans to a conservative version of a belief in
traditional values. Therefore, future research could be focused on
these "revivalistic social movements which seek limited replacement
or total replacement of existing norms, values, and power distribu-
tions with ones from a venerable, idealized past." A social critic
could contribute much to our understanding of rhetorical theory and
collective behavior by studying these movements individually and then
by analyzing their inter-relationships and inter-dependence as they
forge a new vision. Golden concurs with this approach, believing that
an analysis of various collectivities striving for similar goals
could be more productive than the study of a single movement.9

A fourth conclusion related to this study is that linearity does
not have to be an essential part of the criticism of movements.10
Studying a movement chronologically, which was first espoused by
Leland Griffin,11 can provide invaluable insights for the critic, but
a linear approach may not reveal that which is rhetorically signifi-
cant.12 Scott and Brook believe that rhetorical criticism is in a
pre-paradigmatic stage with many theories competing for acceptance.13
However, contemporary critics, arguing for methodological variety,
believe that a "pluralistic approach to research is the only intel-
lectually defensible position."14 A pluralistic approach allows the
critic to focus on different rhetorical aspects of a movement and to
determine which systems best highlight the characteristics of the rhetoric being studied. This study of NANS, encompassing three non-linear methodologies enhances our knowledge of social collectivities and the languaging strategies employed to achieve their desired goals.

Rhetorical critics should analyze social movements with a variety of methodologies in an effort to establish the ways in which existing methods overlap. For instance, when Simons discusses the rhetorical problems encountered by a leader and establishes that a "statement of ideology must define that which is ambiguous in the social setting, give structure to anxiety and a tangible target for hostility, foster in-group feelings, and articulate wish fulfillments about the movement's power to succeed...." is he, perhaps, addressing Bormann's concept of rhetorical vision and fantasy themes? Are the rhetorical problems encountered by leaders similar to the constraints imposed upon the situation which constitute a hierarchy of exigencies which must be addressed by leaders of a movement within a rhetorical situation? I believe that the answer to both of these questions is yes. Therefore, in order to understand the theoretical relationships which exist among the various methodologies currently competing for acceptance, a social movement study should be approached from a pluralistic perspective.

A fourth conclusion which can be drawn from this study is that strong leadership is essential if a movement is to experience any degree of success. Prior to the formation of NANS, several attempts
to establish national anti-busing movements failed. These failures can be attributed, in part, to inexperienced leaders who were unable to meet the rhetorical demands placed upon them in their roles as leaders. Further research pertaining to a leader centered approach to the study of movements might fall into three categories. (1) Because NANS has had five presidents in its six years of existence, it is difficult to assess the role that each has played in the development of the movement; for this reason they were studied collectively. However, NANS' current President, William D'Onofrio, has emerged as the most astute political strategist; he, therefore, warrants further study. (2) Because the female presidents of NANS experienced the most difficulties in leading the movement, further research needs to be conducted on the rhetorical problems women encounter as they attempt to lead movements. A study of this nature would address the stereotypes and negative perceptions which continue to prevail in contemporary society and the languaging strategies employed as women attempt to overcome these negative stereotypes. A study of this nature might provide insights as to the reasons that female-oriented movements and issues are not generally as successful as those managed by males. (3) Another study related to leaders might focus on Paul Weyrich. Weyrich is "head of Coalitions for America which coordinates nearly 120 different conservative organizations" on the contemporary political scene. Weyrich, Richard Viguerie, Howard Phillips, and Terry Dolan are considered to be the leaders of "one of the most
dynamic political developments of the past decade--the New Right.\textsuperscript{17} A leader centered study of one or all of these men as they forge a new vision for America would greatly contribute to our knowledge of rhetorical theory, conservative politics, and the relationship of collectivities which share the same general goals and operate in the same social milieu.

A fifth conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that history, politics, and communication are inter-related elements of the study of social movements. To understand NANS it is necessary to understand the history of segregation vs. desegregation from which this movement evolved. Because the movement focuses on political activism as the desired method of attaining its goal, the critic must understand the ways in which the agents of the established political system respond to the needs of the constituencies they propose to serve. The study of a movement encompasses the ways in which the symbol maker uses languaging strategies to form collectivities. Therefore, a knowledge of the historical, social, and political influences which affect a movement is essential to the process of conducting rhetorical criticism. This study of NANS serves to elucidate the relationship that history, politics, and communication have on the study of a social movement.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWS
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What is your position with NANS?
What other organizations are you affiliated with?
Describe your duties and responsibilities with NANS.
Describe the organizational structure of NANS (local and national).
How many NANS affiliates are there throughout the United States?
What is the financial structure of NANS (dues paying structure)?
Approximately how many members do you have locally, statewide, nationally?

Why did you become involved with NANS? What attracted you to the organization?
Why, in your opinion, are other individuals attracted to NANS?
Describe the typical NANS member.

How has NANS worked to attract membership? What rhetorical appeals have been used?
What problems have you encountered in attracting members, molding them into an effective work unit, and keeping them involved?
What are some of the conflicts you have encountered with members? e.g., differences in philosophy, tactics, strategies, etc., employed to achieve the goals?
How have these conflicts been resolved?

How do the leaders of NANS work to reduce the frustrations of its members as to their feelings about forced busing? How does NANS work to meet the needs of its members?

Describe the various public audiences NANS is attempting to reach.
What individual or group is responsible for creating the NANS messages?
Who conducts research for the arguments developed against forced busing/racial balance?
Who determines the types of rhetorical appeals that will be used? By what process are these decisions made?

What are the rhetorical expectations placed upon you in your role as a NANS leader?
What kinds of role conflicts have you encountered? How have you resolved these conflicts?

What conflicts pertaining to rhetoric, tactics, strategies, etc., have occurred among NANS leaders? How were they resolved?

What kinds of resistance have you encountered from the establishment (local, state, and national)? How are you working to minimize that resistance?
In what ways have you been helped by members of the establishment? Who, among the established structure, are your supporters? Who provides the most resistance?

How have you consciously adapted your rhetoric to meet the needs of various audiences—in-group, media, legislators, etc.?

What major activities, programs, policies, etc., has NANS engaged in to affect current public policies in the area of school desegregation?

What are NANS' future goals? Within 5-10 years, what will NANS have accomplished?

How has NANS evolved and become more sophisticated since its inception?

What conscious attempts have been made to refine the rhetoric? (Local and national)

How did you become such an articulate spokesperson for NANS? What was the process by which you became a leader?

As the leader of a social movement, what was the most difficult problem you have encountered to date? How did you solve that problem?

What significant challenges have you faced? How have you met these challenges?

What characteristics or talents do you possess that have contributed to your success as a spokesperson for NANS (please do not be modest)?

As a leader, what do you perceive to be your greatest strengths? Shortcomings?

What has your involvement with NANS taught you about yourself? Other people? The establishment?

As an individual, what ultimate effect will you have on society?

What kinds of ethical dilemmas have you encountered in your role as a NANS leader? How did you solve these dilemmas?
Interviewee: William D'Onofrio  
President, National Association for Neighborhood Schools  
Date: August, 1980  
Location: Wilmington, Delaware  
Note: A list of interview questions was submitted to Mr. D'Onofrio who consented to answer the questions on tape.

WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH NANS?

I am President of NANS.

WHAT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ARE YOU AFFILIATED WITH?

I am Delaware State Coordinator for the Conservation Caucus, a 400,000-member national grassroots citizens' lobby.

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH NANS.

Let me say, first, that NANS is a far-flung organization with a limited budget. Our Executive Board and Board of Directors meet relatively infrequently. Although matters of policy and direction are discussed and approved at board meetings, implementation, methodology, and new initiatives and the time spans in between are my responsibility with input from others, of course. Telephone and written communications between myself and NANS leaders are, of course, constant. I suppose you would have to say that my responsibility is to lead the National Anti-Busing Movement.

DESCRIBE THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF NANS--LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY.

NANS is an organization controlled by a Board of Directors who are appointed by existing directors of which there are currently some thirty-odd. The board also appoints a NANS Executive Board, currently nine members, and NANS officers: President, First and Second Vice-Presidents, Secretary and Treasurer.

The Executive Board, in recognition of our far-flung structure, is a sort of streamlined board of authority. Below the officers and directors are the affiliate groups of NANS. Each remain with their own similar organizational structure. Many NANS directors and officers are also officers of affiliate groups, although this does not have to be the case. However, it is quite natural that local anti-busing leaders will gravitate to NANS in national positions to recognize leadership and seek local anti-busing leaders for our board.
In this vein, I might add that although NANS has had in the past several non-working or name directors, I am not much for such an organizational tactic and I would rather have such people displaced on the board by those who really work in the movement. Realizing that it is not possible for some people to maintain a continuity in the movement, especially since we all serve voluntarily, we have created a NANS Board of Honor to recognize those fine anti-busers who, for various reasons, have become inactive. These people are, of course, non-voting.

Below the NANS officers and directors, and these are similarly structured for the most part, are the dues-paying members of both NANS and its affiliates.

A recent development in NANS' organizational structure is the NANS-PAC, National Association for Neighborhood Schools Political Action Committee. As we become more involved in advocating the defeat of or the election of political candidates, mainly through information distribution of busing related Congressional Roll Calls, we have had to form a Political Action Committee, PAC, to comply with the harassing federal election laws.

NANS-PAC, which is a special initiative of mine, will not finance campaigns of candidates, but will endorse candidates. Several NANS affiliates have already set up their own PACs under the federal election laws. NANS, itself, is set up as a tax-exempt membership organization under Section 501C4 of the Internal Revenue Code for the principle purposes of educating its members and the public on the issue of busing and for the purposes of lobbying elected officials; that is, the principle of NANS organization of 501C4. NANS, itself, and I, myself, are registered as lobbyists in Washington under another bothersome and harassing federal law, the Federal Lobbying Act. We are also setting up another separate tax-exempt organization, the NANS Educational Foundation, under 501C3 of the Internal Revenue Code. This will enable us to go about educating the public on aspects of the anti-busing movement while benefiting from tax-deductible contributions from individuals, tax deductibility thus encouraging such contributions.

HOW MANY NANS AFFILIATES ARE THERE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES?

Certainly not enough in terms of organization. Expanding the number of NANS affiliates has to be our top priority. The more busing or the threat of busing spreads, the more affiliates we pick up. I understand that we have some twenty working affiliates. Some, of course, are more effective than others. Our strongest affiliates are in Columbus and Cleveland, Ohio; Southwest Michigan— that's Berrien County; Omaha, Nebraska; Louisville, Kentucky; a couple of strong affiliates in Boston, Massachusetts; three or four other affiliates in Dallas, Texas, and Lubbock, Texas; Los Angeles, California; Bayonne, New Jersey; New Castle County, Delaware, and so forth.
An important point must be made here. There are many local anti-busing groups or groups of people, formal or informal, across the nation who are not NANS affiliates or individual NANS members. These areas, nevertheless, still have strong, constant, on-going political constituencies who are anti-busing. The Southeast is a good example here and we have no Southeast affiliates.

Anti-busing initiatives by NANS are indirectly supported in such areas by people who may have never even heard of NANS. For example, Congressman Ron Mottl of Ohio has credited NANS as being the only national organization pushing the Discharge Petition and forcing the Mottl amendment onto the floor of the House for a roll call. This had national publicity even though NANS, of course, was not mentioned in this national publicity. Many, many people, due to the public and media discussion of the Mottl amendment, actually functioned as NANS affiliates or members even without being aware of NANS activity and NANS involvement on the Mottl amendment.

In addition, and this is most important, NANS is but a recent addition to the mushrooming conservative movement; and conservatives are almost invariably anti-busers. NANS initiatives and the fruits of NANS initiatives have become known to this conservative movement. For example, what much of NANS is doing goes out to fifty state coordinators of the Conservative Caucus. As another example, in this election year, NANS anti-busing or pro-busing roll call records of the Congress are being used nationally, for example, by the nation's largest conservative political action groups, NCPAC, National Conservative Political Action Committee. We could never dream of having enough actual NANS affiliates to do what NCPAC will be doing for our movement in this respect by using what we have compiled against congressmen as we approach November.

The point is this: there is an inter-relationship between NANS and unaffiliated groups of people. Thus, if you are discussing NANS strength, it is misleading to talk in terms of mere members of dues-paying members and/or working affiliates.

WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF NANS?

NANS, the 501C4, is funded by individual membership dues and small donations. Membership dues are one hundred dollars per organization; fifteen dollars for a family; ten dollars for an individual; and five dollars for an associate membership. We ask for additional and separate donations from both NANS members and non-members for our lobbying fund to pay for our newly-hired professional lobbying firm in Washington. NANS-PAC is funded by amounts given by NANS members over and above their membership dues.

I'm not willing to give out this information. My thinking here is that what the opposition doesn't know will hurt them and not us; it will keep them glancing over their shoulder, so to speak. Our real membership strength lies in the memberships of our affiliate groups. The important thing is impact among the nation's population and not by the numbers of members. We are in a very nice position in the anti-busing movement; unlike other issues, upwards of eighty or ninety percent of the people in this country are against busing; therefore, a few people, just a few people active in the movement, can have a tremendous impact because of the tremendous numbers of people who are against forced busing.


I became involved in the anti-busing movement in 1975, with a group in Newcastle County, Delaware, called Positive Action Committee. At its peak, this local group grew to some 12,000 members in a very small geographical area. I first became a director, then vice-president, then president of the PAC. Jim Venema, founder of PAC here in Newcastle County, Delaware, is also one of the founders of NANS and became NANS second president. He is still a NANS board member. Quite naturally, I moved into NANS with Jim and became a director in 1977. NANS was first formed in late 1976, and then I became Legislative Committee Chairman, then First Vice-President, and then in May, 1980, President of the group.

As to what attracted me to the organization, well, since it is actually a matter, as far as I am concerned, that busing be defeated nationally, I saw NANS as a means to that end in order to stop busing in my own community.


Those who are attracted to NANS believe in the American system of government. They believe in representative democracy. They believe that our way of representative government works. They have not given up on that ideal. People who belong to NANS are angry people, make no mistake about that. However, they are what you might call rationally angry. It is not fanaticism. Fanatics push for irrational policies such as forced busing.


I would say that the typical NANS member is white, middle-to-middle-middle-class; a parent, of course; at least moderately successful in making the American dream work; highly suspicious of
contemporary government and our policy making institutions, including
the media. As I said before, they believe in the American system of
government as they were taught it and as they try to live it.

HOW HAS NANS WORKED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT RHETORICAL APPEALS
HAVE BEEN USED?

NANS has not used any professional fund-raising methods up to
this point. For example, we have not used the Vigerie direct-mail-
fund-raising method or similar methods. We have depended primarily on
the pyramiding approach of members bringing in members.

When busing hits or threatens an area, we attempt to contact the
anti-busing leaders or groups in that area and then try to sell these
groups or people on the NANS method of solving the problem and thus
setting up an affiliate.

NANS is a prolific distributor of anti-busing literature. We
constantly try to make our organization known to the growing number
of other conservative groups and organizations across the nation--both
single-issue and multi-issue involvees--in hopes of finding a few anti-
busing in these groups.

Rhetorical appeals? Not so curiously, we are ridiculed for our
so-called anti-busing rhetoric by our opposition, especially the all-
knowing sanctimonious media and, of course, by liberal politicians
who, of course, try to bury us with pro-busing rhetoric of their own.

What rhetorical appeals? I would say that the media distorts the
truth on the issue. That the courts are activists and usurpers of
legislative powers and perverters of the Constitution. The pro-busing
legislators are not responding to the wishes of the majority of their
constituents and are, therefore, violating the representative process;
and school officials who back down to the pro-busing powers that be
without protest are protectors of their own hides; that forced busing
and progressive education is thwarting the upward mobility of their
children, of our children rather, and in effect is a deliberate process
of leveling down the quality of education to the lowest common denomina-
tor. It might seem that all this smacks of demagoguery; I reject that
term as a weasel-word used by the opposition as they attempt to keep
dissenting citizens in line.

WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN ATTRACTING MEMBERS, MOLDING THEM
INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT, AND KEEPING THEM INVOLVED?

The biggest problem is apathy. The feeling that nothing can be
done, that the system doesn't work. This is an American tragedy.
Secondly, that anti-busers are racist. The "Anti-Busers-Are-Racist-Syndrome" is reinforced by several decades of educator and media implanted guilt for past discriminations.

Third, the fact that people tend not to get concerned or involved until the problem is actually upon them.

Fourth, curiously, white flight. That is to say, the solution or alternative that is white flight. People vote with their feet and once they have taken that alternative for their own children, many people feel the problem as it concerns themselves is solved.

Fifth, the suspicion by many people of people like myself who are involved and who form dissenting groups such as NANS.

As concerns the molding of members into an effective work unit and keeping them involved, we ordinary citizens have a variety of interests and priorities and we are an organization of volunteers. Everyday things like our jobs, family problems and concerns, and even our recreational involvements and plans inhibit our activities. Paul Weyrich, the Director of the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, put it quite succinctly when he said that even those politicians who support our views tend to think of us as just a group of parents. Hiring an effective lobbyist in Washington and backing him with solid grassroots effort should help solve this problem.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED WITH MEMBERS--DIFFERENCES IN PHILOSOPHY, TACTICS, STRATEGIES, ETC., EMPLOYED TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS?

There really have not been that many. One problem is this. And it gets back to the suspicions of those Americans of involved people, of the so-called "Soap-Boxers," and a sort of shortest-distance-between-two-points analysis. I hold generally to the conviction that busing is a conservative vs. liberal issue. Many people are not quite ready for such candidness. Americans are extremely nice people and being vociferous can turn them off. You know the old saying about honey as opposed to vinegar; however, honey doesn't wake people up. Thus, NANS rhetoric has been known to turn people off. Another problem is that many people still cling to the supposed fairness of the judicial system which, as concerns the busing issue, is an historical absurdity. Thus, some people in NANS still think in terms of filing amicus briefs and the like, of getting courts to accept the anti-busing position, as opposed to taking legislative or political pressure routes.

HOW HAVE THESE CONFLICTS BEEN RESOLVED?

We simply, for the most part, let them learn from their own experience; that waiting for the courts to bail us out of the busing issue is a real exercise in futility, and they have so learned.
HOW DO THE LEADERS OF NANS WORK TO REDUCE THE FRUSTRATION OF ITS MEMBERS AS TO THEIR FEELINGS ABOUT FORCED BUSING? HOW DOES NANS WORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ITS MEMBERS?

We strive to show them that they are not isolated in their battles and that other communities are having the same problems. That beating busing is a step-by-step proposition, but we are making steady progress. That other communities have had success in booting-out unsympathetic elected officials or getting an official to change his tune out of fear for his political career. That other groups including those of opposite viewpoints on many issues have had success using the same tactics we are using. Also, we try to impress upon people, and this is the major thrust of NANS, that Congress can stop busing any time it wants to. That is to say, as soon as we have an anti-busing majority in the Congress of the United States, we can stop busing. Congress, under the Constitution, can stop the courts either under Article III, Section 2, of the Constitution and, of course, we can stop busing by a Constitutional amendment. Congress, of course, can stop the pro-busing advocacy of the federal bureaucracy since Congress controls the purse strings of the bureaucracy. They can certainly stop these antics.

How does NANS meet the needs of its members? We serve as their forum and we articulate their feelings or their grasping for their words; we give them a sense of organization for their concerns.

DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AUDIENCES NANS IS ATTEMPTING TO REACH.

Whenever or wherever there is a public audience, whether it be a public meeting or be it a house-to-house distribution of flyers, or an opportunity to put forth our position on a radio or television program, or to author a newspaper forum, or whatever, we attempt to reach people and we attempt to reach a receptive audience. One of the things I have been deeply involved in this vein right now is to urge political candidates in this election year to make busing and the NANS position an issue. For example, a press release is put out by a candidate opposing a pro-buser and quoting my statements against that pro-buser. In this election year, this is a highly effective method of reaching a public audience and making them aware of NANS and its activities.

WHAT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE NANS MESSAGES?

Many of us are involved in this at the affiliate level as there are affiliates who put out some great newsletters on their own. Much of the information, editorialized with an anti-busing viewpoint, of course, doesn't see the light of day or at least the proper light of day in the local and national media. Many of our people are quite adept at what you might say uncovering busing cover-ups or disputing the ludicrous pro-busing whitewash or hogwash.
Joyce Hawes, of Cleveland, was selected to write the NANS membership bulletin because of the excellent ability she demonstrated in that respect in writing bulletins for her local group, the Citizens for Neighborhood Schools, a NANS affiliate. Previous to that Kaye Cook, NANS of Columbus, wrote the bulletin and before that Jim Venema, an expert in rhetorical and informational anti-busing expression, did the job; and, of course, I have contributed heavily to the NANS bulletin contents myself. In addition, my own memoranda and news releases are distributed to NANS leaders and affiliates elsewhere.

As President, I will probably influence the tone and direction of the NANS messages more than has been done by the past president, in the last couple of years, with the accent on political action. This is what I have done in my role as NANS First Vice-President and the effect we are having in that respect is obvious.

WHO CONDUCTS RESEARCH FOR THE ARGUMENTS DEVELOPED AGAINST FORCED BUSING?

The affiliates have prime responsibility here. It is the responsibility of the affiliates to pass on to the rest of us what is happening in their communities, to document the failure of busing in any way that they can: white flight, increases in racial tension, disciplinary problems in schools, the lowering of academic standards, and so forth. So the affiliate groups have a prime responsibility here of passing the information on.

In addition, probably even more important in terms of influencing the educational community, work by such people as Lino Graglia, James Coleman, David Armor, and others are used by NANS effectively. We spread the word on these so-called respectable dissenters, if you will.

WHO DETERMINES THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL APPEALS THAT WILL BE USED?

I would have to say that the early rhetorical leaders, so to speak, were Jim Venema and myself. Others like Kaye Cook picked up on our style. Bob DePrez, of Louisville, is another original as far as anti-busing rhetoric is concerned. Jim Venema and I are fine-tuned to the rhetorical approach with PAC in Newcastle County, Delaware, getting a heck of a big kick out of the effectiveness of our words. I guess our style became a sort of role model--to use a liberal expression. I suppose you could describe our rhetorical appeals as strident tones laced with vitriol backed by the facts of the obvious and inevitable failure of busing as a national policy, all appealing to the ingrained American sense of outrage at what is actually a fascist endeavor by our government.
WHAT ARE THE RHETORICAL EXPECTATIONS PLACED UPON YOU IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER?

I suppose with my track record and the familiarity with my style by NANS leaders, they expect me to do more of the same.

WHAT KINDS OF ROLE CONFLICTS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED? HOW HAVE YOU RESOLVED THESE CONFLICTS?

In NANS, I can truthfully say that I have never experienced a role conflict.

WHAT CONFLICTS PERTAINING TO RHETORIC, TACTICS, STRATEGIES, ETC., HAVE OCCURRED AMONG NANS LEADERS? HOW WERE THEY RESOLVED?

We have had no rhetorical conflicts among NANS leaders. Style, yes; they are a group of people of different background and varying styles. Some of us have been, to put it succinctly, rather snobbish at times. However, over the years, we have come to respect each other's style, realizing that we have to reach different types of people and in order to do that we have to use different types of people in our organization. We have really developed into an organization of great respect and admiration for each other. I mean that sincerely. The adverse conditions under which we operate, that is the monolithic pro-busing establishment, binds us together. I will say matter-of-factly, some NANS leaders have had difficulty in the past in accepting as peers and compatriots people from, say, Louisville and Boston, who have been much maligned by the media. I would say that that is no longer the case. I have worked consciously, mainly during my two years as NANS First Vice-President, to eliminate this problem and as far as I can see here right now, I have succeeded.

Early on, NANS eschewed demonstrations and when I use the word demonstrations, I always refer to non-violent demonstrations. Eventually, however, we came to the conclusion and we realized that if affiliates wanted to non-violently demonstrate, and I say NANS' policy previously was against any kind of demonstration, well, then such demonstrations were purely within their prerogative.

Earlier, NANS paid a great deal of attention to court cases, a great deal of attention and effort in getting our views expressed through attorneys in court, filing amicus briefs and so forth, a great deal of wringing-of-hands about the injustice of it all, and so on. Personally, I always knew that going to court against busing was like sending a Joe DiMaggio up to the plate against a pitcher who was allowed to throw an iron baseball. The strategy now, I am pleased to say, is that we are part of the movement that is going to bring about a confrontation between our representatives in the Congress.
and the activists who serve the Judiciary and the movement is going
to hold elected officials more accountable for their actions.
I would have to say that there are no conflicts whatsoever as to the
direction of that methodology of NANS in this vein.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT?
HOW ARE YOU WORKING TO MINIMIZE THAT RESISTANCE?

Well, in general, they have always given me the impression that
they wished we would go away, speaking here of our elected officials.
Usually the resistance has been around the rationale that the courts
have spoken, that we have to correct so-called Constitutional viola-
tions or weasel words like equal educational opportunity, or that
peace must be kept in the community. The issue itself is spreading,
spreading nationally. The realization among candid observers that
busing is a failure is minimizing that resistance among elected
officials using such rationale on their part as I have described above.

The media establishment, especially the major media has been
unmoving.

Getting back to tactic conflicts in NANS, we used to do a great
deal of wheelspinning trying to crack the media. The realization
now, like the rest of the conservative movement, is that we have to
essentially be our own media, working from the grassroots up and
discrediting the establishment.

IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT?
WHO, AMONG THE ESTABLISHED STRUCTURE, ARE YOUR SUPPORTERS?

Our strongest supporters in the establishment are the conservatives
within the establishment. Others help us when it is in their interest
to do so. I am speaking here of elected officials; conservatives in
the establishment, in general, are on our side ideologically.

HOW HAVE YOU CONSCIOUSLY ADAPTED YOUR RHETORIC TO MEET THE NEEDS OF
VARIOUS AUDIENCES—IN-GROUP, MEDIA, LEGISLATORS, ETC.?

I would have to say, certainly you have to do that and, of
course, that is the beauty of the English language. You can do that.

WHAT ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC., HAS NANS ENGAGED IN TO
AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION?

First, we don't call it school desegregation. We call it forced
busing. We spread and magnified the negative effects of busing,
always on the offensive, making it embarrassing and a position of
vulnerability to be in favor of forced busing. This, given the nature of the issue itself, its failure, its affecting public policy, busing is being more candidly discussed. Its defenders are being viewed as the fanatics or the not-so-candid-perpetrators of nonsense. It might not sound very nice, but only NANS, uninhibited as we are, can bring this about. Too many other institutions, organizations, and individuals with vested interests are not capable or willing to do this. My major activity, and I cannot repeat this too often is to bring every possible elected official's stance on the issue to his constituents. The right to vote is the ultimate weapon and with the vast majority of Americans opposed to busing and thus, on our side, it is the proverbial shortest-distance-between-two-points as concerns effective public policy.

WHAT ARE NANS FUTURE GOALS? WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS WHAT WILL NANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

I am not quite sure what you mean here. Our goal is to end forced busing, forced racial balanced busing as a public policy and to return sanity to public education, to return effectiveness to public education by removing the effects of failed public policy as it involves education. I hope that within five to ten years we will have contributed a great deal toward changing the ideological and philosophical make-up of policy makers in this nation. I hope that within five-ten years we will have helped in shaping public policy. I hope that we will have helped to establish an entrenched conservative concern in the establishment in government just as the liberals have done with their ilk for decades. I see NANS as a pusher of the pendulum to move the country away from the left.

HOW HAS NANS EVOLVED AND BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED SINCE ITS INCEPTION? WHAT CONSCIOUS ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFINE THE RHETORIC?

I suppose you would have to say that we assimilate very well. Experience makes us ordinary citizens more sophisticated; a sort of geometric progression of learning how to be activists.

The rhetoric is refined as we become more knowledgeable on the issue and more knowledgeable on the nature and weaknesses of the opposition. However, I don't believe that this is a conscious refining of rhetoric. Let's just say that it is a matter of more confidence in the effectiveness of our rhetoric.

HOW DID YOU BECOME SUCH AN ARTICULATE SPOKESPERSON FOR NANS?

I always did have a way with words, I suppose, and the people in the anti-busing movement apparently liked what I said. As far as
the process by which I became a NANS leader, I suppose it was just because I was there. I suppose it was because of my willingness to hang in there.

**AS THE LEADER OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT, WHAT WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEM YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED TO DATE? HOW DID YOU SOLVE THAT PROBLEM?**

The biggest problem as always is apathy. How did I solve it? Well, I still haven't solved it. We are still looking for a solution. Unfortunately, it doesn't take as many enlightened and willing souls as we might think to have an impact.

**WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED? HOW HAVE YOU MET THESE CHALLENGES?**

I mentioned these before: apathy, a recalcitrant and hostile establishment, the sheer monolithic nature of the opposition. How have I met these challenges? Just by plugging away, always aware of the size of the undertaking and always trying not to allow myself to burn out. This is most important. Always realizing that it is a step-by-step, inch-by-inch proposition and that momentum is increasingly on our side.

Besides, I have an inspiration: I just don't like liberals.

**WHAT CHARACTERISTICS OR TALENTS DO YOU POSSESS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR SUCCESS AS A SPOKESPERSON FOR NANS?**

A belief in our system of representative government and an absolute awe of the Constitution as it was written by the Founding Fathers (I hope that is not too mushy). A deep feeling for people who are bewildered by what their government is doing to them. All this gives me a sense of purpose which I suppose others perceive and admire.

**AS A LEADER, WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE YOUR GREATEST STRENGTHS? SHORTCOMINGS?**

Candidness, I suppose, a willingness to say and do what others are less willing to say and do. A willingness to shoot from the hip. I call this going for the jugular of the opposition.

As for shortcomings, I am an absolutely terrible, terrible public speaker and charisma is not one of my personality traits or rather one of my favorable personality traits.
WHAT HAS YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH NANS TAUGHT YOU ABOUT YOURSELF, OTHER PEOPLE, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT?

As concerns myself, it has convinced me that I can have an impact.

As concerns other people, regretfully, that far too many live in a very confined segment of their own world, but that many, on the other hand, are vibrant, tough, and determined citizens.

As concerns the establishment, the realization that the establishment is a cynical, self-aggrandizing power conscious, self-righteous, and sinister monolith. It is agonizingly slow in facing up to its failures and negative impact and the harm it has had on the community.

AS AN INDIVIDUAL, WHAT ULTIMATE EFFECT WILL YOU HAVE ON SOCIETY?

Now that is some kind of question. As an individual, the best I could hope for is to be a tiny part of what you might call a ripple effect. As a leader of a group like NANS, I could add to the velocity of the ripple, thus influencing the velocity of succeeding ripples.

WHAT KINDS OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER? HOW DID YOU SOLVE THESE DILEMMAS?

I suppose that the only ethical dilemma that I have had is the knowledge that some of the people that I am trying to discredit or even destroy in terms of their careers are basically decent people despite being advocates or perpetrators of a disastrous public policy.

How do I solve this dilemma? I believe that I am involved in a serious issue and that I am on the right side of it. If I am going to have to worry about the ethical dilemma I mentioned above, I am just not going to be effective and I am going to wind up compromising myself and compromising the people who depend on me.

WHAT ROLE DOES DR. RALPH SCOTT CURRENTLY PLAY IN NANS?

Regretfully, Dr. Scott is no longer an activist in NANS. Early on, of course, Dr. Scott was an anti-busing pioneer. He helped form NANS. His symposia were invaluable in helping bring NANS into the anti-busing movement and giving people an awareness of the anti-busing movement. Dr. Scott's thrust always was to help change the thinking in the education establishment. Now, unfortunately, the people in NANS, not being educators, perhaps could not get quite as involved in this aspect as Dr. Scott might have wished.
WHY WAS DENVER SELECTED AS THE SITE FOR THE FOUNDING OF NANS?

I was not part of NANS when NANS was formed in October, 1976. I joined just a few months later. NANS, of course, was formed in the back room of the first of Dr. Scott's symposia on constructive alternatives to busing. Frank Southworth was the first NANS president and he is from Denver and some of the people involved in forming NANS, such as Scott and Southworth, were involved, I believe, in an earlier attempt to get a national anti-busing group started; so when the next attempt started, the attempt that culminated in the formation of NANS, I suppose Denver was just a logical place to start.
WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH NANS?

Nationally, I am on the Executive Committee of NANS; I am on the National Board of Directors of NANS; I serve as secretary of the national group. Locally, I formed the local chapter and was its President until February or March of this year when I moved up to the Executive Director and someone else took over as President of the local group (NANS-Columbus).

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

Nationally, my duties as secretary are fairly obvious. I take minutes of the meetings and see that they are transcribed and sent to all the members. As far as the Executive Committee goes, the Executive Committee is made up of nine people and we make policy that we suggest to the Board of Directors and the Board of Directors, in turn, dictates the policy; it either accepts or rejects the policy. So, in that aspect, I serve on both the Executive Committee and the Executive Board and they are policy-making positions.

On the local chapter as Executive Director, we haven't given that a job description yet. I am the spokesperson for NANS in Columbus. I am probably the most knowledgeable person on the anti-busing issue in Columbus. I am certainly the most experienced, being in it for four years; it is rather like an overseer kind of position. Policy-making decisions are involved in that also.

WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF NANS (DUES PAYING STRUCTURE)?

Locally, our dues are fifteen dollars a year. This gets into local and national. Our dues are fifteen dollars a year and of that fifteen dollars, five dollars is kept here, locally, and ten dollars is sent to national. If a person wanted to join the national organization the dues would be ten dollars.
The money is spent on—and these are pretty much the same thing on the local as well as the national level—expenses in general—postage, printing, telephone expenses, office supplies. In the case of national board members it pays expenses to travel to national board meetings, if we send someone to a new city to set it up, those expenses are paid for. Locally, sometimes we will pay for another person from NANS of Columbus Chapter to attend a national board meeting just to sit in on it.

IS ANY MONEY NOW GOING FOR LOBBYING OR IS THAT A SEPARATE FUND?

That is a special fund, but it is intermingled with the other monies. We are having a concentrated effort now to raise money for the lobbyist; we have to pay him a retainer per month. So far, we just hired the lobbyist back in May, we paid him his first retainer so we have been able to use the money that has been designated for the lobbyist. If we run out of money we will go into the regular treasury. The lobbying money is, as I said, intermingled with the regular treasury; we don't have a separate account for it, but it is earmarked. We know how much money there is in there for it.

HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY?

I haven't the slightest idea how many we have locally. At one time, a couple of years ago, locally, we had about 2,000. Nationally, I don't have the slightest idea because we have changed our direction.

In the beginning, when NANS was formed, there were no individual NANS chapters and our membership was derived mostly from affiliated organizations and we counted their members as our members. There was a time several years ago when I heard the figure between 350,000 and 400,000. But we have changed directions and have found that we were not being as effective as we wanted to be with that kind of membership structure, simply because we would send information to local affiliated groups and they, in turn, were supposed to send it on to their members and they didn't do it most of the time. Consequently, if we had a nation-wide petition drive or something that we needed grassroots support on, the grassroots people weren't getting the information. Then we started in the other direction as in forming local chapters and membershipwise, I have no ideas as to what it is now. We do have representation in about thirty-eight states, but I don't really know a figure.

WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH NANS? WHAT ATTRACTION YOU TO THE ORGANIZATION?

I became involved with NANS because I knew back in 1976, here in Columbus when I started hearing about the court case that the decision had not been made yet, I knew what the decision was going to be. It always has been what it turned out to be. The judge said,
"Roll the buses." I knew that it was not going to be stopped locally because I am from the South and I have seen cities being taken over by the Federal Courts in the South and so I knew that it was a completely futile effort to try and stop anything locally; and I thought that somewhere there must be a national group.

I just found out about NANS in October or November of 1976. I found out about it through a neighbor here in Columbus who had seen an ad in the Cleveland newspaper. I wrote to them and they started calling me.

What really attracted me to NANS, besides the fact that it was a national group, I was not going to join up with any national group I did not know anything about and I was not going to join up with a national group if their philosophy was not what mine was as far as a non-violent implementation goes. As luck would have it, along about April of 1977, the NANS Executive Committee at that time, which I think at that time was only about seven people, I found out they were having an Executive Committee meeting here in Columbus. They had chosen Columbus because it was a city at that time where they had no activity in and they just wanted a quiet weekend where they could do some planning and be completely away from local problems so they chose Columbus because it was a kind of crossroads from all of them coming in.

I found out about them. I could not go that weekend at all; my weekend was totally booked up. But I got in touch with Paul Langdon and told him where they were meeting; he went over and met with them and upon his recommendation that they were sane, responsible, intelligent people, I took it upon myself to join. And when I did, I started getting more calls from national and I just became involved that way.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS ATTRACTED TO NANS?

I think for pretty much the same reasons that I just gave you that I was. Sometimes local people have to be educated on the fact that this is a national problem and not a local one. But once they are educated on that fact, then they are strong NANS members.

DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL NANS MEMBER.

I think the typical NANS member is middle class; most of them have kids in school, typically. We have some that don't, but most would have kids in school. They would probably be a little bit more patriotic than somebody else might be; they would believe very hard in the work thic: you work hard, you get rewarded for it, law abiding citizens, frustrated when they first join. After they have
been a member for a while they are not frustrated any longer, but typically middle class and all the trappings that go with middle class.

HOW HAS NANS WORKED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT RHETORICAL APPEALS HAVE BEEN USED?

Sometimes it has been easy. Sometimes we have not had to work at all to attract membership in a new city. We usually try to get in that city with a letter to the editor or sometimes running a little ad in the paper. If we can just get one or two members in that city we start getting correspondence from these one or two members and we either find the leader we are looking for there or we find a contact that we can go into the new city with. Once we are there and once the threat of forced-racial balancing is there, it is not hard to attract membership at all. Keeping it is another matter. Once the buses have rolled, people tend to become apathetic.

We have not done our job if we find too much apathy because our job is to educate them that it is an on-going kind of problem and it is not the kind of problem that is going to be solved overnight. I think that here in Columbus we have done a pretty good job. We still have a much larger core membership than in some of the areas.

Attracting membership is connected to our effectiveness. I don't think a person has to be a NANS member to help us be effective. An example of what I am talking about is here in town, the Mottl amendment that came before the House floor last July 24. We had an outpouring of support for that from people who were not NANS members that did not even know—I mean not only were they not NANS members, but they were so uneducated on the political aspects of it that they were not even aware that Congressman Devine and Congressman Wiley had been solidly in their corner all along. We asked for their support and it just blossomed; it just mushroomed.

There are a lot of people who will see a newspaper clipping and sign it and send it in, or sign a petition, or go to the voting booth and vote the way they know the NANS position is without being a member. I get a lot of times from a lot of people, "Well, I'm not a joiner, but I'm with you." I have a lot of people who call up and ask what the NANS position is on a candidate, but they are not NANS members. But for every one--somebody did a survey one time or some kind of scientific study, at least I was told this--person you talk to, in reality, you are talking to five more. So in that aspect we don't need a lot of members to achieve what we are hoping to achieve.
WHAT RHETORICAL APPEALS HAVE YOU USED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? THERE WAS A TIME, IN YOUR EARLY YEARS, WHERE YOU WOULD GO DOOR TO DOOR TO HAND OUT LITERATURE.

We still do that. Just recently, right before the primaries, even though John Glenn was running unopposed in the Democratic primary, and even though Jim Betz was unopposed in the Republican primary, we put out about 10,000 flyers with John Glenn's voting record—he says one thing but votes another. Anyway, we are still going door-to-door.

As far as rhetoric and trying to attract members, in the educational process we try to tell them that it is not a local problem; it is a national one. It cannot be solved locally; it has to be solved nationally. You are just spinning your wheels if you try to do anything locally.

WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN ATTRACTING MEMBERS, MOLDING THEM INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT, AND KEEPING THEM INVOLVED?

As you said when we were talking before, it is rather like a corporation, the problem is that we do not pay them a paycheck every week. One of the things I forgot to say earlier is that nobody in NANS is paid a penny for anything, not a retainer or anything. The only person who is paid is the lobbyist and he is on a retainer.

So the problem then is to mold the organization into an effective work unit without paying them and you run into all kinds of problems. You run into people who love being appointed to committees so they can go out and say they are involved, but they don't do anything. More often, you will find people who want to head up a committee just for the sake of heading up a committee and they don't want to do anything. Then there are those who have been the thorn in my side and have made me the most skeptical of all. The crazies are easy to spot; they come across loud and clear right away and you can just weed those out, but the ones that I just cannot get over and I am most suspicious of are the ones who seem sincere and they seem like valuable people to help in the beginning and then little by little you find out it is not really the "cause" they want to help out, it is really themselves they want to help. They want to run for some kind of political office or they want their name in the paper or their face on TV. Those we have weeded out. They have gone by the wayside, too. And sometimes that weeding out process just had to be a matter of taking the bull by the horns and getting the job done. I am sure there are some people who did not renew their membership because of my straightforwardness, but that is okay. We got others in their place. And I think now we have finally gotten down to a pretty good group.
We still have a couple of minor problems with some people who feel burnt-out; some work too long. As far as keeping them involved, I was talking about being burnt out. That is probably the biggest problem as far as keeping the members, especially the board of director members. Burn-out seems to be a bigger problem on the local level than it is on the national level. I think that that is because people on the local level do not have the experience that the people on the national level do and you learn through experience. You have to go through almost a burned out stage at one time, I think, and you are lucky if it doesn't get you. We have lost some local leaders, local board members through a burn-out kind of process, but the encouraging thing locally is that we have run into a lot of new people, new faces, just since the buses have rolled this past year and we have gotten some new people on the board with some new blood and I think that is good so they seem to have replenished themselves.

**IS THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE RETAINED SO MUCH OF YOUR STRENGTH RELATED TO YOUR STRONG ORGANIZATIONAL BASE OR IS THAT HAPPENING ALL OVER THE COUNTRY?**

The answer is yes, to both parts of your question and I will explain by using areas such as Columbus as an example. In Columbus, where we had a strong base that was strongly tied in with national, we are still strong, we are still solid. The reason we changed from an affiliated group structure to chapter structures is that the chapters are going strongly and the burn-out rate is not as high and membership dro-off rate is not as high as it was in an affiliated group situation. Anytime that there is a strong local tie with national, the base remains fairly solid and in any of the chapters that we have that is the case because we see that it is from the national level.

**WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED WITH MEMBERS SUCH AS DIFFERENCES IN PHILOSOPHY, TACTICS, STRATEGIES, ETC., EMPLOYED TO ACHIEVE GOALS? HOW HAVE THESE CONFLICTS BEEN RESOLVED?**

As far as members go, there have been only minor differences in philosophies; usually a person investigates NANS before joining. By that I mean they have seen a newsletter, they have seen a brochure, something to that effect; they know a friend who belongs to NANS. And just by reading the newsletter, or reading the brochure, or knowing that their friend belongs they have heard about it and they know that we are not a violent group. They know that we are a peaceful group so there really has not been that much of a difference in philosophy on how to get things done.
As I was saying earlier, when the buses rolled here in town, I was so frustrated myself when we lost that court case at the Supreme Court level because I was in the Court when they held the hearings—the oral arguments—and I came away optimistic. I thought, "By golly! They are going to act sane for a change." I really thought we were going to get a favorable decision. So, when July 2 came around, I was just literally dumbfounded that we lost. I just couldn't believe it. I had not geared myself up for that. I thought I had but I hadn't really done it.

And so I made some threats about taking it to the streets, or saying that we may have to consider taking it to the streets. The other side's been doing that for years. We could give it a try. So I was under some pressure from people who said, "Well, now you are talking; now let's see some action... and the squeaky wheel gets the oil," and that kind of stuff. But after weighing it carefully in my mind as to what would be achieved and what could happen, I decided not to.

Because one of the things that I found was in the cities where there had been violence it has not necessarily come from the anti-busers; it had been started by the pro-busers posing as anti-busers. And the anti-busers were the ones that got blamed for it. So I did not want to take that chance. I had worked too hard to build credibility and holding a march that turned violent or even holding a march that didn't turn violent was not going to do anything except get some publicity. If it had been violent, we would have gotten tons of publicity and I didn't want to run that risk. The buses were still going to roll the next day; nothing was going to stop that. I didn't see that the benefits would outweigh what could happen. So I decided not to and that was my decision. It was not a board vote—it was just me... the Ayatollah Cook saying, "No! You aren't going to march!" And that was it. And that is how we overcame that problem. I just said, "No."

**GENERALLY, YOU ATTRACT MEMBERS WHO ALREADY KNOW WHAT YOUR GOALS ARE. DOES THAT REDUCE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS THAT MIGHT OCCUR?**

I think so. There are some conflicts with a new city starting out. We are lucky here in Columbus that we don't have a splinter group but there are some cities that have a NANS chapter in them and have a splinter group also. Generally, the splinter group will get a lot more publicity in the beginning and then they are just like a flash in the pan. They die out and the NANS chapter is still there. This was the case in Los Angeles, California. There was a group there called FORCE. I do not remember what it stood for, but they were not affiliated with NANS and there was a NANS of Southern California chapter there. for a while, FORCE was getting all the publicity because
they were doing things that commanded the media's attention. But nobody knows what happened to them now and NANS is still going strong out there.

**HOW DO THE LEADERS OF NANS WORK TO REDUCE THE FRUSTRATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS AS TO THEIR FEELINGS ABOUT FORCED BUSING/FORCED RACIAL BALANCE?**

Educating them and educating them some more. Educate them every chance we get. I think part of the NANS philosophy is that if a person is educated on what the problem is, who the other side is, who is causing the problem; if they know who the enemy is they know what to expect from the enemy; they know that they are not alone, they know that it is happening in other cities, they know that Columbus is not unique. I nearly throw-up every time I hear some establishment person say that in town. But Columbus is not unique and just by reading our newsletters, NANS members know that their city is not unique, that there are others all over this country that have a common goal, and they are not alone in fighting it and then generally we do not have a problem with the frustration.

**WHO ARE THE ENEMIES NOW?**

The same ones that have always been, except every time I look around there is somebody new. I think the main one is the NAACP because they file most of the suits. The ACLU files some of the racial balance suits. When the Mottl amendment came up for the vote on the House floor we found out just how many pro-busing outfits there were.

I knew about these before but they have never really come out so that other people could see them. The AFL-CIO took a strong position against the Mottl amendment and the funny thing is that ninety-five percent of their rank-and-file members oppose forced busing and probably ninety-five percent of their rank-and-file members don't even know they have a position that favors forced busing.

The teachers' unions took a very strong position against the Mottl amendment. President Carter and his whole bureaucratic administration is against it. But he is up for re-election. I think he has seen his four years and we will get an anti-buser in there for awhile.

Another enemy that I have had a hard time in resolving in my own mind as to how to handle. The ones I mentioned, the pro-busers, the blatant pro-busers, I can handle those. I know who they are and they do not bother me. I know what they're trying to do. I mean, they bother me, but I know how to deal with them. But the greatest enemy is the parent who says, "Well, gee, you can't fight the federal government; you might as well put the kids on the bus and forget about
it. It's not so bad; they are only gone for one hour." They are more concerned about the time the kids are on the bus. The parent who actually allows it to happen to their children without really finding out what is happening. The parent who tells me that their child is--"Well, I guess my child is doing alright. They got straight A's," but that doesn't mean they are learning, but they brought that "A" home. That parent I see almost as much an enemy as the guy who stands up and argues for the NAACP. Because they are not part of the solution and they certainly are part of the problem. They are part of the problem that is the hardest to fight because they see themselves as being solidly on our side and yet they are not; they are a real hindrance and I have a real problem with that.

IS THIS YOUR BASIC APATHY? AND A LACK OF INTEREST?

Apathy, yes. Let somebody else fight their battles. Apathy, that is it in a nut shell. Their apathy and their ignorance and they are so apathetic that they do not want to be educated. So I think they are a big problem.

WHAT ARE THE RHETORICAL EXPECTATIONS PLACED UPON YOU IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER?

People expect me to basically just tell it like it is. I never decided to be the anti-busing leader for one thing, when it was thrust upon me I decided that was what I was doing and I was not ever going to run for a political office and people kept asking me what office I was going to run for and I didn't run for any and now they know that I am not. So I don't owe anybody anything. The Republicans didn't pat me on the back and the Democrats didn't pat me on the back--nobody. As a matter of fact, they would probably like to stand as far away from me as they could. I know the Democrats would and sometimes I think the Republicans would.

So people expect me to tell it like it is and they expect it to be a little spicy because that is just me; they expect me to be truthful with them and that is one thing I have always done. Sometimes I have been in a debate situation and somebody would throw a question at me that I was not absolutely sure about the figures involved; I mean I may remember reading something two weeks ago about a situation but I cannot really get it in my mind, I guess. One of my talents is that I have the ability that I will throw it out like I know exactly what I am talking about and most of the time the person I am throwing it out at will just shut-up immediately. But I never do that unless I am absolutely positive that it is there and I can back it up. I am not going to throw something out that I do not have anything to back it up with.
So I always try to be truthful even though sometimes I have—when I couldn't, as the saying goes, dazzle them with your brilliance, you baffle them with your B.S., and I have done that sometimes, but I have always had substance behind what I was throwing out.

Basically, I just call it as I see it. I sometimes have been a little sarcastic towards the leaders in the city. I called Mayor Moody a gutless wonder. And he is. The man amazes me. I don't know how he gets elected; I voted for him again; I didn't think there was a choice. But I still think he is a gutless wonder and that amazes people to know that this little housewife would stand up there and say that. And I think that is why I have gotten away with it because I am basically—I was a housewife when I started but now I work.

**WHAT KIND OF ROLE CONFLICTS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED?** **HOW HAVE YOU RESOLVED THESE CONFLICTS?**

Some of the conflicts I have had are simply in being a wife and a mother and that conflicts with being an anti-busing leader. That has been worked out because I have had an understanding husband and children who tried to understand. Bless them. Sometimes they have been patient and sometimes they have not been patient. That summer of 1977, they were made of patience and sometimes it just wore thin. So I have had conflicts there and the way that has resolved itself is just simply timewise.

I have learned the hard way that I am not going to save the world overnight. The buses are not going to stop rolling tomorrow and so I might as well do tomorrow what I was going to do today unless it absolutely has to be done today; therefore, I give more time to the family. Also, as time went on, there were fewer things to be done, fewer pressing things to be done. So the time element has gotten better.

I have experienced another kind of role conflict. I grew up in the South and I grew up with this "Scarlett O'Hara" image. This is rather difficult to explain. Being from a middle-class Southern background, there were certain ways we were expected to think and the more liberal-thinking the more intelligent you were—supposedly. I mean, that was the way the theory went. Only the rednecks would think in a conservative kind of manner and they certainly would be the only ones who would speak it. So when I got involved in this, I saw myself as—and I described myself several times—as a liberal who was opposed to busing. I was determined that I was going to make this NANS of Columbus—oh, for lack of a better description, another TWIG organization—or something that people were just going to be clamoring to join and we were going to have all kinds of respected leaders.
Well, we did wind up with respected leaders, but not the kind that I had in mind when I first started. I lost a lot of friends who saw me as being a radical, but now that I look back, they really weren't very good friends to start out with, but anyway, they aren't there anymore.

I saw myself, as far as a role conflict goes, I was trying to be the liberal anti-buser and it didn't take me very long--by the fall of 1977--I had turned into a full-fledged conservative anti-buser who knew that I was just as smart and smarter than most liberals. I resolved that conflict by just getting to know me.

**WHAT IS YOUR DEFINITION OF A CONSERVATIVE?**

I had not thought about that. I just think now that the government is too big and the government is trying to do too much to the people. I think a conservative is one who wants less from the government and depends more on his own resources. I heard somebody say one time that in times of trouble conservatives turn to God and liberals turn to the government. I do not know that I necessarily agree with all of that, but I thought it was a pretty good stereotype.

**WHAT KINDS OF CONFLICTS HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED IN YOUR ROLE AS A PUBLIC FIGURE?**

I think that one of the reasons I was so good in that role is because I used to be a pro-buser. When I lived in the South I thought that was the thing to do. I did not have any kids then, for one thing, and I just didn't bother me at all that little kids were put on buses for an hour a day and shipped out of their neighborhoods. All I could see was the so-called moral dilemma in it and that it was time the little black children had the right to go to school with little white children; and I didn't look past that.

So, I know how the pro-buser's mind works so that when I talk to an audience that is primarily pro-busing--for example, I spoke three hours to an AFL-CIO conference, the worst three hours I ever spent in my whole life; it was terrible. I thought I was prepared for that but I wasn't. I didn't know how they felt at all. But because I did understand some of what they were trying to say, some of the questions they were asking me, were trying to get me to answer in a certain way and because I used to feel that way, I knew what they wanted me to say and I could turn it around to express what I now felt and what I knew to be the truth so I didn't experience any conflict that way.

As far as dealing with the media--I don't know that this is what you would call a role conflict. I have always, as I said earlier, just
always been me. One of the reasons, I guess, that I dealt with the media so well is because I worked for a TV station in Raleigh for a while and media types didn't scare me. I used to be one and I was never, well, once-in-a-while I did on-camera stuff, but they weren't new; it didn't bother me to have a camera pointed at me. So I just treated them when they asked me a question like I would if you or anybody else had asked me a question. I would make it a little more concise.

In talking to different audiences, I did consciously adapt rhetoric for different audiences. For instance, there was a time—several times—that if I were talking to an audience that was made up primarily of businessmen, especially suburban businessmen, I spoke to a couple of Kiwanis clubs, Rotary clubs, that sort of thing. I gave them the rhetoric about you are paying for this; you may be in the suburbs and you may not have kids who are involved right now but you are paying for it. Your taxes are paying for it. Your taxes are paying to destroy the education of these children and if you don't help us stop it here, it is going to move to the suburbs. I did that and I use that kind of stuff with older people when I was talking to them because, by golly, they are paying for it and they do have grandchildren, most of them. So I used different rhetoric to that group of people.

With the anti-busers, I just gave them the whole ball of wax about what they wanted to hear as far as the kids involved. And the thing I loved the most was debating the pro-busers from the legal aspects of it. Because they don't really have a leg to stand on except that the Supreme Court says they are right because the President keeps appointing liberal Supreme Court Justices and that is the way it is working out; but when it came down to my giving a discussion or a debate situation with a person in the NAACP, I really liked that the best because I think they are just dead wrong when it comes to the bottom-line of what busing was supposed to do in the first place which was to give black children a better chance for an educational opportunity and it has failed miserably. I love to talk to the NAACP people about that because they know it has failed. They do not have a leg to stand on and all they can come back and say now is that it is the law of the land and that can even be shot down. So, I didn't really experience any role conflicts in talking from one group to the next; I just adapted what I was saying to what I thought the audience wanted to hear.

WHAT CONFLICTS PERTAINING TO RHETORIC, TACTICS, STRATEGIES HAVE OCCURRED AMONG NANS LEADERS? HOW WERE THEY RESOLVED?

There was a time—and it seems like most new affiliates go through this—when there were some NANS leaders who thought legal action was the best step to take. We saw that happen here in town, not with NANS,
but filing amicus briefs or filing your own law suits (reference to the Hammersmith case in Columbus which demanded the right to attend the neighborhood school). . . that was ridiculous, but I had a role conflict there. I knew those people were way out in left field and we were getting nowhere and they were spending money for absolutely nothing, but I could not say that publicly. I could tell them privately; and I did, but if I said that publicly it would wind-up looking like we were splintered and weren't supporting each other and that was not a very good thing to do so I just let it go by the wayside. I knew it was going to.

But even at the national level, we had the people in Louisville, the people in Boston, that thought we ought to be a little more assertive; they thought we ought to be a little more flamboyant; they thought there ought to be more marches, more demonstrations. And the people in Boston now to this day hold an annual march. You never hear about it or read about it anymore, but they do it and I love it. I think it's beautiful that they can still get people out to do it. They hold it in South Boston and they generally have three or four hundred people every year out doing it and I think that is good. That is their thing. For a while, I guess, there was some dissention over whether or not the Louisville people should even hold marches, but I have changed my mind about that. You know, there may come a day when here in Columbus we hold a march. I don't know. We didn't, but I'm not saying we won't. But those were some of the conflicts but they have been resolved.

ARE THE KINDS OF ACTIONS THAT ARE TO BE TAKEN DISCUSSED AT THE NATIONAL BOARD MEETINGS?

Yes. As a matter of fact, there was at one time, and Bill gets into this on his tape, there was a policy where we didn't sanction marches, or demonstrations, or protests, pickets, or anything like that. And we did have a lot of pressure from some of the locals, primarily Boston and Louisville, that wanted to do that kind of thing. And there was a time in there when there was dissention back and forth about it. Do we or don't we? We did and it worked. We did and it didn't work. That sort of thing. But that problem was solved. We did take a vote about a year and a half, two years ago at a board meeting and decided that if the locals wanted to do it, it was all right. They could do it as long as it was done with discretion.

WHAT OTHER PROBLEMS HAVE BEEN ENCOUNTERED?

Not very many others than what I have mentioned. The marching was one of the major conflicts that we had at our board meetings. Also, with new people, new NANS leaders coming into the national board meeting and not understanding why national would not support them in a
lawsuit. We knew that problem was going to solve itself because after the lawsuit fell by the wayside, then they were going to see why we didn't support that lawsuit. Basically, those have been the only problems that we have encountered at the national group as far as different conflicts and differences in strategy.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT BOTH LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY?

Mainly, just the media. The local media have been very good. I think the local media--this is something I have never said in an interview before, but I think it is the truth, I think the local media--saw NANS as compared to this group, CAFB, as being the more moderate group and I think the local media consciously said, "If we get the people to follow her, she's not going to lead them in a fight in the streets. If we follow this other outfit, they might very well wind up burning the buses." I don't know if they used those words, but I think that decision was made. I really do. But that is okay because we have just done terrific because of it. They could have chosen to ignore both groups, so I should be thankful for the fact that they did not ignore NANS. So locally we haven't really had a problem.

Nationally, we have had a hell of a problem with the media establishment and I haven't the slightest idea what to do about it. We have not overcome it; it's still there. I guess unless we get down-right violent we probably are never going to get any national coverage unless there are some outbreaks of violence somewhere where there are some NANS groups and there hasn't been so far. I hope there isn't. But I did get an interview with a guy from Time magazine before the buses rolled for about an hour and when The whole thing was over, he was giving me his polite, "Well, gee, thanks for taking the time to talk." And I said, "Well, I don't really mind it. I would feel it had been more beneficial if I thought anything was going to come of it." He asked me what I meant. I said, "You're not going to print this." He asked, "Well, how do you know that?" I said, "You're not. I didn't tell you we were going to burn the buses. You didn't want to hear what I have to say." This young man said, "We look for cause and effect. It is our job to report the cause and then what the effect is." I said, "But I am telling you what the effect is; we are going to defeat these senators; we are going to defeat those congressmen on down the road." He said, "When that happens you might get some coverage."

WHAT ARE SOME OF YOUR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES? YOU WERE GOING TO TRY TO GET METZENBAUM IN THE NEXT ELECTION.

Oh! I am going to have so much fun in 1982, when that fool comes up for re-election. Right now, we are trying to let people know
of John Glenn's voting record. Realistically, John Glenn is a hero. Realistically, he is not going to be defeated; the man is going to be re-elected.

I get really frustrated because one of the things that NANS has learned nationally, and we are doing this nationally and I won't get into this. I will mention it briefly because Bill tells you about it on his tape, is coalition with other conservative groups. And we do consider ourselves to be a conservative group; that's been one of our problems, too. Some people say I am liberal and I don't like all of your conservative rhetoric. But the bottom line is the people who vote our way in Congress the most consistently are conservative congressmen and conservative senators and so I embrace them.

I am disappointed that we have contacted some special interest conservative groups here about trying to form a coalition to defeat John Glenn and we have been told he is going to be re-elected and people don't want to lose their credibility by trying to defeat him. I wouldn't be in the anti-busing movement if I had that kind of attitude. I have to do what I think has to be done. If it doesn't work, even if I know it's not going to work, that's okay, but there is a chance he won't be elected by as large a majority as he might think. But we might get a landslide; I don't know. But at least if we do what we feel we have to, if we put out the information on him, then I don't have to sit in my house on election night, watch that idiot get re-elected and say, "If only I had done so-and-so." I can feel good.

We are really lucky here in the central Ohio area with Congressman Devine and Congressman Wiley. Both have excellent anti-busing records and politically we will be trying to help them get re-elected because they are on our side. We tend to take people on our side for granted, but yet, there are people out to get them; they do have opponents so I wrote to Sam Devine just last week and told him I would be glad to help in his campaign in any way I could.

Now, when 1982 comes along and Howard Metzenbaum is up for re-election. He is so unpopular. I really mean this sincerely. I am not trying to be funny. Of all the people I have talked to, I have only met one person who told me that they voted for Howard Metzenbaum. Of all the people I have talked to nobody says, "Yes, I voted for him." They either don't say anything--I voted for John Glenn. I wouldn't do it again, but I didn't know that much about politics at the time. But I thought that he was an astronaut so he can't be all bad. I read about him in the history books and I just pushed that little lever and that is what most of the voters will do again this time--but I don't know anybody, but one person, that voted for Howard Metzenbaum.
And my circle of friends is rather limited in the context of his voting record, but I think he is a very unpopular man and I think that his rhetoric—he's got his own style of rhetoric as far as—the one guy who told me he voted for him last time said that he fell for his line about the oil companies. But nothing has happened and he's been there four years and it is just going from bad to worse. So he's got his own rhetorical problem that he's dealing with. I firmly believe that the AFL-CIO put him in office. They convinced their rank-and-file members that he was the good guy, that he was going to save everybody from the big bad oil companies; and he's voted pro-union all the way; he's voted pro-busing all the way.

But there is a movement in this country towards the conservative side and away from big government and boy! he is a flaming liberal! He is one of the worst senators. You mention Howard Metzenbaum outside the state of Ohio and everybody knows who he is and he is not very popular outside the state of Ohio. And so I think he is going to be fun to get rid of. And I think it is entirely possible and very likely that he will be defeated. The Republicans are gearing up for him now. And the Republicans didn't really want to put up anyone against John Glenn because he was so popular. Jim Betz says he is not a sacrificial lamb but I think he might be their token. But I think there is going to be a good candidate against Howard Metzenbaum and I think he is going to be fun to defeat.

IS ASH BROOK STILL PLANNING TO RUN FOR SENATOR IN 1982?

Yes, he says he is. I think he'll have a primary fight, but I will support him.

YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED SOME RESISTANCE FROM THE POLITICAL ESTABLISHMENT. WHO SUPPORTS YOU NATIONALLY?

Nationally we have some good guys on our side. We are working in certain states with a conservative coalition to get rid of some of those senators such as Church in Idaho or Iowa. He's been targeted and our people there are working with a guy named Simms. I think he's a congressman now.

In the House—we keep moving towards that majority in the House, but it's not there yet. But our biggest problem is in the Senate. But we have got a lot of congressmen and senators that do support our position and we get more all the time.

HOW MUCH INFLUENCE DID NANS HAVE IN GETTING THE ANTI-BUSING PLANK AS PART OF THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM?

A lot. We were instrumental in getting what little they put in in 1976. They did have a little plank in there; it wasn't as strong
as this one. Different NANS leaders are active in local politics in Wilmington, Delaware—well, in the whole state of Delaware. Jim Venema headed up Reagan's statewide committee there. We had quite a few NANS members who were delegates at the convention and this was the conservatives' year in the Republican Party.

Bill gets into it even more on his tape about the issue being an issue of conservative vs. liberal; and it is. I didn't think that in the beginning, but that is one of the things I changed my mind on.

In Reagan's acceptance speech, he said something about neighborhoods. I watched NBC and one of the anchormen there was asking a political analyst, Theodore White, about Reagan's speech. And Theodore White, who wrote The Making of the President, said, "When Reagan talks about getting back to neighborhoods he is clearly talking about the disastrous policy of forced busing that has been a failure everywhere it was implemented." I was so glad to hear that. I wished we would have heard it from some of the speakers, but he said it and that was what Reagan was talking about. And as long as the platform is there and they work towards the platform, I feel very comfortable about it. I would feel very comfortable about Reagan as President just because so many policies are set by bureaucrats that we never elect and he would have conservatives in those positions.

YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AN AFFILIATION WITH THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS? IT IS DEFINITELY THERE AND IT HAS GROWN MUCH STRONGER OVER THE YEARS.

Oh, yes. Bill D'Onofrio, and he will tell you this, too—Bill was a State Director for the Conservative Caucus in the state of Delaware. And I may not embrace every one of the conservative issues—one is the Fundamentalist Christian movement—I do not embrace some of their philosophies, but I do embrace the people they are pushing for office and to that end I will work to help those get elected. I have a question in my mind about abortion. I don't consider myself anti-abortion, I don't consider myself pro-abortion either. But those people want the same kinds of people in Congress that we do so we are just learning to play the game the liberals have been playing for a long time and that is joining together.

IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT? WHO ARE THEY?

I think I answered that when I was talking about the anti-busing congressmen, senators; they may be the only establishment that has helped us.

Locally, back in late 1976, and early 1977, somebody kept sending me minutes of the Chamber of Commerce meetings where they voted from
the Columbus Fund to give money to the MCSC to where they had their meeting back in early 1976 to form MCSC. I would say that somebody in the establishment sent it, but I don't know who did.

More recently, the Republican Party has been reasonably helpful to us here in town and nationally; we have already discussed that. The Republican Party here sponsored a task force to find out about judicial tyranny and whether or not the Federal Courts were going too much. And they brought Raoul Berger and a couple of other Constitutional experts and they held hearings on that. They then submitted their findings to the Republican National Committee. We were informed of what they were doing and we had really asked them to do this. Now we are asking other state Republican Parties to do the same kind of thing.

As far as individuals go, John Kasich, a state Senator, has been extremely helpful to us, but then he's always been a good guy. We helped him get in and he's been helping us. Some of the others I mentioned--the speakers at the convention--are on our side.

YOU HAVE HAD A GREAT DEAL OF INFLUENCE ON MOTTL. HOW DID THAT COME ABOUT? HAS HE ALWAYS BEEN AN ANTI-BUSER OR DID HE GET THAT WAY AFTER CLEVELAND?

I really don't know the answer to that question, Joyce. I believe that Mottl has always been an anti-buser because it is my understanding that he introduced that first, he was active in introducing the amendment in 1975. There was an amendment introduced in 1975 and I think it was his. His voting record is liberal on most other issues except for busing. And strangely enough, he is from the Cleveland area, but his district is in Parma. No, I would say he is not one who had to be turned around. To the best of my knowledge, they did turn around Vanick, from the Cleveland area. Charles Vanick is ultra-liberal, rather like Metzenbaum. Only he did sign the Discharge Petition for the Mottl amendment to come out of the committee and then he did vote for it. He is a lame duck right now; he is not running again. I would not consider him as being a friend; they just turned him around.

I don't feel too safe with somebody that you have to turn around. If, all of a sudden, John Glenn would come out and turn into a confirmed anti-buser, or Howard Metzenbaum--the sky would fall if he did. But I would not trust John Glenn. I would be grateful for his votes, but I would think that he was just after my vote and then he was going to go back to doing what he did before. I would not trust him.
WHAT MAJOR ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC., HAS NANS ENGAGED IN TO AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION? MOST OF THIS WE HAVE COVERED. DISCUSS THE LOBBYIST BECAUSE THAT IS RECENT.

Our lobbyist's name is Warren Richardson and he is with the firm of Richardson, Randall, and Associates. I understand that Newsweek or U.S. News and World Report, one of the news magazines did a survey of the ten most effective lobbyists in Washington and his firm ranked in the top ten. I don't know in which place it ranked, but it was up there.

And I am really impressed with this guy. I had an image of some cigar-chomping, back-road bull shitter who was wheeling-and-dealing. This guy is not like that at all. He is tall and very nice looking, but he is soft-spoken in a very assertive way. He gets his point across; I think he would handle arguments very well. I was just really impressed with him. I think he knows the issue for one thing; and I think he believes in the issue and that really turned me on. That we were not paying somebody to lobby for us who did not really agree with what we were doing. We had checked him out anyway. He was on Capitol Hill lobbying somebody several weeks ago and he related this to Bill D'Onofrio, that somebody, a congressman, had sent for him and said that he was surprised to find a lobbyist on behalf of the anti-busing movement in Washington because there had never been one there before. I think a lot more senators and congressmen are going to be surprised.

What he is going to be pushing now and what we are pushing right now is John Ashbrook's bill in the House; it is House Resolution 1180; it is not a constitutional amendment, but it would remove the jurisdiction of the courts over the schools and since Congress can make the laws then it would be constitutional for them to do that. The courts would probably say it was unconstitutional on down the road, but this being an election year, we want to get a push on this and we would hope to have a vote on it before November.

IS THERE TALK OF ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT COMING UP?

Yes. That is the ultimate. That's the only way it is going to be stopped.

WHOSE DECISION WAS IT TO GET A LOBBYIST? DID THAT COME THROUGH THE BOARD?

Yes. We had been playing with that idea for about two years. There was a time when we started with a big campaign to raise what we were calling "seed money" and we were going to have a guy named Richard Viguerie out of Falls Church, Virginia, do a sample mailing. The whole effort was to raise money. The money just did not come in the way
we expected it to. Direct mail solicitation is extremely expensive. So we kept spinning our wheels and really getting nowhere and every time we would have a board meeting we would say, "Why don't we take this money and just dive right in and hire a lobbyist?" Others would disagree because we told these people when they gave the money that it was going to be used to raise funds. Finally, this year, early this year, we just decided that we've got to do something; this is an election year. We've got this money setting there and more is coming in and if we don't do it now we never will. So, that is when we took the board vote; we did it by mail.

WHAT ARE NANS' FUTURE GOALS? WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS, WHAT WILL NANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

I would love to say that we will stop the buses from rolling by then, but I don't know; it could be done in five to ten years. Realistically, I think it might take ten to fifteen years to stop it. It might be sooner than that.

ANY OTHER FUTURE GOALS--LEGISLATION?

We will support any bill that is in Congress that will help us in any way. Part of my rhetoric is to say that any piece of legislative pebble we throw in front of the buses slows them down. The constitutional amendment is the boulder we are going to throw out there and there is no way they can get around it. So, yes, we will support different pieces of legislation, but only from a slowing-down kind of process.

HOW HAS NANS EVOLVED AND BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED SINCE ITS INCEPTION?

By becoming a lot more realistic about things. Getting a lobbyist is a sophisticated sort of thing. By joining in the conservative coalitions that I mentioned earlier. By becoming basically realistic about the media. We could probably conquer the media. We could probably wind up with media coverage if we had the money, the time, and the person to go after that media coverage. But we don't have it and we don't have the money to hire anybody. Jim Venema came close to it, but he ran out of time. He started feeling burned-out and he had other things to do. Jim is still involved but he will not jump back in it the way he was. I think we have become more sophisticated all the way around.

I think the leaders themselves have become more sophisticated and therefore the organization has become more sophisticated. I think you learn by your mistakes. I think if you don't you had better get some new leaders in there. I would not come out with the same kind of rhetoric now. . . well, some of it I would, but I know more now than I did four years ago, so I wouldn't resort to some of the rhetoric I was giving out then as compared to what I would do now.
DO YOU THINK THAT HAS BEEN THE CASE ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL WITH THE LEADERSHIP? JOYCE DEHAVEN WAS PRESIDENT FOR AWHILE. I HAVE NEVER MET JEAN OR READ ANYTHING OF HERS.

Jean was kind of an interlude in NANS and Jean was burned-out when she took the job and really shouldn't have agreed to take it. Jim Venema, when he resigned and Joyce was interim president, Joyce's rhetoric was like Jim's or like mine. She is extremely knowledgeable. Joyce has a head for figures. Where sometimes I get really screwed-up when trying to think of a percentage or a figure. Joyce is really good with doing that.

Jean had been through the war like the rest of us, but had been through it even more so because she was on the school board and Jean is kind of a system-oriented person. I think Jean had a personal conflict in that and this may be interesting. I don't know that she would mention this, but I wouldn't mind mentioning it to her. For the most part, the Republican Party has the most anti-busing--well, the Republican Party does have the most anti-busers, yet Jean is a Democrat and has run for office on a Democratic ticket before. She might have a role conflict there. I don't know. I have never been one to really push one party over the other because Mottl is a Democrat. The most conservative guy in Congress is a Democrat; he's from Georgia. There are exceptions. But that might be a conflict for Jean.

We have just become more sophisticated by learning from our own experience.

HOW DID YOU BECOME SUCH AN ARTICULATE SPOKESPERSON FOR NANS?

I started out being articulate. I think my style of saying things, as I was saying earlier, telling it like it is and throwing in a little bit of spice here and there. I have always been kind of a rebel. For the same reason I would never work for a large company because I couldn't stand to sit at a little desk all day long and punch my time card. Being told that this is your job description so don't go out of the bounds of it. I think I have always been articulate. I was on the debating teams in high school and college. It just came. I have always been rather sharp-tongued. I didn't have to develop that.

AS THE LEADER OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT, WHAT WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEM YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED TO DATE?

Facing the buses rolling. That was the worst problem. And getting through it and getting over the burn-out feeling.
I thought I was geared-up for it. I really thought I was. I knew they were going to roll. I had been telling everybody in town they were. I geared myself up. My kids were in private school. They weren't on the buses. I had TV cameras follow me to work that morning but when I was going down Sharon Woods Boulevard and I saw these kids waiting on the buses—this is the very first day and those parents who had sent those kids out to get on those buses didn't know if there was some idiot that was going to bomb the buses; they had no idea what was going to happen the first day. I even drove my own children to school rather than have them ride their private school bus because I didn't have any idea—I couldn't imagine these parents sending these kids out to get on these buses knowing what I knew had happened in other cities. Thank God, it didn't happen here. But we didn't know that then.

But the point I'm trying to make is that when I rode down there and I saw those little kids—and the parents weren't even out there with them, once in a while you would see a parent here or a parent there, but for the most part, the kids were just there. I thought, "Jesus Christ, I have busted my tail for four years and these idiots are sending their kids on the buses and they have no idea what is going to happen! Why am I doing this? My kids aren't involved. So why am I doing this?" I really felt like that for quite a while.

I had a helluva time getting through the day at work—getting through the whole week. That was Thursday; they rolled on Thursday and then again on Friday. And I cried. I was cried out by the following Monday morning. It really surprised me that I would react that way, but I did. And then I started feeling like, "Why am I doing this? Why? Nobody appreciates it. It isn't going to get anywhere. The buses are rolling." I just felt hopeless. I felt frustrated and I started feeling apathy. And it was just a burn-out syndrome. When I figured that out—and the national guys like Bill D'Onofrio and Jim Venema were the biggest help. They had already been through it. Jim had been through his own burn-out kind of thing. Bill has never felt it. Bill has been able to pace himself so that he has not experienced it. But he really helped me through the biggest hurdle and when I finally realized what it was, that it was a natural kind of feeling, I just rode with it for a while. I didn't bother to read anything; I didn't want to hear it.

People would call me to tell me about what awful things had happened to their kids in school and I found myself saying, "Why are you letting this happen to them? Don't tell me about it. You are the ones who are letting this happen!" I really made some people irate during that period. But that is the truth and that is the way I felt
about it. And I just took that laid-back kind of attitude. I finally began to gear-up again when spring started coming around. And I jumped back in, not with both feet this time. With both feet, yes, but I kind of floated along.

WHEN DID YOU GIVE UP THE PRESIDENCY?

In February or March.

DO YOU THINK THAT IS GOING TO AFFECT NANS LOCALLY?

If I can help it, it won't. Marilyn Redden and I are two different people; she is the new president. I have been begging Marilyn for a year to take over the local presidency so I really handpicked her. She is different from me. I didn't realize how system-oriented she was until she took over NANS and I will not sit by and watch NANS of Columbus turned into a PTA outfit. She is learning that you can't run it like a PTA outfit, but her background is PTA and school board. From that aspect, she has got the connections. She's got the background to get and find her way around things. She is finding out that it isn't doing her a lot of good, though. She isn't very good at rhetoric. I am finding that out.

She uses the terms segregation vs. desegregation vs. integration. I never use any of those; NANS leadership doesn't use any of those. She has to be trained. She has got to be cultivated, but I think it is going to work out and I am not going to let the direction change. I will see that we get a new president before I will let it be destroyed or turned into something that I think would destroy it.

Marilyn has a lot of organizational skills that I lack. She has got a lot more patience than I have to organize. I cannot stand dealing with the nitty-gritty things in an organization that have to be dealt with. Like, how are we going to word this membership application? Do we call it a membership application or do we call it a membership form? How do we word this? And I just want to say, "Who cares?" I don't like that kind of stuff, but Marilyn was the patience to deal with that.

AS A LEADER, WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE YOUR GREATEST STRENGTHS AND YOUR SHORTCOMINGS?

I am articulate. I am intelligent, I think. I am gutsy. I don't get intimated very easily and for this job I guess that's the best way. One of the idiots at the AFL-CIO thing called me an egotist. They were not being very complimentary and I told them that it was true that you have to have a strong ego in this job; you have to have a healthy ego to go and spend three hours listening to what they were
saying. So I told them I wasn't concerned about my ego. There are times I worry about turning into a masochist; I sometimes wonder about that.

As far as my shortcomings. I am not very patient. I have learned patience. In four years I have learned a lot of patience. I have learned tolerance, but that is still a shortcoming. I am short on patience and short on tolerance. Even though I have more now than I did four years ago, I still don't have enough. Also, I can't stand the nitty-gritty organizing. I know it has to be done, but I don't like to do that.

I also project a good image to the media. As I said earlier, the camera doesn't scare me; it doesn't intimidate me. I know how to use it, but that is because I learned that in the past.

WHAT HAS YOUR INVOLVEMENT TAUGHT YOU ABOUT YOURSELF, OTHER PEOPLE, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT?

That I really can make a difference. I really can do something when I set my mind to it. For many years, since my kids were little, I had never been that actively involved in anything; I learned that I can. Some of this stuff that I am saying now came easily, such as talking to the media or writing the national bulletin or writing an article for the Focus page. Yes, it came easily, but I didn't even know I could do it before. If someone had said, "I can see you doing this--writing an article or even writing a letter to the editor," I probably would have said, "What?" If they had dared me to then I probably would have done it. But I have learned that I can do things and that I had skills that I didn't know I had and they help me in my job now. I am now writing a company newsletter; it is not quite as biting as NANS, I have to tone down my style. I have found out that I can be tolerant when I have to be and patient when I have to be.

It has taught me to be tolerant with other people. I keep saying that, but it's so true. I have learned; I have changed friends. I don't have that many friends left. The friends I have now are probably friends I would never have looked at before. I have friends from--this sounds so trite, but it's true--all different walks of life or all different social standings; whereas, before I only had one little group; they were molded into the neighborhood people or the people I knew at church; but they were all middle-class-white-collar-wives-didn't-work-the husbands do--kind of people. You raise your kids, you coffee klatch in the morning; that kind of stuff. And now, you name them and I have probably met them and probably liked them. My friends have become very diversified and I have learned to like that. I have learned to respect other people's way of life--life style--even though it is different from mine. I have come to put a priority on the right kind of things that I didn't have priorities on before.
What has it taught me about the establishment? That you cannot trust it. That you cannot trust it at all; that it's going to screw you. "It" is the stereotypical establishment. The school system. Dr. Joe Davis is a nice guy, but he is the establishment. We used to sit down, before the buses rolled, I wasted more time sitting down at that Columbus Board of Education in monthly meetings going over what NANS wanted done when the buses rolled. Well, the bottom line was that we didn't want them rolling at all so we were wasting their time sitting down there talking about what we wanted done. We wanted monitors here; we wanted this there; and, finally, I wised up and said, "Hey! Forget it. You know there is no reason to come down here every Wednesday morning from nine to twelve. I am wasting my time. You are wasting your time." But the establishment said, "Yes, I think we can work that out." Knowing full well that the buses were going to roll. They might not have liked it either, but they were not going to tell us that. They were going to make that the best little implementation they could. That is the establishment and I don't trust them. And when they come out and say, "This is working so well," they are lying through their teeth. I know they are lying. I have got proof they are lying from parents who tell me that they are lying, but they need federal money so they get it.

The state is the same way. They want federal money to come in here so they have to tell everybody how great busing is and how terrific we are making it work. "Columbus, we are making it great!" You know that.

Cleveland is a whole other problem. I think their biggest problem--and you know I've said that all federal judges are lunatics and I think they are, but that is rhetoric. I have heard from people who sit in his courtroom and they think he isn't playing with a full deck. I think Duncan probably thinks he is doing the right thing. I think most pro-busers think they are doing the right thing. Except the ones who push it from the very beginning and they know they are hurting these kids.

Gary Holland, the new guy on the school board, has got all this uproar going on now about the discipline and the blacks being abused and they are. But Bill Moss has been sitting down there saying all this kind of stuff was going to happen for however many years he's been on the school board--two or three. Gary Holland was saying, "Hey! This is great! If whites are against it, they are automatically racist." They have their own kind of rhetoric. But that is what Bill was saying and now they are saying, "Hey! They are hurting our kids here!" I feel like writing a letter to the editor saying, "Hey! people told you if you started a fire the house was going to burn down. Now you are asking, 'Huh? What? Who said that?' Did somebody say the fire would really burn the house down?' And now you are asking, 'Why?.'"
But anyway, I think Duncan thinks he is doing the right thing. The one thing that he has done that I at least respect him for is leaving his kid in the public schools. A lot of judges pulled them out. He may pull her out later on. . . But Battisti, I don't think he is really sane. I don't, based on what I've heard. But he can just be a very stubborn man. Garrity, in Boston, did the same thing. But it's not necessarily what Battisti has done that I don't think he's sane, it's in talking to various people who have been in the courtroom up there. I understand that he loses his train of thought and that he doesn't really seem to be in control of the courtroom. They are all a little looney.

AS AN INDIVIDUAL, WHAT ULTIMATE EFFECT WILL YOU HAVE UPON THE SOCIETY?

I don't know about society, but I hope I have an effect on my kids. I hope that they--I hope that I am teaching them that you can fight for what you believe in without having a quick victory. That it is a victory just to fight for what you believe in and to do it the way it ought to be done.

WHAT KIND OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED?

I'm not sure that I have encountered any. I found it interesting when I was listening to Bill's tape and how he responded to that question. He said that he felt like sometimes the people he was trying to destroy were very nice people; he just happened to think they were wrong. I don't think of it like that, but then I don't think of trying to destroy the person. I just think of trying to destroy what they say.

One of the things I have been able to do with pro-busers is to be friendly with them before the debate and after the debate is over, but go for the jugular during the debate and then just divorce the two after that time is over. I never really had an ethical problem.

We talked earlier about the kinds of messages you might present to a group knowing that they might not be entirely accurate, but I never considered that to be an ethical problem. If the situation called for it, I would throw it out like I knew what I was talking about because I knew that if anyone called me on it, I could just say, "Hey! I just said it a little differently. It says right here so-and-so-and." But I would never have the guts to throw out a blatant lie. A blatant fact that I knew was a bold-faced lie that I was just making up because with my luck, I would get caught and that would damage my credibility and NANS' credibility and I would not do that. I don't lie very well. I just seem to go bleah. . . and the whole thing just falls apart. And I cannot do it and I would never do that. I wouldn't do that to NANS either. Because I would get caught.
I HAVE SEEN YOU ON THE FOCUS PAGE. DO YOU WRITE THAT YOURSELF?

No, I take a lot of it out...well, sometimes, depending on what it is. If I like the way Bill D'Onofrio or Jim Venema has written something, expressing a thought, I might take a paragraph here or there out of it. A lot of it is all mine....

Who develops the arguments? The arguments usually come from the pro-busers. They throw out something that we have to refute and so the arguments come from there.

WHO WRITES THE REFUTATION?

Just whoever happens to be the one in the "hotseat" at that time, so to speak. If you are talking about style and who developed the rhetoric, Bill gets into that and that was what I was saying earlier when I joined NANS and when I really got involved which was right after I joined. Jim Venema was President then and he was my "Guru," so to speak. Jim was classic. Jim all the way. He did all that and Bill just did--I can tell now who wrote what, but in the beginning I couldn't tell their writing apart. Bill's has longer words than Jim's but they are both hard-hitting. Bill's is hit-'em-between-the-eyes-intellectually and Jim's is more gutsy. Their rhetoric is pretty much the same; their phrases are the same.

I guess I was just caustic enough in my basic make-up that they appealed to me. That doesn't appeal to everybody. It has turned some people off. And there have been times I would just laugh after reading something that Jim Venema wrote. He would call to see what I thought of it and I would say, "Jim, have you ever tried tickling them under the arms to get their attention before you hit them over the head and knocked them out cold and then they don't know what you're saying?" He says, "No, you get their attention right away." I think I differed with him on certain kinds of things; he has cracked me up on some of the things he has written. But my style--and you can probably tell from the newsletter--it was hard-hitting, but it was me. It was not quite as hard as Jim's. I don't think Joyce's is quite as hard as mine. So we just do it ourselves.

COULD YOU EXPLAIN THE INITIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NANS?

From what I understand, at one time, Frank Southworth and Scott had been involved in trying to form a national anti-busing group. NANS is not the first attempt to form a national anti-busing group. We have made it; we are still alive. The others lasted about six months--I don't think any of them survived a year. There were a couple in the South that I was not aware of until I joined NANS, but some of the board members in NANS do come from some of these former attempts to do that. Frank was one of those who had attempted to form a national group.
Frank Southworth is from Denver; he was the first NANS president. He owns his own real estate company in Denver. I think he is probably quite well-to-do out there. He used to be in the state legislature.

Jim Venema ended up doing most of the work because Frank didn't have a whole lot of time; Frank finally resigned and Jim took up the ball.

WHAT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED? LOCAL CHALLENGES?

The challenges I have met have been at the local level. I have to relate what I was saying earlier about molding an effective unit when there was resistance to what NANS was saying. Different people at different times know that different things ought to be done. Sometimes they thought there ought to be more overt kinds of action. I solved the problem because I am just strong-headed enough--sometimes I can be downright stubborn--but I depended upon a lot of strength from national in ways to deal with these kinds of problems from people who had already dealt with them. I found that the most effective way was that if it could be ignored, then ignore it because the chances were great that it would go away. If it couldn't be ignored and it was on the verge or it had the possibility of hurting the NANS' credibility then I had to deal with it straightforwardly.

HOW IS THE PROBLEM OF "BURN-OUT" HANDLED?

Jim Venema experienced burn-out. After he resigned as president he immediately began his senate campaign; so he went from one direction to another--still busy all the time. After the senatorial campaign was when I noticed it, but he was fortunate enough to recognize it and to deal with it himself.

At the national level there have not been that many people who have gotten totally burned-out, but I don't think anyone is immune to it. Bill may be immune to it simply because he might be smarter than the rest of us and he knows how to pace himself.

Some people on the local level have also experienced burn-out. Some still help where they can.

HAVE THE LEADERSHIP STYLES CHANGED WITH THE MOVEMENT?

I think with different leaders you obviously have different kinds of leadership styles. When Jean Ruffra was president, I did most of her work here; I wrote her letters.
WHAT PERIOD OF TIME WOULD THIS HAVE BEEN? I THINK I'VE MISSED HER AS A PRESIDENT.

Everybody missed her as president. That is why she is no longer with us. That is why she's not president any more. Jean's just that kind of person. She was president from the fall of 1978, through the spring of 1979. But I took over and really did most of the work. I was not willing to take the presidency and I am still not willing to take the presidency. I gave it up here and I am not about to do it at the national level. I could have done it. I could do it now if I wanted to, but I am just not willing to after I have gone through that burn-out kind of feeling, and have got my feet back in; I am going along at my own pace. I am not going to jump back into that.

WHAT IS YOUR RHETORICAL VISION FOR NANS?

I saw us as sweeping the constitutional amendment through real easy. Real easy. And I believe that if we ever did get it past the House and the Senate we would not have trouble ratifying it the way ERA has. I think it would pass the states fairly well. It would sweep through the Southern states. Except in the strong industrial states of the North, I think it would go through without a hitch. I used to dream about that a lot.

I see a school system where kids really can learn basic education which is reading, writing, and arithmetic, and understanding the English language and not being confused by the teaching of moralistic values. That is where my conservatism comes out. I don't think it is the school's role to do that but I would like to see them salute the flag and have a moment of silent meditation.

When I was in grammar school I can remember that we had prayers and we didn't have any of this moralistic preaching from the teachers or values clarification. They have all these fancy names now and I have a real dilemma with a lot of the black kids who were supposed to go to the nice white outer-city neighborhood and be motivated to work towards that goal and every piece of evidence shows that it is not doing that. These kids are having a lower self-esteem; they are only there for six hours a day and they go back to where they live. They are being reinforced with the values at home of either working towards that or giving it up because they will never get it. The bottom line of where the problem is going to be solved is in the home, not in the outer-city school area. It doesn't have anything to do with it. And every piece of evidence that even black social scientists are coming up with is that it is lowering the black child's self-esteem and that is what it was supposed to raise, using Kenneth Clark's old doll study in pre-1954.
Evidence indicates that it is simpler to educate a black child in a black environment; it is more beneficial to have the black teacher who understands the black child's specific needs. There is a lady in Chicago, Marva Collins, who is a black former Chicago public school teacher and who started her own school. They had her on Sixty Minutes and her students were talking about how they liked to read Canterbury Tales; they liked to read the classics. My kids don't read that; I would love for my kids to be in her class, to have a teacher who would motivate them like that. I think it's fantastic. But these are inner-city kids and it can be done there. And if it can be done in one place it can be done everywhere and these are not special kids. The only thing that makes these kids special is that their parents chose to put them there and that makes the difference.

But I really believe that it is a simple solution, even if parents don't have the education behind them to know how to motivate the kids. Even if they don't really want to motivate the kids. I think that in the proper environment, the kids can be motivated. There we are getting into the school vs. the parent's responsibility again. There are some parents who just won't accept their responsibility, period. They don't want to be parents; they don't want to be bothered by it. The main responsibility of the school is to educate that child to try and love and understand him for the six hours that he is there, to try to teach him how to live within his own environment, how to survive within that and instill in him a motivation to get out of it as soon as he can. That doesn't mean run away at twelve years old; that means to get an education. Too many times we are not saying this.

DOES THIS ALSO APPLY TO THE WHITE CHILD? DO YOU THINK THE WHITE CHILD CAN BEST BE EDUCATED IN HIS OWN ENVIRONMENT?

Yes, I think so. I don't think it is as big a problem for the white child to be educated by a black teacher. I don't think the white child faces the same kind of problems with a black teacher as a black child faces with a white teacher educating him or her. My oldest son had a black reading teacher when he was still in the public schools and she was excellent; I wish they had more like her.
WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH NANS?

I'm the first vice-president.

NATIONALLY?

Right.

WHAT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ARE YOU AFFILIATED WITH?

I'm chairman of the National Organization to Preserve and Restore Freedom. I'm editor and publisher of the National Associated Press of Freedom. I've just become a member of the Moral Majority; I'm involved in veteran activities, Am. Vets Post. 61. I get involved with a lot of issues, as far as issues like Christian schools, I've been heavily involved in to balance it down, forced housing, different things like this....

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH NANS

That's a pretty hard job to do. Number one, I run the Statistical and Information Center for NANS which comprises several things from cataloging and supplying documentation on different segments of the busing issue as far as social science evidence, statistical data on everything from white flight to school violence.

We more or less maintain the communications for the organization. In other words, any affiliate organization or any member of the board is allowed to communicate directly with any other affiliate organization or group of the board. But if they want to, they can send in all their material to the information center and we correlate all the material that comes in and re-distribute it among all the affiliates and officers in the NANS organization. This way saves a lot of time, a lot of problems, and keeps a constant flow of communication between the organizations, leaders, and affiliates.

DESCRIBE THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF NANS BOTH LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY.

The best way to describe it is a president's office in New Castle County, Delaware, and the Statistical and Information Center here in
Louisville. We've got another information center of a different nature in Dallas, Texas.

We have a membership bulletin that goes out every so often. This goes to every member of NANS. That is done in Cleveland, Ohio's chapter. And then we have membership in Columbus, Ohio.

The difference in the things are that we mainly take care of mailing affiliate organizations and the leaders in the NANS movement, plus other interested social scientists who have lent a hand as far as supplying information and data to us. Where, on the other hand, is general membership mailing. If we tried to send everything we send out to leaders the postal bills would be several thousand dollars a week; so it's quite impossible to do it that way. What we depend on is each organization leader, when he receives his material and holds his weekly or bi-weekly meetings, that he will disseminate the information we are sending him to the members of the organization.

Locally, what is your structure?

Locally, we participate in a lot of activities that many organizations do. Thursday night we were at the Moral Majority banquet. This weekend we have an affair in Jaytown, Kentucky, where we've got a booth set up. In other words, school board meetings, working with academicians.

Two of the guests I had at the Moral Majority banquet were black ministers from Louisville who were very interested in private Christian education. And they've asked our assistance on statistical data as far as private education for minority children goes, and we've furnished them with a flock of information.

I just talked to Professor Peevy, who is professor of education at the University of Louisville, last night and asked him if he would be agreeable to assist me in assisting them. He assured me that he would be agreeable.

We're involved in a lot of things that are not strictly fighting busing. It's a question of bringing about a better educational system in this country. It's a question of building a better society for the children of this country--black and white, rich and poor. So like I say, we get involved in a lot of issues that are strictly not the busing issue but they all relate to education and children and the moral fiber of this country.

How many NANS affiliates are there throughout the United States?

Now that is a hard one to answer. The best way I can tell you is this: we're across thirty-eight states. We have two types of membership: an organization can affiliate for one hundred dollars flat rate
and that makes them a NANS affiliate. That doesn't mean that any members of their organization have to join NANS as individuals.

I'm trying to give you some classic examples: Texas. We've got Dallas, Austin, Lubbock...no, we've got four. We've got organizational drives going on in two others. But then we've got a lot of people who have joined NANS who have not affiliated as an organization as such.

So to tell you exactly how many affiliate organizations is a pretty hard thing because of the way our structure is set up. I can tell you that membership-wise we're around a quarter of a million people.

Now, the affiliates in Michigan, there are two organizations with the same name but they affiliate as one organization in southwest Michigan. We've also got chapters around the Detroit area. Mainly, what we can go by is what figures these people send us as far as what is encompassed in their organization--what their mailings are, how many people they're reaching. That's where we come up with the figure of a quarter of a million.

WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF NANS?

The financial structure is strictly contributions and dues paying. You'll find out we're probably one of the lowest budgeted national organizations in this country to achieve what we have achieved. In other words, nobody in NANS is paid. The only person we pay is the lobbyist because we have to hire him and a couple of times when we couldn't get volunteer legal services on certain things that we needed special expertise in, like taxes, we had to go ahead and hire an attorney. But besides that, everyone in NANS is strictly on a voluntary basis. We try to hold down every cent we can.

APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE LOCALLY, STATEWIDE, AND NATIONALLY?

Locally, I would say about five hundred. Statewide, because the issue of busing is not of major concern in Kentucky outside of Jefferson County, I would say probably seven hundred fifty. And then nationally, a quarter of a million, 250,000.

For example, Michigan has probably got more areas with forced busing than any other place in the nation. I'd say Ohio is running a close second. This makes a difference. And then, also, how long an area has been under a desegregation plan.
In other words, the American people, I don't think, will ever change from wanting quick answers. They figure 20,000 people out in the street were going to stop busing overnight. Everybody would say, "We quit. You're right!" But it isn't that way. We found out the hard way, that it takes patience; it takes work; it takes compiling facts, convincing the members of Congress, convincing members of the Senate. Getting across to the American people that this program is not helping children; it's hurting children. And this is the biggest thing we've had to fight, because we're not the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. We don't have million dollar grants; we don't have paid staff. We have to do everything on our own. It's a little bit different when you have to operate under those conditions.

**HOW DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH NANS? WHAT ATTRACTED YOU TO THE ORGANIZATION?**

At the time I became involved with NANS I was chairman of National Organization to Restore and Preserve Freedom. Twice before, national organizations in the anti-busing movement had tried to be formed and it never worked out. I was contacted by Professor Ralph Scott, head of the Educational Clinic of the University of Northern Iowa. He had read some publications and some papers I had done on the busing issue, and then invited me to Denver, Colorado.

When I got up there I met a lot of old friends from the busing movement and from traveling around the country, and I met a lot of new people who basically figured that we could get a lot more accomplished together than we could separately. That's when NANS was born, in '76 in Denver, Colorado. I don't know if I've answered your full question.

**WHAT ATTRACTED YOU TO THE ORGANIZATION?**

I think just common problems that we shared and the common goals that we shared, as far as doing something about it. Plus a love for my own children and a lot of other children in thinking we could do something better.

**DID THE NON-VIOLENT STRATEGY HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH YOUR ATTRACTION TO NANS?**

This is something that basically all the NANS leaders agree on and it was always since day one in our organization before the formation of NANS. We printed hundreds of thousands of words on how violence only loses the battle for us. We've got a lot of frustrated parents that you have to deal with, and things like this--but striking out--it's not the black people's fault. The majority of blacks in this country, the Lou Harris poll shows, are opposed to busing. The majority of all races are opposed to busing. And to turn around and convince people that they have to strike out against the Supreme Court, the
members of Congress, the people who are imposing this on the citizenry. It doesn't convince anybody.

Although, it's a very sad thing to say...Walter Cronkite was a man I confronted on this. I said, "It's a shame that an organization that is nationally recognized all over the country, that is up there testifying before the Congress and before the Senate, who's bringing in top name social scientists in this nation, that they can't get a bit of coverage. But every time somebody puts on a white robe or something, why, every TV camera in this nation is there.

Cronkite answered, "It's unfortunate. But it's not the man on the soap box. It's the man who throws the rock that gets the coverage."

This is something that NANS has always had a hard time dealing with. If you try to do things credibly, honorably, why, it seems that the news media is the first one to ignore it. If you want to go out there and stir up racial trouble, you'll get all the press coverage in the world. And it's wrong because it adds to the problem instead of helping to solve the problem. This has been a great problem for us.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS ATTRACTED TO NANS?

Basically, they're attracted to NANS because we're the organization who knows what is going on. Who can turn around and not only furnish the expertise as far as academic credentials go, that busing is wrong. We are the people who are going about it the right way, not the wrong way. We're not the people standing out there shouting on the street corner. We're the people who are up there in the halls of Congress, meeting with people on the President's staff, politically involved to bring about change in this country right down the line.

And, really, when they get over their initial "being-mad-at-the-world-type-thing"—when it happens—and when they listen to the same rhetoric which turns around and accomplishes nothing, then people start to search for answers. Who can really do something about it? And I think NANS record is outstanding.

In 1975, Congressman Larry McDonald, Democrat of Georgia, had House Bill 12365, which was to stop busing. Seventeen members of Congress voted in support of that bill. In '76, we had similar legislation. That was with the formation of NANS and that was a few months after we took on the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to debate on national public television and beat them. We got seventy-six votes. Last year we had the Mottl constitutional amendment up. We got 209 votes.

In other words, we have turned around and just hammered away and hammered away, made trip after trip to Washington, but we went up there armed with statistical data to show that blacks are against it, whites
are against it. It's tearing down not only the moral fiber, but it's causing educational decline; it's wasting billions of tax dollars; it's wasting energy. We're showing where this program is a colossal failure. It's bringing about, in many cases, more resegregation than segregation before the plans were initiated. In other words, we're going up there with facts, not fiction. And we're getting the job done.

**DESCRIPT THE TYPICAL NANS MEMBER.**

How do you describe the typical NANS member? That's a hard thing for me. We've got so many people. Most of them are housewives; we've got white collar workers, blue collar workers; we've got academicians; we've got members of the Congress, members of the Senate. The best way I could describe the typical NANS member is a middle-class, hard-working individual, who cares about his community, cares about his family, and cares about what happens to this country.

**HOW HAS NANS WORKED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT RHETORICAL APPEALS HAVE BEEN USED?**

We have a basic appeal that we use in an area—a basic strategy. For example, Lubbock, Texas. Number one, we'll have whatever affiliate organization is close there attend school board meetings, rallies, things like this, and pass out NANS material. We will search news clippings for local leaders and when we find these people we'll call them up; we'll write to them; we'll let them know who we are, what we're doing. Then we'll try to set up a rally and go in there where we can address the mass of citizenry.

One of the tactics that I always try to use is to try to force the NAACP, the ACLU—whoever is the moving party in the action—to public debate in those towns on the issue of busing. Is it good for children or is it bad for children? We always try to reach the black community. One of the things I thought was wonderful was Los Angeles. I was there for the start of busing. You had blacks, you had Mexican-Americans, you had all of them come out against busing. This is one thing that has been successful in areas like LA where in other areas it has been hard to do because we had organizations like the Klan who automatically—I don't care if there were twenty of them and there were 10,000 other people—those twenty would get more press coverage. Then the first thing that the pro-busers would say was that all anti-busers are Ku Klux Klan. But we don't allow the Ku Klux Klan in NANS and we don't allow organizations who use this as a race issue. It's a freedom issue and it's the future of children to us. It's not a race issue.

What I'm saying is that, basically, we use the same tactic. Going in there with good, hard social science evidence, showing them where this is bad for children, showing them where the people who promote
this are high-paid individuals getting, in many cases like local organizations, federal grants and a lot of other things to push this garbage out on the community.

They cannot substantiate, when it comes to open debate, where this has helped children, black or white, anywhere across this country, where it's done anything for the community, where it's done anything for educational achievement. All it has done is tear down communities, destroy education, and hurt black and white children. This we can substantiate.

That's the reason today the NAACP backed off the debates with me in, I guess, forty cities across this country. They will no longer debate. Once we put the U.S. Civil Rights Commission down on the issue and some local NAACP presidents and lawyers, after that point, they flatly refused to debate. That's where right is might in our case.

WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN ATTRACTION MEMBERS, MOLDING THEM INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT, AND KEEPING THEM INVOLVED?

Number one. In any area that the busing issue is becoming a prevalent issue, the first thing you find is a group of attorneys who for $50,000, $100,000, $200,000, are going to say, "You've got a good chance to beat this in the courts." It's a question of NANS' philosophy of direct action through legislation opposed to court litigation. If you study the record, all this court litigation has gone for nothing. It's just meant that people who are opposed to busing have dug into their hard-earned dollars and spent millions on attorneys and still ended up with forced busing.

Generally, the number one problem we face is people who are saying we've going to beat this in the courts, as opposed to going the right way--the way that is proving effective. In Yonkers, New York, right now, we have this problem. Two weeks ago, I was sitting in Benton Harbor, Michigan, in their remedy litigation and all across the country we've had this problem of a lot of people promising they can do something important, but it's always been the same outcome. They end up with busing.

A lot of times we try to work with these attorneys. I guess like Disaster by Decree there by Lino Graglia, explaining why you can't win in a stacked court of political appointees who have been appointed for their liberal philosophy. It's done some good in some cases, but too many lawyers are willing to promise too much to people.

I put forth the philosophy that if they want $100,000 and they say they can win the case, raise $200,000. Put it in an escrow fund and tell them if it's worth that to you, tell them when they win your case,
when they stop them from implementing a busing plan here, when they get that Supreme Court decision, they've got the $200,000. If they don't get it, they don't get anything. I said, "You watch how fast your lawyers take a walk!" We couldn't get communities to do this. But if they would have some of these fees on this is outrageous.

When I was in Benton Harbor there was a chief counsel for the NAACP who was up there. They told me that in 1978, on desegregation cases he received over a million dollars in court fees.

You can see, if you can separate the people who are truly devoting their time, and I'm not condemning all lawyers, but you've always got these few that the dollar is the big thing and if they see a dollar out there they're going to go out there and tell the people anything they want to hear to get those dollars. And it's sad, but that's what we have to fight and to go into a new area, condemn an attorney when you really don't know his motivation; a lot of times you find out that a lot of these guys are sincere. But they've got it in their head that they can win.

When you show them the top constitutional lawyers in this country who have been involved and not won, and then ask them to read books like Disaster by Decree, Government by Judiciary, and find out that there's no chance of winning, it's a hard thing to do and it takes time. We've had a lot of lawyers in a lot of places who have come out who were the ones who were fighting the school desegregation case, who have not only come out and joined NANS, but recommended NANS.

APPLYING THIS TO AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS...

Yes, if I wasn't getting too far off, there's something else I'd like to add. We have had problems with the Nazi party and with the Klan in different areas and these problems haven't been that major. In other words, they get out there, they make a little bit of noise, like Los Angeles when they were having their major rally before school started. We had the Nazi party over here; we had the Progressive Communist Party over there; we had the Klan passing out literature over here; and these are problems that in one way hurt organizational efforts because a lot of people are scared away by these people's presence. This is one reason that we made sure that everyone knows emphatically we are not connected with these people; we don't subscribe to their theories; we don't subscribe to their tactics. They are not part of the National Association for Neighborhood Schools.

This has always been a problem in a new area because these people jump right in there and try to make off the Klan as the anti-busing movement. You show me the first time the Klan's been up there in the
halls of Congress, that the Klan has been putting together social
science evidence to convince people that busing is wrong. In other
words, all they promote is the race issue. It's a sad thing, but if
anything hurts movements like NANS, it is movements like the Nazi
Party, the Klan, the Communist Party—the far right and the far left,
in my thinking are the same thing. They come around full circle, but
they're both working against the good of the people and the good of
the children.

I'M STILL GOING TO TAKE YOU BACK...

Fine.

WHAT PROBLEMS, BESIDES THE NAZIS AND THE KLAN, HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED
IN ATTRACTING YOUR INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS WHEN YOU GO INTO A CITY?
ADDRESS THE CONCEPT OF MOLDING THEM INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT. WHAT
PROBLEMS DO YOU ENCOUNTER THERE AND THEN KEEPING THEM INVOLVED OVER
THE LONG TERM--BECAUSE THIS IS A LONG-TERM PROCESS?

Some other problems we've encountered are--always before
busing starts, the federal grants come in. These are left-wingers
who get these federal grants and always come up with fine-sounding
names, everything from Coalition Against Racism, Coalition for Peaceful
Implementation, right on down the line. The first thing they do is take
those federal dollars and start hitting all the ministers in the com­
munity and forming an effective organization to promote integration.

Generally, I don't think it's without exception, the press always
gives these organizations very, very favorable publicity. Then when
we come in the first thing they want to say is, "You must be against
religion because the religious leaders are for it." But I point out to
them the religious leaders aren't all for it. In Louisville, Kentucky,
the religious community right here took out a full page ad in the
Courier-Journal. It cost them several thousand dollars. They had over
300 ministers from Louisville and surrounding areas here voicing their
opposition to it.

When you go in there, you're going in there against already-
organized coalitions to promote this thing. A lot of these are well-
respected community people. And until we got to the point where we
attracted congressmen and senators to become members of NANS, prominent
social scientists, and people like this, so we could show prominent
church leaders the credibility of NANS, then we had problems. But,
as I say, we've been able to overcome this because we do have the names
now; we do have the people now.
AND HOW DID YOU GET THOSE PEOPLE?

By sitting down and taking the time and the patience to furnish them documentation after documentation on the busing issue. And showing them that we were right. This was hurting children. To show them we were not a racist organization, we were a pro-family, pro-children, pro-America organization.

It's been like walking on eggs. I'll be truthful with you, because any little thing—there was a march out here on Dixie Highway last Friday night—an anti-busing march. Some of the people who put it on asked me to come out and speak. I went out there and there was the Grand Dragon of the Kentucky Ku Klux Klan. There were also several people out there with KKK on the jackets. The Klan had decided to come to the march. I had to leave. In other words, I just got in my car and left. All it would take is for me to be there speaking and have my picture taken with those Klansmen and the first thing that would happen is one of these pro-busing people here would grab that and it would be all over the country: NANS First Vice-President marches with Ku Klux Klan. So, what I'm saying is that you run into these situations and you have to handle them as best you can. I think maybe Kaye told you that when we spoke in Columbus they had the Revolutionary Communist Party there in the audience, pulling all this. And I run into it all over the country. You just have to do the best you can.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS YOU HAVE IN KEEPING YOUR INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS INVOLVED AND WORKING?

The biggest problem is—you have to let them know that they are part of things, that they're making the difference. We meet weekly and have been doing so for five years now, better than five years. We discuss leadership decisions with the people. We have a very open forum. For instance, they're in Jaytown setting up an affair. These are projects that are thought up by the people who think that NANS ought to be involved. They reach a lot of people and as long as people know they're accomplishing something, that they're getting something done, then I think they're very willing to participate.

Whenever you can't show people that you're making progress, where you're doing a job for them, then I think you have a hard time keeping people. White flight has hurt us right here in the Jefferson County area very badly because a lot of our members have moved out to Bullit County, Oldham County, and over into Indiana. When this happens the expense of gasoline being as high as it is, it's hard to get them to drive thirty to forty miles to a meeting.

WHEN WAS YOUR INITIAL ORGANIZATION IN LOUISVILLE ESTABLISHED?

It was established in 1975.
HAVE YOU LOST MEMBERS SINCE THEN?

We have as far as Jefferson County goes. I think we've lost as far as the county goes. We've gained as far as statewide goes.

THE PROBLEMS AND THE REASONS FOR THEM LEAVING ARE...

Mainly, white flight. And a lot of it is economics, too. A lot of them couldn't afford private Christian schools so the best option they had was to move.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED WITH MEMBERS? THESE QUESTIONS ARE PRIMARILY ORIENTED AROUND YOUR LOCAL ORGANIZATION.

One of them we touched on earlier, when I was telling you about what Cronkite said. People get very alienated when they see these pro-busers getting massive publicity. And the people who are fighting busing cannot get publicity on their issue. This is something that has been discussed not only between the Kentucky organization but between organizations all across the country. If you get out there and throw that rock, you'll get the coverage you want. It's been a hard thing to tell them you not only get the coverage but you get discredited along with it. To try to keep the frustration in check and tell them that it doesn't matter when we get a local media blackout or a national media blackout on something that's very significant.

What matters is the fact that we just took out a Congressman in Birmingham, Alabama, on September 3 and put a real good conservative in. In Kentucky, Hal Rogers has just won the primary for Tim Lee Carter's seat, who is a very avid pro-buser. We picked up another Congressman there for next year. Jacob Javits has just gotten knocked out on the Republican ticket in New York. And I tell them to read the pro-busers' strategy and they're crying their eyes out about the power we've gained in the halls of Congress. This is what counts; not what's on the front page of the Courier-Journal, but how many elections we win and how many we lose. We're winning ten times more than we're losing. That's what counts is for us to keep our people informed that we're winning this thing.

Statistically, if you put it on a graph, NANS is going straight uphill. And this is what counts. You have to...you can sympathize with their problems when they pick up a paper and have to read this stuff, but when you can go back to them and show them where we're getting the job done. Our press here has made no bones—Barry Bingham runs the Courier-Journal, the Louisville Times, Channel 11, WHAS radio. Before busing was ever implemented he made his feelings quite clear that he was in favor of it. I don't think the editorial policy of those papers or media has changed one bit to this day. But still they can't come and say you're losing. Several times they've tried this and like
editorial responses on television and stuff, we tore them up with facts and figures. There's a lot of problems that organizations have but the main problem is this press thing, I think.

HOW HAVE CONFLICTS THAT HAVE DEVELOPED WITHIN THE GROUP BEEN RESOLVED?

We're very democratic. If it's a disagreement between leadership and membership, or if it's a disagreement between membership and membership we bring it up on the floor and let both sides state their case. We put it to a membership vote and the membership prevails and that's the way we were set up and that's the way we operate.

Basically, disagreement is on very small things. Should we go set up at this fair or should we go do this or should we have this? Just minor things like this as far as what direction the organization should take on doing certain things.

The easiest way we know is to tell people, "It's your organization. You get it up there on the floor; you discuss it; you vote; and whatever the vote comes out that's what we're going to do."

I think this is the way an organization should run. Whenever people feel that they do not run an organization, then I think this is when we lose a lot of people. When they know it's their organization, that they've got a voice in it, that they've got a vote in it, then I think you keep people.

WHAT IF SOMETHING CAME UP AND THE GROUP WENT AGAINST WHAT YOU THOUGHT THEY SHOULD DO?

Alright now, as far as NANS goes, when an organization affiliates with NANS they agree to live by NANS' by-laws. Now, if they violate those by-laws, they're no longer a part of NANS. Now, if a group of individuals wants to do something on their own or under another name, that's their business. But if they do it under the NANS name, they have to abide by the NANS by-laws, or else they're disaffiliated with the organization.

SO THEN YOU NEVER REALLY COME UP WITH ANY PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES OR EVEN TACTICAL DIFFERENCES?

Oh, yes. We've had a lot of discussions on different tactics to take. The second year of busing here, I was a member of the Committee of Fifty, which was the Mayor, the county judge, representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, League of Jewish Women, NAACP, ACLU, about three different anti-busing organizations, and a lot of people felt like I shouldn't have been involved in this. But it was the same way. It was put to the membership and they felt
like we should have a voice in what is being said. So there's a lot of opportunities for us to be involved in different things.

Usually, if it's anything that has people from the other side involved there is heavy discussion among our people as to whether we should participate or whether or should not participate. But like I said, I've always told people that if I felt you were wrong then I would participate as an individual and not as a leader of an organization. I've never had to do that because I've always had the backing of the majority of the membership.

HOW DO THE LEADERS OF NANS WORK TO REDUCE THE FRUSTRATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS AS TO THEIR FEELINGS ABOUT FORCED BUSING AND THEN HOW DOES NANS WORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ITS MEMBERS. SOME OF THAT YOU'VE ALREADY ADDRESSED.

I would say, number one, I think the most wonderful thing is that we let them know that they're not alone. We let them know of all the other organizations across the country who are fighting the same battle they are, who are involved with it. We quote national polls to them several times to show them that they're with the majority—the mainstream of the American people. You're not in the minority position on this issue. That's one reason we keep all these different communications from all over the country flowing, because it strengthens the organization to know what they're doing in Benton Harbor, Michigan, what they're doing in Dallas, what they're doing in Boston, what they're doing in Denver, because they know people are out there working, accomplishing, fighting their fight. I think this is the main thing—to turn around and make people aware that we are winning the battle, and that they're not fighting it by themselves. They don't have the whole world on their shoulders; there's a lot of other people out there with them.

HOW DOES NANS WORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ITS MEMBERS?

Basically—the needs of its members—I would say is something that I wish we had the money to pay tuition for every NANS members' children for private education, but we don't. One of the things we've been working with southwest Michigan on is the establishment of private schools before implementation. I understand they've got two private schools now that the local NANS people have gone together and bought. Their implementation won't start until next year. We've asked other communities to do similar things. You have to look at state laws in particular areas as far as our tutorial programs, legal or illegal, in your state. Things like this that are unanswered until we get the litigation through Congress to stop it.
We do get involved in several things like this. We furnish information on Christian schools, on private school movements, on state laws in their states. We furnish people a contact to get started. We give them names of books to get in their library to read on starting their own private schools. We just do a ton of demographic research. You look, all underneath there is filled with records (indicates file cabinets which line the walls of the room). That stuff I'm digging through right now over there--there's stacks over here. The filing cabinets are full. When people can get answers, especially when their congressman comes out and says, "I'm against it, but I can't do anything about it." We fire them back a letter right away showing them constitutionally, under Article III, Section II, what their congressman can do. We turn around and the answers they don't have in hand when people say something to them; they write us, we get those answers right back to them. They find out that they've become experts on the subject after awhile. They know how to knock the politicians down; they know how to answer the NAACP, and the ACLU. This is the thing. We strengthen each individual chapter through knowledge and at the same time we get the job done in Washington, D.C. And at the same time, that individual chapter works for defeating those candidates we're having trouble with in Washington. It's a help and help situation. We help them and they help us. But basically the grassroots is our strength.

DESCRIPT THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AUDIENCES NANS IS ATTEMPTING TO REACH.

I think NANS is trying to reach every person in this country. In other words, we're trying to reach not only the American people, but individually we're trying to reach the Mexican-American community, the black community. For instance, Jimmy Wong started the Freedom Schools in San Francisco. He's Chinese-American and one of our board members. Libby Ruiz is Mexican-American from Tucson, Arizona. You know about the black school board member in Cleveland who's such an articulate spokesman on the busing issue.

But really, me, myself, personally, and I've made this statement several times. I want to confront the NAACP in front of the American people. I want to expose this bunch of hypocrites for what they're doing to the black children in this nation. I want to ask them to explain how even the pro-busing U.S. Department of Education says that forty-two percent of black seventeen-year-olds in this nation are functioning illiterate. That's this year they're saying. I want them to explain those academic achievement scores that have gone downhill, downhill, downhill after the busing issue. I want to know how much of that is going back to help those minority kids. I want to kick them right in the teeth because they've hurt black children in this country and I don't think if busing was stopped today that the full ramifications of what they've done twenty years from now wouldn't still be felt. These kids are going to be parents. What kind of parents are they going to be with the type of education that the NAACP has forced them
into many of these situations? If I wanted to do one thing in my life it would be to get the NAACP in front of the American people and show them up for all the harm they've done to the children of this country, both black and white.

OTHER AUDIENCES THOUGH, THAT YOU'RE TRYING TO REACH INCLUDE THE LEGISLATORS, THE MEDIA...

Right. It's making every American understand exactly what forced busing does to a community, to the children of the community.

WHAT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE NANS MESSAGES?

No individual or group. Now, let me tell you why. It's because of the type of format that we use. In other words, when we send out a mailing, which—well, I'll give you some examples. There's quite a few I try to keep, at least currently, that went out in the last two months. I keep extra copies in case somebody sends in requesting something. And then as I put out another mailing then I pull the in-material. And then file some of it and throw some of it away because I've got everything loaded up with....But what I'm saying, is all different organizations across the country that are NANS affiliates have put together studies and things...here's a classic example...when an organization puts out something like this. Alright, then we'll disseminate that to all the other organizations across the country. Everybody is working and adding to. So, what I'm saying, is our ideas come from all our people. Now, maybe a lot of the work right in there maybe wasn't done by the NANS director in that particular area of the country. But they did a good job. So we disseminate that to all the other NANS chapters across the country, to all the board members. Everybody contributes, and the same when it comes to ideas. Everybody contributes.

HOW LARGE A ROLE DO YOU AND MR. D'ONOFRIO PLAY IN PUTTING A LOT OF THAT TOGETHER? (REFERENCE IS TO A NANS REPORT UNDER DISCUSSION)

Maybe on that report there maybe they wrote requesting certain statistical data that they incorporated into that thing. I'll send it back and I've really got no idea what they're doing with it most of the time. We're trying to put something together, well that's fine. They're doing something. If I've got some demographics here that will help in what they're doing, then I'll send them to them. When it comes back I'll go over it and if they've done a good job on it then I'll turn around and if they don't send me enough copies then I'll go ahead and have copies printed and I'll disseminate it across the country for them.
Bill is NANS expert on political strategy. I'm not a politician. Bill understands politics; he understands the workings of politics; and he is the man who more or less calls the shots. He's the man who set up our lobbyist in our Washington office. He's the man who knows the ins and outs of politics and that's Bill's field of expertise. Study of the busing issue is my field of expertise. We've got different people who contribute different things. When you squeeze them all together they make a pretty efficient organization.

WHO CONDUCTS RESEARCH FOR THE ARGUMENTS DEVELOPED AGAINST FORCED BUSING?

I do a good portion of it. But let me also tell you, people like Professor Herb Walberg, people like Professor Ralph Scott—all these people. I guess the greatest thing I've ever read on the busing issue is The Busing Cover-Up, which Professor Scott authored. When it comes to the legal part, Professor Lino Graglia, University of Texas Law School, wrote Disaster by Decree, which is a fabulous book on the legalities of busing. Another fine book is Government by Judiciary, by Professor Raoul Berger who, if you remember, is the man who, in the Nixon impeachment era was called in as the greatest constitutional authority on presidential impeachment in the country. And by the way, the man is a liberal, but in his own book, not only showing the unconstitutionality of the busing issue itself, he asks the question, "How can the American people respect a Supreme Court who rules things unconstitutional when they themselves have been unconstitutional?" referring to the busing issue.

So what I'm saying is, we've got a lot of fine people across this country who are doing excellent work and more or less I've done quite a few local studies. In '76, I printed what they called The Anti-Busing Bible. I was one of the contributing authors to Rebuilding American Education. It's been a combination of a lot of people furnishing the facts.

This week's Time has got an article on white flight by Dr. David Armor of the Rand Corporation, which is the longest study that has ever been done on the white flight phenomenon. He is stating now, emphatically, that after six years of study and restudy, and looking at everybody else's studies, where Coleman was torn down because he made a few mistakes in his demographics—he didn't factor certain things in. David Armor didn't do this. He is stating emphatically now that between thirty to sixty percent of the white flight from major cities is caused directly by the implementation of forced busing.

These are things that we've known all along, but we didn't have the people with the credentials that couldn't be challenged because they didn't do a comprehensive enough study. You don't hear people
challenging Armor because Armor is a guy who went through and tore down after Coleman did his reversal. Pettigrew came out, Green came out and tore up what Coleman had to say because I think in one area they used something as minor as...there was a flood that moved several hundred people out of that community. They lost their homes and that this wasn't factored in and this would have had a significant impact in that one area. In other words, they never really showed that Coleman was wrong. All they did was show that a few things that should have been factored in were not factored in. With Armor they can't do this. He went through their studies and tore them apart because of things they had not factored into their studies. So today Armor is the man. Armor is just reinforcing what we've said all along, but he's reinforcing it with the study and with the academic credentials--you know he's Harvard--to get the job done.

So we use a lot of material from a lot of different sources and you'll find among NANS leadership mailing people like Dave Armor, Ralph Scott, Lino Graglia, all of them are on our leadership mailing. We want them--part of them are affiliates of NANS, part of them are not affiliated with NANS--but we want all of them to know what we're doing, that we feel like their work is significant and we feel they should know when we use their material, how we're using it, right on down the line.

When I was up at Benton Harbor two weeks ago, Ralph Scott and David Armor were some of the people who were called in for consultation. This is a service we furnish especially in smaller communities, where lawyers will say, "Well, who do we get in as expert witnesses?" And then we'll furnish them with a list of expert witnesses and tell them their particular field of expertise, if it's legal or if it's social science, academic achievement, right on down the line. So that they know who to contact, where to contact them and what they need to put their case together. Of course, we've got very little faith in the outcome of their court case, but still this is a function that NANS has to perform. It's information that if these people want it, why, we're obligated to furnish it to them.

WHO DETERMINES THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL APPEALS THAT WILL BE USED AND BY WHAT PROCESS ARE THESE DECISIONS MADE?

I'm supposed to go up to speak in Yonkers, New York, pretty soon, but besides abiding by the principles of NANS and the NANS' by-laws, I go there and I pretty much say what's on my mind, how I feel, and do my best to get those people involved in supporting NANS and getting them involved in the fight.

I don't know if we've ever put any restriction on any person who was speaking on behalf of NANS, with the exception that they abide by our by-laws and their statement of principles. That they
use this as a freedom issue, not as a race issue, that they put forth facts which are documented facts, lay off of any unfounded rhetoric, and turn around and tell the people like it is. Above all, be truthful. What their chances are, what they can do, right on down the line. And, by the way, when those things like by-laws and that kind of stuff is drawn up--this is no one person's decision. Anything like that that is adopted by NANS is put to a full vote of the board. In other words, nobody acts on his own to say, "This is going to be NANS' policy." Because we're set up on very democratic principles.

WHAT ARE THE RHETORICAL EXPECTATIONS PLACED UPON YOU IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER?

Number one, our goal is to stop forced busing. But you'll find individual leaders of NANS have different philosophies--sometimes clashing philosophies. We have some NANS directors who are very, very strong advocates of public education. I am a very strong advocate of the free enterprise system. I advocate the voucher system. I think every child in this nation, regardless of socio-economic status, should have a choice to go to the school that that parent and that child choose. I'm a person who does not believe in a state school system, especially one that has got a fifteen year declining educational achievement level. I believe in the Constitution. I believe in equality of opportunity for all children. But I can never see this coming about under a state system. That's why I advocate the voucher system that Canada uses, that Sweden uses, that most of your European democracies have used for sixty, eighty, one hundred years, where you have pure freedom of choice in the education. A child would have a choice if he wanted to go to a private school that was set up down the block or a Christian school or a state school. This is my particular philosophy and one of the things I'm fighting for. But I don't say voucher is NANS' policy, but it's Bob DePrez's policy. And as far as the National Organization to Preserve and Restore Freedom goes, it's their policy. So, a lot of times I have to draw a definite distinction when I'm speaking.

I met with the school superintendents last year in Michigan and they loved everything I had to say until I brought up the voucher system. Right away they objected. I had two small town mayors with me plus some community leaders. And I said, "Well, why don't you lay it on the line as to why you object to the voucher system of education?"

They said, "Well, we can't compete." And I said, "Well, what are you talking about? Are we talking about what is best for children or are we talking about our $40,000 a year position? Which do we put in front as far as goals go? What's best for our children or what's best for our pocketbook?"
Paul Harvey stated it several times: Grades one through twelve in public education costs twice as much as private education in this country. But when you look at academic achievement levels—academic achievement levels are three to four years higher in private education than they are in public education. So it makes for a very awkward situation, especially when I'm speaking to people and I bring up voucher and they think voucher is NANS' philosophy and voucher is not NANS. But these things I fight for because I believe in them.

As far as your being a NANS leader is concerned: There are certain things that you have to do. You've placed great emphasis on telling the truth and being honest about your facts and knowing what the facts are. What are some of the other things—particularly when you're dealing with people both within the organization and people outside of the organization? Do you ever have conflicts that occur between those two, particularly when you are trying to appeal to both at the same time?

I've always found that the community people are worried about the welfare of their kids. I've spoken all around the country and when you're talking to people who care about the welfare of their children, those audiences have been very receptive. We've always had the problem with agitators, especially these Communist front organizations like the Revolutionary Communist Party—those kinds of people. But the people themselves have been very receptive. I know a lot of times you hear things about the Muslim community, the Black Muslims. There's a certificate of outstanding community service from the Muslims when I spoke at their mosque. Now, parents, black or white, when you talk about what's best for their children, when you talk about the welfare of their kids and they know you're sincere and that you're there to try to help them, why people are wonderful.

You've never had the need to distort, conceal, or exaggerate in addressing your own supporters or the outside?

I've tried not to because I'm a firm believer that anytime you do that it's going to come back to haunt you. I'd rather say that I've been truthful with you and I'd rather say that I don't know than to tell them something that I know they want to hear. I don't believe in that. That's one reason I'd never make a politician. Because I don't believe in that philosophy. I don't believe in fooling people. I'm one of those old believers in the Abe Lincoln theory: you can fool some of the people some of the time. I don't ever want them to come back and say that Bob DePrez lied to us.

What kind of role conflicts have you encountered and how have you resolved those conflicts?

Are you asking about the national level or on the local level?
On a national, we've had several things--like the Ashbrook bill. At the last board meeting we had quite a conflict on talking about amending the language on the Ashbrook bill. Generally, we sit down and we go into long discussions on it and we bring up point and counterpoint until we reach some kind of a rational decision on what is feasible, what is practical. And I think the same way on local issues, as far as letting the people handle things instead of saying that we're going to do it this way. I think the best way you ever solve problems is by pure prolonged discussion until you come to some kind of an agreement as to what the right move to make is.

Sometimes leaders of social movements face discrepancies between role expectations and role definitions. Did you ever feel that you are trying to be all things to all people in that you are always forced to deal with any kind of dilemma with great skill? You have also got the conflict of trying to address your various audiences--the media, your members, the congressmen that legislate. How do you coordinate all of those responsibilities so that you, as a person, do not feel the conflict?

Number one, you work twenty hours a day. Number two, you look on all of them as responsibilities that you have to handle and you do the best you can. One of the major problems that I didn't even touch upon, one that we've run into many times, is where we have two or more organizations in an area and they're all vying for membership and leadership. Unfortunately, maybe ten percent of the time as far as the total of NANS organizations goes, you get politicians involved or you get local leaders, who are running for politics, then you get organizations fighting organizations and you have to go in there and try to unify it.

In dealing with all of these things you put them down and you try to put them into an order of priority. I don't ever feel like I'm trying to be all things to all people. A lot of times I feel like--I come in here and I guess had two feet of paperwork stacked on that desk and just felt like there was no way--like throwing up my hands in the air. But then I always say to myself, "You take the first piece of paper first and you do something about it." And some way you always manage to get through it.

You have never felt really pulled by the demands made on you?

Yes. I've felt like I had too much. But I've always found that if I get on the phone and get some people down here that have been with this long enough and that know my philosophy, I can delegate a lot of my minor things to other people. Yes, it's hard. It's a helluva strain a lot of times.
ONE OF THE WAYS YOU DEAL WITH THE CONFLICTS IS TO DELEGATE WHEN POSSIBLE.

When possible. If there is somebody else who has been with us for five or six years and can answer as well as I, then I can delegate a lot of the smaller things and then devote more time to the major things.

WHAT CONFLICTS PERTAINING TO RHETORIC, TACTICS, STRATEGIES, ETC., HAVE OCCURRED AMONG THE NANS LEADERS AND HOW WERE THEY RESOLVED?

I thought we already covered that, but I think we're no different than any other organization, philosophically. But there are quite a bit of differences as far as views go and organizational structures or tactics. We try to handle them in a reasonable and responsible manner. Usually through prolonged discussion of an issue. Many times we've turned around and tabled things so that we could contact people who have had more expertise on what we were talking about than we did. But we've always tried to reach a very rational conclusion for anything we've done. We don't believe in the philosophy of standing up and screaming or name calling. We turn around and use the democratic process and make it work for us.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE DISGRUNTLED MEMBERS, PARTICULARLY IN YOUR HIGHER ECHELON—YOUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS? WHAT HAPPENS IF THEY GET TOO DISGRUNTLED OR DOES THAT EVER HAPPEN?

Oh! Yes. We've had problems like that. In fact, a few times... One time in particular, we printed up a list of complaints as to the way NANS was being run. And we sent them out to all the affiliates, all the officers, right on down the line, and asked for their input on it. And told them we'd call a national board meeting and for them to discuss this with the membership and to come back and tell us how they felt about the situation. And when we all got back, heard what everybody had to say, we sat down and we smoothed out our problems, made the changes we felt were necessary depending upon the way the membership felt, and went on.

We don't believe that there's any problem that arises--because all of our goals are so similar--that we can't turn around and sit down as rational people and come up with a logical conclusion to solve the problem. It's always worked out fairly well for us. We've never had any fiery letters of resignation or anything like that. I think we're very fortunate.

THEN EVERYONE STAYS WITH IT?

Right. We've had people who say the workload on them has become too heavy. Then they have stepped down into an honorary director position. But this was voluntary on their part because they said, "It's been two years that I've been on the board and I've got certain
other obligations and it's just too hard on me and I'd like to assume less responsibility." Then, we've asked for recommendations from that area as to whom that director should be--if we had affiliates there, we asked the affiliate organizations to come up with recommendations for the national board. We always try to operate a smooth operation.

HOW MANY PEOPLE SIT ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS?

I think right now we've got thirty-four or thirty-five members on the national board.

IS THERE A GROUP ABOVE THAT, AN EXECUTIVE BOARD?

There's an executive board of seven members. We might have expanded to nine. I'd have to go back to the by-laws, but I think it's still seven. The executive board mainly deals with other issues than the full board does. But anything the executive board does is in the manner of recommendations. When we go before the full board, they read the recommendations of the executive board. It's more or less a planning and strategy committee. But the full board has to vote approval.

Now, we are empowered between national meetings to make decisions if something comes up that is an absolute emergency, like we hear that testimony is being taken in Washington on a particular thing and we want to turn around and say get two or three prominent social scientists in there to testify. Well, we don't have time to contact everybody, sit down and have a meeting, fly in from all over the country, and discuss who's best for the job. So the executive board would probably send a letter around on recommendations for those they thought we should have there to testify and why. We would go ahead and do that. But everything we do like that, when we have national board meeting, we're answerable to the national board for whatever we do of this nature.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT--LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL--AND HOW ARE YOU WORKING TO MINIMIZE THAT RESISTANCE?

When the Mottl constitutional amendment was voted on, Congressman Mottl stood on the Capitol steps and read off forty national organizations who opposed him on this bill, starting out with the NAACP, the ACLU, NEA--to organizations like the AFL-CIO, and the United Auto Workers, of which I am a member. And he listed the only organization in the nation, nationally, that had supported him, the National Association for Neighborhood Schools.
All these organizations we are confronted with daily. We turn around and furnish factual information to the people of those organizations and say, "Look, regardless of what you're trying to accomplish, what you're doing isn't working and what you're doing is harming the children."

Now, we confront these people with facts, not with "You're a no-good SB because you don't support our position." We work to sway these people. The unions here in Kentucky came out very organized against busing even though the AFL-CIO and the United Auto Workers supported it. We have union leaders who still go to national conventions and turn around and expound the NANS philosophy. We work within groups and within the media to try to turn around and change these people.

BUT YOU'RE STILL HAVING PROBLEMS GETTING COVERAGE BY THE MEDIA?

It's a funny thing, when the media has something major on busing they still call this office to get the facts, get their statistics; but when it comes to expounding the philosophy, then they back up. They may call here and get the latest on white demographics, or they may call to get the latest on school violence. But besides that, they back up. And that's where they always quote these pro-busers and leave the anti-busers out.

HOW ARE YOU CONTINUING TO WORK TO PERSUADE THE LEGISLATORS?

Several times a year national mailings are sent out with key statistical information on the busing issue. A lot of our mailings, when we have key legislative moves going on, we ask all our affiliate organizations to get their membership to write their congressmen, write their senators, to get their friends and neighbors to do the same. A lot of times we draft letters and send them out as a sample of what type letter should be sent. So, it's mainly a grassroots movement on that level. We hit them with our lobbyists at the top, but we hit them with their constituency at the bottom.

HOW CLOSELY AFFILIATED WITH THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS ARE YOU?

Bill is very heavily affiliated with them. NANS as an organization, I don't think is heavily affiliated. I talked to a lot of people. I talked with Phyllis Schlafly, I talked to Jerry Falwell. Several people like this.

There's a book up there now showing the leaders of the pro-family movement from across the nation. I just got that about a month ago. I'm just thinking now of going over it, seeing what people that we do not have in national leadership in these organizations.
In her newsletter this week, Phyllis has got a fabulous article on busing and in fact, I've got myself a note here to send Phyllis a letter of thanks....But this is all single issue groups, but this is all by John Ashbrook, by the way. And right now here at the bottom she's saying what Ashbrook is saying--what the anti-busing movement is today. Where we've gone. In other words, we've gone from the streets to the ballot-box.

ARE YOU AS AN INDIVIDUAL AFFILIATED WITH THIS GROUP OR IS NANS AFFILIATED?

No, NANS is not affiliated.

NOT UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS?

No. We work with a lot of people like Phyllis Schlafly. The first time I met her was in '77 when they had a national taxpayer's conference in St. Louis, Missouri. And I was invited as a delegate to that conference and that's the first time I ever met Phyllis Schlafly. They were interested in what we were fighting for, and we were interested in what they were fighting for.

There is a coalition of sorts. I think most of your conservative caucuses--their lobbyists, our lobbyists, meet every Friday in Washington and they see where they can help each other. In that sense, yes.

I just joined the Moral Majority, because busing is an issue with the Moral Majority. Phyllis Schlafly--she's ERA--but busing is an issue with her. So, she's on our leadership mailing list, and I send her a lot of information on the busing issue.

In other words, we send information to a lot of people across the country and every time they come out with something like this it's a plus for us. We've got a lot of people in our organization--I guess the majority are probably opposed to ERA, but I'm sure there are some that are for ERA. So NANS does not take a position on ERA. We don't take a position on abortion.

POLITICALLY, CONCERNING POLITICAL LEADERS OR LEGISLATORS, DO YOU WORK TOGETHER IF THEY ARE NOT SUPPORTING YOUR CAUSE OR RESPONDING? IS THERE A GRASSROOTS AFFILIATION ON THAT LEVEL--OF WORKING TOGETHER ON THAT LEVEL?

A week ago I received something from Yonkers where the Conservative Party of Yonkers donated two hundred dollars to get NANS of Yonkers, New York, rolling. They had a meeting; the Conservative
Party people were there; they put forth what NANS is all about, and they made a donation.

How do you separate this? The Am Vets have donated to the anti-busers. A lot of United Auto Workers locals have donated to the anti-busers. A lot of churches have donated. As long as it isn't an organization that is looked upon as radical, like the Klan or something like that, we have no objections to it. Strictly, we're out to preserve the neighborhood school concept and to stop forced busing and to bring about a better educational system for children.

IF THAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH THE COALITION THEN YOU'LL DO THAT?

Right. In other words, when I put out my next mailing, I'll give Phyllis Schlafly a very big thank you for what she's done this week in her newsletter.

The Republican Study Committee has just released their study on HR 1180 and the Republican National Committee, in which they mentioned the National Association for Neighborhood Schools by name, as the only national anti-busing group. I thank them for that. But at the same time, when I write on politics, I remind them that it's pro-buser and anti-buser, not Democrat-Republican. I remind them about Congressman Larry McDonald of Georgia who's a Democrat. I remind them about Congressman Ron Motl who's a Democrat. Who all these people are on our side. So we've got Democrats and Republicans alike. So don't ever think that NANS pushes a party because we don't push a party. We examine the issues, and vote for the individual, not for the party.

IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND WHO, AMONG THE ESTABLISHED STRUCTURE, ARE YOUR SUPPORTERS AND WHO PROVIDES THE MOST RESISTANCE?

The highest elected official when busing started here was Jefferson County Judge, Tom Hollenbeck. He came out with peaceful implementation and all this stuff. But after he found out what the issue was all about--after he got an education--we made recommendations as to witnesses to bring into the case, things like this. And they went through considerable expense to bring these people to testify. The county judge went to places--we held seminars in Nashville, Tennessee, and the judge went there as one of the speakers.

We have a lot of politicians who have lent their support. If you look at the Republican National Platform, you can see what they've done. Reagan was here in '76, and we put the question to him and his answer was to get the federal government out of your schools and return control of schools to the local community and the local people.
HOW HAVE YOU CONSCIOUSLY ADAPTED YOUR RHETORIC TO MEET THE NEEDS OF VARIOUS AUDIENCES, YOUR IN-GROUP, THE MEDIA, LEGISLATORS, ETC.?

I don't think I've changed what I say. When I speak to the press, I basically say the same thing that I would say to a group of citizens. The only thing I do is to try to reduce it from being long and drawn-out—that's the same problem I have with writing—and try to hit hard basic facts which I give. As far as addressing the citizens groups, I elaborate more on each and every thing.

But I don't basically change what I say if it's before press or before citizens groups or before the Black Muslim community because it doesn't make any difference. The only thing I try to do is to keep updating my facts as far as my presentation goes. Now, with a few exceptions, such as when I was addressing teachers at the University of Louisville, I heavily researched the NEA to give more updated material on that and I more or less addressed academic achievement, parental involvement, neighborhood schools—that type of thing more heavily than I did the overall impact of busing.

THEN YOU DO CONDUCT SOME SORT OF AUDIENCE ANALYSIS AND THEN DEVELOP YOUR ARGUMENT ACCORDINGLY?

Oh! Yes! I think you have to. You know that if you're going to address a group of academicians, or you're going to address a group of mixed community, politicians, parents, school board members, I think anybody would have to do that.

WHAT ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC., HAS NANS ENGAGED IN TO AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION? YOU CAN DEAL WITH THE MAIN THINGS, WHAT THEY HAVE DONE, AND THEN WHAT YOU ARE DOING. THE LOBBYIST, I KNOW, IS A SIGNIFICANT FACTOR NOW...

Right. The lobbyist. We've made many trips to Washington with citizens' lobbies. I think the taking on of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in debate was a very significant part of the NANS movement. We testified or had our people testify in several hearings across the country which were conducted by groups like the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. We've tried working with black community organizations, furnishing major media with facts and things like this, addressing any type of group that we felt would have a significant impact—whether it be PTA, parents groups, or even the NAACP. Anywhere we felt like we could do some good—Lions Clubs—anything. We've been there. If they requested a speaker, we had one there for them.
SO THE IRS IS ONE OF THE RESISTORS?

Definitely. They're trying to remove the tax-free status on the Christian schools now, over the integration issue, and they've got a big drive on again this year to do that.

WHO PROVIDES THE MOST RESISTANCE? THE PRO-BUSING ORGANIZATIONS?

I would say the NAACP, if you're talking about one organization. The other night the black ministers were discussing this and they're like most people, they want to know, in view of so much evidence now that has come to light on the destructive effects of busing, and so many people who have put forth the constructive answers, and so many schools, especially minority schools who have achieved success in this country, why would the NAACP keep promoting busing? That is very simple. The NAACP in the '50s and the '60s had issues--public accommodations, the right to ride in the front or the back of the bus. They had a lot of fine issues. And morally, I agree with them; they were right. And you'd be surprised how many people that are NANS members marched in the '50s and the '60s to accomplish those things. Lino Graglia was one. I was president of the United Auto Workers local; I marched in Washington in support. But we were talking about giving people freedom.

Now, the reason the NAACP, I say, holds on so tightly to the busing issue is because they're out of issues. In other words, they're out of key issues that will keep their people and if they drop something like the integration issue and the forced housing issue, they will no longer have the need to function. They would no longer draw support. So for organizations like this, it's a matter of survival.

The NAACP Legal Defense Fund--why aren't those lawyers donating their time if this is such a noble effort? Look at their tax returns. They're the guys making a hundred fifty, two hundred thousand, five hundred thousand and a million dollars a year off busing cases. You'll find out that every one of them is tied up with federal grants. This guy, the minister over here, he's a secretary; he's getting $14,000 a year. Now this is in addition to what he gets off his church. We've seen it in city after city. When we've made application to get copies of the federal grants and they have to list their wages and who their paid personnel are. You turn around and take the dollar factor out of the busing issue, take the people who are getting paid to promote busing and you don't have a pro-busing movement. You destroy it overnight. Every leader, and I can't think without exception, who is promoting busing in one way or another, is getting either political votes or he's getting dollars, one of the two. And if they aren't getting that they aren't involved.
YOUR NEW AFFILIATES? WHAT ARE THE NEW AFFILIATES YOU'RE TRYING TO START AND WHAT NEW CITIES ARE YOU GOING INTO?

Portland, Texas, greater Texas, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I just talked to Fort Hill, Louisiana. We've got a new organization in southwest Michigan called Concerned Citizens. We've just about got those two separate chapters down there. We've just about got those talked into affiliating. We just organized Yonkers; we just organized a St. Louis, Missouri, chapter. I was trying to think of some more... But what I'm saying is, a lot of our people are working in areas that aren't major organization drives, but these are major organizational drives. These are areas where we send in two to three thousand NANS' brochures. We sent in a lot of other printed materials; we've got specific people who are going in and working on organizing efforts. This is mainly handled right here. They mainly contact me. I get whatever material they need and go through our records and see if we've got any contacts in that particular area. Then if they get a significant response and if they request a speaker to come in, then I get together with Bill on something like that. But we operate on a very low budget. So we have to see if there is a significant amount of interest in that area before we make any kind of financial commitment like $800 or $1000 expense money for plane tickets and motel reservations.

WHAT ABOUT YOUR POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE?

The Political Action Committee is Bill's baby, really. He's the man who heads it up. If I can furnish Bill with some information once in a while that he may not have—when I get significant information in here for file, I'll make one copy of that and send it to Bill. And if Bill gets something significant at his end, not for distribution, but for file, then he'll send it on down here. The political part, that's just about strictly Bill D'Onofrio who's it. He's the man.

AND THE LOBBYING GROUP? WHAT DO YOU HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH WITH THAT?

The same thing we've been accomplishing. Changing congressmen's and senators' minds. Getting our legislation passed. I think more significantly is knocking out incumbents who are pro-busers and I think we've got a real fine record on that score.

On 1180, when we get it in committee, then we'll put out a national call for individual organizations to get money together to pay transportation for their own people to come in and meet in Washington, say on a Wednesday or a Thursday. These people can go around individually and say, "Hey! We're from your constituency and we're here to lobby for the Mottl amendment." In other words, our lobbyist does a fine job and we have these people writing him. But
Ashbrook's doing a tremendous job. Mottl's doing a tremendous job. McDonald of Georgia, Gene Snyder, our own congressman here. We've had a lot of help.

If you take the other side, Jimmy Carter lobbied personally against us on the Mottl amendment. Fritz Mondale is a very strong pro-buser. You've got either very strong pro-busers--Ted Kennedy is another one--or you've got very strong anti-busers and the rest of them try to ride the middle-of-the-road by saying that it's the Constitution, you can't do anything about it. This is what the majority of them try to tell you, until you educate their constituency as to what they can do and when you do this you put the monkey on their back. And then they have to do something.

A lot of people here call Barry Bingham the kingmaker. He's that powerful. He is the only newspaper, let's face it. They call him the kingmaker for the state of Kentucky and he is very pro-busing and his publications are very pro-busing. If you go to Benton Harbor, Michigan, their media is anti-busing and then pro-anti-busing. You run into different situations in different parts of the country. California is split. The LA Times used to be pro-busing and the Herald-Tribune seemed to be anti-busing. In Boston, they've got the Boston Globe and the Boston Herald. The Boston Globe is very pro-busing and the Boston Herald is very anti-busing. You work with what you have and you work to change the rest.

I could add one thing to that, dollar-wise. It's probably the most unbalanced thing you'd ever see, but the pro-busers have funneled in millions and millions of dollars to promote this thing. But when our organization applied for tax reasons, not NANS--I was putting out 80,000 newspapers every two weeks. When we applied for our tax free status, we had to furnish every publication that we had ever printed. When the IRS read them all, they started their correspondence back and forth on why they wouldn't grant us a tax-free status. And when we finally got down to saying, "Get away from all the rhetoric, if you're going to deny us tax-free status, you have to make a specific charge as to why you're denying us tax-free status." Do you know what their charge was? We were opposed to social change. Now, we asked the attorneys about it and they said we could beat them to death. But it would have cost us $20,000 just to take them to court to get on tax-free status. Where any pro-busing organization, all they have to do is write out a slip of paper and fill out an application for 501C3 that says our principle purpose is to bring about racial balance in the so and so school system and they've got their tax-free status. It's that simple. Dollar-wise, they beat us to death. For every penny we've got to spend, they've got a hundred dollars to spend. But still, we keep beating the main stuff. It's an amazing record.
when these people go in person and say, "I'm from the Chamber of Commerce and I'm also a member of NANS and I'm down here on behalf of getting HR1180 passed." This has a much more significant impact on a congressman when he knows these people are from his area and they took the time and the expense to come to Washington. I don't think there's anything better than face-to-face contact as far as lobbying goes. You can have the best lobbyist in the world but still that congressman cares about how many votes you represent in his area when it comes down to brass tacks on the issue. This is a way we like to try to do. Same way on the Mottl amendment. I guess we had two to three hundred people running around the halls of Congress lobbying. It's a fine thing because some of those people came twelve to thirteen hundred miles just to lobby.

WHAT ARE NANS' FUTURE GOALS AND WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS WHAT WILL NANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

I personally believe we'll have busing stopped before five years are up. At that point I think NANS has got some very significant decisions to make and that'll be not only that we stopped forced busing but is that it for us or are we going on further to try to accomplish something better? And as for things like tuition tax credits and the voucher system, or something I fight for now—a lot of NANS leaders agree with my position. I would like to see us go on to make those things a reality. But we're going to have to wait until that day comes and see how everybody feels about it.

SO WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS YOU'LL HAVE YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT?

No, I'm not saying a constitutional amendment.

BUT YOU'LL STOP IT THROUGH OTHER LEGISLATIVE MEANS?

Right. We'll have it stopped through Article II, Section 3, by making it illegal for any court to go ahead and order it.

HOW HAS NANS EVOLVED AND BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED FROM ITS INCEPTION?

There again, there are a lot of answers to this one. But I think just by people helping people. I'm one of the few on the NANS board that does not have a degree. I've got a high school GED. I've had a lot of people sit down with me, like Professor Scott and others, that say, "Bob, what you're saying is right. But it's not too polished. It's not sophisticated. In other words, you reach a lot of people but you turn a lot of people off by doing certain things or saying certain things.
And I think basically NANS people have helped NANS people as far as the proper way to get messages across, the proper way to deliver a speech or something of this nature. I've always been proud that NANS people aren't the kind who say, "Well, I'm not going to say anything to so and so because I don't want to embarrass him." Because we're all fighting for the same goal and some constructive criticism can help out. I think more so than that, it's by the calibre of people we've attracted into NANS which has brought about significant change. Because everyday I sit here reading the mail I'm reading different people's ways of putting something across; I read different people's ways of making a point, and I think this helps me as an individual in analyzing the way I would say it and the way they've said it.

One letter I did here in a hurry one day, I got it sent back by--it must have been an English major--because every correction was made on there. And said, "Bob, if you want to get your point across this isn't the way to do it." So now I'm really careful about it. It was a letter that we didn't have time to proof read; it was late at night and it was something that had to go out in the morning mail and I had been in meetings all day and I ran in here and did it really quickly and it went out. I guarantee they let me know about it.

ORGANIZATIONALLY, THOUGH, HOW HAVE YOU BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED?

Number one, by studying political tactics in this country, by looking at other organizations that are successful--analyzing what their tactics have been. I think by having contact with other--I don't know if conservative is the right word--I hate labels. But I think just by exposure....exposure to other organizations, to studying the tactics of other organizations, by help that other organizations have given us, but again, the calibre of people that we've attracted in and all these things have been positive as far as NANS is concerned.

WHAT CONSCIOUS ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFINE THE RHETORIC BOTH LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY?

I think we've answered that. But constructive criticism, I think, has been one of the major things and I think the other major thing is the calibre of people we've attracted in and have lent assistance and helped us refine our technique.

HOW DID YOU BECOME SUCH AN ARTICULATE SPOKESPERSON FOR NANS AND WHAT WAS THE PROCESS BY WHICH YOU BECAME A LEADER? THIS GOES BACK TO STARTING HERE IN LOUISVILLE AND THEN JOINING NANS.

I would say studying the issue. More or less living it and breathing it. The first year of busing I very seldom came home. We
had offices on Princeton Highway then, and for the first year four or five hours sleep a night was all I ever got. I had people dragging in kids every day to tell things that happened to them in the schools, and just going on and going on reading everything I could get my hands on. Going up in debate against—at that point when it was a hot issue we had a lot of public television debates and things here—I would sit back and analyze a debate and when somebody got one in on me, I'd work to beef up that area because I didn't know all I should know about it.

So it's a question of being armed with more facts than anybody else in the country. And this is what you have to be, you have to be an absolute expert on the issue. You have to quote facts; you have to quote statistics; you have to commit them to memory. A lot of times for a debate, four to six hours before the debate started I would be sitting here just reviewing tons and tons of facts that I had already written. I'm one of those people who would go to a debate with thirty sheets of paper, but it's amazing that some way I always seem to be able to find that right sheet of people so I could double-check myself. I think it's just a question of doing the best job you can do and working as hard as you can work to do a good job.

KAYE FEELS THAT SHE WAS A MEDIA CREATION IN COLUMBUS. CONSIDERING THEIR ALTERNATIVES, THE MEDIA LATCHED ON TO HER BECAUSE SHE WAS SO ARTICULATE AND THEY HELPED HER TREMENDOUSLY. DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?

I've seen several copies from Columbus and in fact I've been there a couple of times myself. I would say on that that you would have to take Kaye's word for it. When they first started I think it was a lot of communication more than it was directly meeting with her.

BUT DO YOU THINK THAT THE MEDIA HERE HELPED YOU IN THE WAY THAT THEY HELPED HER?

Oh, no. No way! When busing started here there were twenty-three anti-busing organizations in Louisville. Concerned Parents was the largest.

WAS THAT YOUR GROUP?

No. And that was Sue Conners. And all the media was Sue Conners, Sue Conners, Sue Conners. And then after the riots here—I think particularly the thing that changed my mind was after all the riots everybody was scared to march and everything else...I think they arrested 197 in one night. A lot of people were beaten in the streets; they had the National Guard in here, Kentucky State Police, Jefferson County Police, Louisville City Police, Federal Marshalls; there were a lot of injustices on both sides. I put together a voter's registration march, that was in '75, which I turned around and got a lot of
union men as marchers and I told them there wasn't going to be anybody carrying a racist sign or anything else in that march. And the time to get it settled was now. In other words, fall out in the street if you don't agree because you don't have to march with us. If you believe differently than we believe then form your own march and march. But we weren't going to have people throwing rocks or putting out racial slurs or anything else because we weren't that type people.

After that march was very successful --no problems--then I came back out here on Preston Highway and they were having a rather large demonstration and they had a very large bonfire built on a shopping center parking lot. I had been called to go out there. They had three lines of riot-equipped police with three-foot billy clubs. I went over there and I talked to them. This was a time when constitutional rights were suppressed very heavily here in Jefferson County.

The Major who was in charge told me, "Bob, we don't want to bust up those people's demonstration, but that fire"--they had logs, tires, everything burning out there--was actually burning the blacktop parking lot and had the tar on fire--he said, "If those people will agree to turn around and let the fire department come in and put out that fire they can have some barrel fires." It was cold. And I went over there and I talked to everybody and they agreed that they would do this. Well, the fire department pulled up, we had some agitators in there; they started throwing rocks and bottles at the firemen and the firemen pulled out. That brought a major confrontation and a lot of people were hurt.

I said to myself, "There's got to be a better way." That's when we decided that the best way to do things was to start printing our own newspaper, getting out the facts, getting people involved this way instead of head-to-head confrontation.

I think after Sue Conners fell out of favor with the people--there was a lot of scandal about money and this and that, and I don't know how much of it was true or not...But there was one question on the march that they were going to have uptown. This was a question where the federal judge had an injunction against her marching and the people wanted her to march. Well, she didn't march and after that it was sort of up for grabs.

We had the Ku Klux Klan in here recruiting ninety miles an hour; we had the Nazi Party people in here. You name it--everybody was in here trying to get the people to join what they believed in. And I think over a period of a year or so, when it came to answering the pro-busers in editorial responses and debates, things like this, why these people fell flat on their faces because they didn't know anything about the issue. You got the kind of rhetoric that bluebirds
and redbirds don't mix and whites and blacks don't mix. All the ridiculousness that you can think of. Eventually I think that people saw that I was trying to do things the right way and that I was doing them the right way, and eventually, the majority of the people came to me.

That takes us back to an earlier question. Was your original group violence oriented?

No.

Your group never was?

No.

So then it was easy to bring them into NANS?

Now, let me explain something to you here. When you say violence oriented. I wrote several major articles condemning the violence on both sides. Some articles were printed in the Courier, the Times. But I always told people that you have a right to stand up for your constitutional rights. I went to jail twice over this issue. One time was at Churchill Downs when I went up and confronted the Chief of Police over telling a woman that she had three minutes to get her—they all had anti-busing buttons—to get those off or go to jail. She had a constitutional right, a freedom of speech and freedom of expression and the right to petition her government for redress of her grievances. I was arrested over this issue. I was unanimously acquitted. I filed suit against the city; that cost me $2,000. I got $500 back out of it. But at least it was standing up for what we believed in within the confines of the law.

Another time, they issued an order against protest because they had trouble at Valley Station. I had a bunch of my people over here at our offices on Preston, standing on our own property with American flags. They told me that they had an order that nobody could protest in Jefferson County. I told them we were on our own property, that we had a constitutional right to be here. They gave us five minutes to disperse then they moved in with riot-equipped police and took us to jail. We were all unanimously acquitted there. Again, because we were standing within the confines of the Constitution; we weren't endangering public safety; we weren't blocking roads or sidewalks; we weren't bothering anybody. What I'm saying is, I draw the line there. When they go to take away your constitutional rights that's the time you have to stand up, but you don't have to stand up in violence. You can make your point as well standing there with the American flag in your hand a lot better than you can standing there with a baseball bat in your hand. And this is what I've told my people.
By the way, that case comes up in Federal Court somewhere towards the end of this month.

I filed charges of U.S. civil rights violations against the county police department. They've got it postponed four times now. This last time they said that they wanted to postpone to take depositions from people. That was eight months ago. They've never taken deposition one and the trial comes up this month. That's where I draw the line. There's violence and there's legal resistance; I advocate legal resistance but I don't advocate violence.

Of all the splinter groups that were originally active, how many of them came into NANS?

The majority. Their members came into NANS and then they, as organizations, went out of existence. Today there are four active organizations, National Organization to Restore and Preserve Freedom, which I'm chairman of; Valley Station Regulars, which really doesn't hold meetings or anything but they do hold a demonstration once in a while; Supporters for Freedom, and NANS. And the Supporters' president is at least at every other one of our NANS meetings and supports NANS wholeheartedly and most of his people are members of NANS.

So you still have the four main groups functioning now?

Actively, people that are meeting at least bi-weekly, there are three groups and that would be Supporters, National Organization to Restore and Preserve Freedom, and NANS. And all three of these work together.

What happened to the other twenty-one?

They just went out of existence. They lost. They lost support. Nobody was showing up at their meetings and eventually they went from meeting weekly to meeting every other week, to meeting monthly, and then eventually out of existence.

As the leader of a social movement, what was the most difficult problem you encountered to date and how did you solve that problem?

There have been a lot of difficult ones. I'm trying to think of the most difficult. I think the most difficult problem we had and that I had was overcoming the belief that all anti-busers were racist. This is a charge that was leveled at us every time we turned around. If you're against busing you're Ku Klux Klan; if you're against busing you're a racist. Fortunately, I was one of the individuals who had a track record dating back from the '50s. They
could show my involvement in human rights and civil rights and which side of the issue I was on. Confronting these people, especially in television debates and things like this, I was able to get my message across. That's why I eventually got speaking engagements in the black area where I could reach the black people. Coming up in October, I'm going to have a major speaking engagement in the west end of Louisville to the black community on minority education.

It was the hardest thing we had to overcome because it was very easy for the pro-busers to label everybody as a racist who opposed forced busing. And it was a hard thing for us to overcome.

We had one march here--between ten and twenty thousand people--that was a Concerned Parents march. Now if you take ten people there that walked into that march with signs, "KKK All the Way!" or something, I guarantee you every camera there is going to zero in on those signs. So automatically, they label everybody. This is a hard thing to overcome and it's a hard thing to get across to people that they can't be associated with this kind of thing. I had a lot of arguments with my own people. Everybody's got a right to march. And I say, sure, but if you're conducting a march and it's your march, you've got a right to say what kinds of signs will be in that march or if there will be signs in that march. And what I'm saying is that what you're doing is letting somebody else use you and I've said that we can't have that. If we're going to let people really know what we're about, then we can't be supporting images that are contrary to what we believe in. A lot of people disagreed with me on this issue. I think eventually we prevailed. But it was about the most difficult thing. I think every area of the country will pretty much tell you the same thing...to get over this racist image that they want to portray.

I know Kaye had a lot of trouble when the Klan had their rally on the steps there, and how they can proclaim themselves as an anti-busing movement when they can't show one constructive thing they've done to try to stop busing.

SOME OF THIS YOU'VE ALREADY ADDRESSED. WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED AND HOW HAVE YOU MET THESE CHALLENGES?

I think I've addressed most of them. You know I've addressed or debated and been part of panel discussions with a lot of sociologists, psychologists, people of this nature. And I think one of the--probably the hardest--drawbacks for me is that I don't have the academic credentials that a person in my position should have. And when I go against these kinds of people, why I always felt for years that that was a drawback. But I found out that people as a whole listen to you and how authoritative you are with the facts.
What I'm trying to accomplish is to be able to get in front of people who are reasonably intelligent and turn around and present the facts, not rhetoric, but present the facts and back them up with the type of credentials which most people consider as what they need to influence them on a given situation.

I felt that way for years. You sit with a board of people and everybody's got a degree in this and that, and this one's a professor of education here, and this one is a constitutional lawyer here, and there you are. I always felt like it was a drawback for me, but lately I haven't been received that way or perceived that way. But for years it did bother me very much because I'm the kind of person who's very good at speaking to a blue-collar group at a union meeting. But when it comes to addressing academicians, I had to do a lot of studying and change a lot of terminology to get on their plane and get my point across.

There's just been a lot of things. Making the decision to get out of the street and then to make everything political. A lot of people were opposed to this and I'm still not opposed to street demonstrations as long as they're conducted credibly and honorably, that they add to the message you're trying to get across not detract from them. This is the way I've written several NANS chapters and told them that how you're perceived is going to be by how you act. Everybody is going to be watching. I guess there's been a lot of problems, but nothing we couldn't work out.

WHAT CHARACTERISTICS OR TALENTS DO YOU POSSESS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR SUCCESS AS A SPOKESPERSON? DETERMINATION?

Being an outspoken individual, I guess that's helped quite a bit. I guess having the determination to stick with something.

AS A LEADER WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE YOUR GREATEST STRENGTHS AND SHORTCOMINGS?

One is my family. I know that a lot of leaders had problems and conflicts because it took too much time from their family life and this kind of thing. My wife and children have always been right with me, working with me and everything. This has been a tremendous asset. Other assets are a lot of fine friends, a lot of people who believe in me. And probably a good upbringing as far as instilling morals and pride into me, myself. I was brought up to believe that you could be anything you want to be, you can learn anything you want to learn. As long as you're willing to sacrifice to take the time and study and learn and put forth what you've learned. And I've always been a positive individual in that respect and I guess I have to attribute that to the way I was brought up because that's the way I was always taught. There's nothing you can't do if you want to do it bad enough. These are the things I think all add strength to what you do.
YOU OBVIOUSLY HAVE VERY STRONG ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS.

I was United Auto Workers President over twenty years ago. In fact, I went against the UAW on several issues and UAW did teach me quite a bit about organizing, so...

WHAT ABOUT YOUR SHORTCOMINGS?

Ah. Shortcomings. I have shortcomings, too.

AS A LEADER?

I have a very hard time sometimes in controlling my temper, especially when somebody is making a very idiotic statement as far as the anti-busing movement, or the busing issue or things like this. I fight very hard to control that and I do a pretty good job of that. But it is a shortcoming because I know I should put myself above that. I should turn around and be like a lot of people who are able to dismiss things like this by saying, "That man's making a fool out of himself so why should I let this bother me?" But I do let it bother me. I still come home and wake up in the middle of the night thinking about what somebody said.

WHAT HAS YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH NANS TAUGHT YOU ABOUT YOURSELF, OTHER PEOPLE, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT?

About myself. It's taught me that I can accomplish a lot more than I thought I could accomplish as far as the debates, etc. Until it happens to you, it's hard to explain. But when you're going up against--say like we did at the Gault House--I went up against three prominent social scientists who are in here with pro-busing evidence to support their case--I was looking at their credentials and saying, "Hey! You've got a high school GED!" But when I went up against these people with the facts and figures and the logical argument and the truth, I came out on top. All these things magnify themselves.

Other people. It's taught me that there's a whole lot of caring, sincere people in this country. You'd be surprised at the number of NANS who don't have children--whose children are raised; they're grandparents now. I've just found out that there's a lot of wonderful people in this country and a lot of people who believe just like I believe.

With the establishment, sad to say, I've found out that most politicians are in it for a buck, what they can get for themselves. And I can tell you some long stories on this. Basically, the majority
of politicians are very selfish and very self-motivated people. I went to Frankfort, Kentucky, when we were lobbying for anti-busing legislation. George Armstrong, who is the President of the Kentucky chapter of NANS and I sat down and met with Governor Carroll. We had an appointment set up by the State Representative Bob Hughes, Dottie Purdy and Archie Romines. We told them what bills that we wanted passed. He told us at that time that we had them. Now, these are things I even told the Courier-Journal, and the Governor never said, "He's wrong."

But, anyway, that was my first lesson as far as politics goes. We went up there and they were debating this one bill very hotly and heavily on the floor. Bob Hughes and Dottie Purdy called me over to the side and they told me to get down to the Governor's office and to tell him that this bill is in trouble. And that we need help.

I went down to the Governor's office, talked to the Governor's secretary and held her what happened. She sent me into his office. He called his male secretary in and he wrote a note. We went back upstairs and they called a caucus out in the hall....the majority caucus on this side, the minority on that side. This is after two or three hours of hot and heavy debate on this bill, this was to cut off all state funding for desegregation purposes. It was Archie Romine's bill. They told those people that this was the Governor's bill. They walked back in there and there was never another word of debate. The bill was put up to a vote and it was passed unanimously.

That night at the Holiday Inn where a lot of legislators hang around, we were having a victory celebration about getting our bills passed. And I guess there were about fifteen or twenty State Senators and House of Representative members there and I asked them how they could let one man dictate how they would vote. And two or three evaded the issue but one State Senator told me, "It's very simple, Bob. You are elected by constituents and these people have needs. That's the reason they elect you. Maybe it's roads; maybe it's sewers; maybe it's school taxes. Now if you go against the Governor that means the Governor goes against you. So if you don't vote with the Governor, you can't get anything that your people want. Therefore, you can't serve your constituents. So either you go along or else you forget about them."

I found that same case to be true all the way up into national politics. They trade votes, whatever administration is in power, just like the Supreme Court. If you've got a liberal President, he's going to appoint liberals to the Supreme Court. If you've got a conservative President he's going to appoint conservatives to the Supreme Court. Look at Drew Days, Asst. Attorney General. He's an
ex-NAACP attorney. Thurgood Marshall, sitting on the Court, was an attorney for the '54 Brown case.

It's all political favors and that's the reason I think you find out the AFL-CIO and the UAW backed the busing issue so heavy because it's a voting coalition. It's, "We'll deliver the black vote, the labor vote, you deliver the labor vote for the civil rights issues." It's one hand washing the other and the American people are stuck in the middle and I think it's a rotten system. I'd like to see it changed, but it's going to take a lot of work.

AS AN INDIVIDUAL, WHAT ULTIMATE EFFECT WILL YOU HAVE ON THE SOCIETY?

That I can't answer. I'll tell you what ultimate effect I would like to have. I'd like to be part of bringing forth the voucher system in this country. And I'd like to be part of bringing about equality, true equality of educational opportunity to every child in this nation. I'd like to be part of eliminating what I feel is tearing this country apart--this racism rhetoric. How can you turn around and tell a black child today that he's had an equal educational opportunity if he's been put in a sub-standard public school while another child has had a choice of being put into a very above average private school, as far as competing in later life? As long as we've got a system like we have today of state education for the poor, private education for the more affluent, I don't think we're ever going to be able to say that we've afforded equal opportunity to all.

When we erase these kinds of programs, then we can start looking for that color blind society that was talked about so much in the '50s and the '60s. Where we can say that you had the same opportunity as everybody else did to become a doctor, to become a lawyer.

The Bakke case, I was heavily involved in that. We started to file an amicus curie brief; I had several write-ups, in fact, I had a half-page write-up here in the Courier-Journal. But in that case, there were only one hundred openings for medical school but there were three thousand applicants when Bakke tried to get in. This means that over 2,900 were left outside the door.

The U.S. Department of Justice brief showed where the dean had the right to appoint five percent of that class. The people on the admissions program had the right to pick so many, sons and daughters of alumnae had so many positions. Then this so-called fifteen percent minority positions. I was telling these black ministers that was tokenism. They turn around and throw you a crumb and you feel like you've gained something as far as rights go. But talk to those 2,900 outside the door and how many of those are not minority
children? What do you say to those kids as far as getting something for them? I told them fight for something reasonable that will correct the situation.

If we turn around and give all children an equal educational opportunity and then turned around and said to those who wanted to go on to law school or to medical school that if you can score high enough to show that you can get the job done, or if you can't, then work for another year, study another year and come back and do it again, we'll put up the tax money to finance a medical school for you. We'll build more medical schools. But when you get that degree and you get that internship, and you start making good money, then you're going to have to pay back x amount of dollars so the next kid can become a doctor.

Open up more medical schools in this country, then you're achieving social justice. Then you're going the right route. But to turn around and line yourselves politically for tokenism, and that's what it is, because there are 435 members of Congress, 100 members of the United States Senate, the majority of which vote for busing, but not one has got his child in a forced busing situation. The Vice-President of the United States turned around and has his child chauffeur-driven to Maryland to attend a public school to which he paid tuition instead of having him in the D.C. school system. All these hypocrites all the way through preach this garbage about helping minorities, are just that--either they're making a dollar off it, they're getting a vote off it, or they've got some kind of a motivation.

But when it comes to true social justice and equality of opportunity, none of them fight for it and they're scared to death of it.

WHAT KINDS OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER?

Ethical dilemmas. I think I'm fighting for what I've believed in all my life as far as freedom and justice go, so it has not been a dilemma for me. I tell a lot of people that I'm no different today than I was twenty years ago when I was marching in Washington, D.C., to bring about rights for people. And I'm fighting for rights of children today, so really as far as ethical dilemmas go, there's no difference.

AS YOU'VE STATED BEFORE, IF YOU STRETCH THE TRUTH WITH YOUR MEMBERSHIP YOU RUN THE RISK OF THEM FINDING OUT....

That's right.
THE SAME WITH THE SOCIETY? SOMETIMES IF YOU'RE FORCED TO RESORT TO DISTORTION, WOULD THIS LEAD TO AN ETHICAL PROBLEM?

I was in worse shape than most people when it comes to that. Because I was putting out--see all those--those are just headlines off newspapers that I've written, and some of those were twelve and fourteen page newspapers and a lot of them I wrote forty percent of the entire paper. Those were distributed not only all over Jefferson County, but they were sent to people all over the country. And that was '75, '76, '77. So they can still look back and say, "Hey! Bob DePrez said this." So for Bob DePrez, it's a little bit different saying something and then denying it, than it is writing something and putting it in print for the world to see. Do you understand what I'm saying? So you've got to be right.

Now, I'm not saying that I haven't made a mistake like saying 34,000 children left Boston in the first four years and come back here to the office and looked it up and it was 32,500--but what I'm saying is there's no time that I went out there and said that 95,000 children left in the first two years when only 2,000 left. In other words, I've made a few statistical mistakes coming off the top of my head, but they've been in a very close range. In other words, another 1,500 wouldn't have made that much difference. But the few times I've done that I've morally disciplined myself to not let it happen again.

YOU'VE NEVER HAD TO TAKE ANY KIND OF INTENTIONAL ACTION THAT YOU FELT SORRY FOR LATER?

Not that I can think of. I try to weigh out everything I do very, very carefully.

ANYTHING ELSE?

No. Except that we're very happy that you're doing this. We hope it will be of some significant contribution somewhere along the line to accomplishing something better for kids in this country.
WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH NANS? YOU CAN ALSO TALK ABOUT YOUR PAST POSITIONS.

I am now a member of the Board of Directors. I was President in 1978 and 1979; I am a charter member; I was one of the co-founders of NANS.

COULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHAT IT WAS LIKE IN DENVER WHEN NANS WAS STARTING?

We came together in Denver for a meeting of people that we had contacts with across the country with the purpose of forming a national organization. We were leery, we had several meetings; we attended several meetings; we had a few speakers from across the country. Then we went into our own private meeting and we set up a set of by-laws. We tried to write them so that we could be incorporated in Denver, Colorado. And we also wanted a set of by-laws that could pertain to any part of the country. Once we got those by-laws set, we became incorporated in Denver, then we could branch out, use that same set of by-laws in any state in the country.

WHAT OTHER ORGANIZATIONS ARE YOU AFFILIATED WITH?

Locally, I am a member of several Democratic clubs. I am involved in PTA; I'm a member of the Order of Eastern Star, Moral Majority, Save Our Community Schools, and several local civic organizations.

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH NANS, PRESENT OR PAST.

As a member of the Board of Directors, when we formed, it was one of my duties and all the other directors' duties to come together. We tried to meet twice a year, and we would take ideas from our local city and we would try to get together. We approved memberships from the various organizations across the country and in NANS. These were affiliates. We tried to spread the word; we tried to get members; we tried to let our local people know that NANS existed. We just really tried to get a lot of free publicity.
Some of us were invited to appear on local TV panel shows and we did at every opportunity. A lot of us were school board members and we had a lot of opportunity because the press would always come to us and we then had the opportunity to mention NANS' name. We took advantage of that. We would go to local meetings and tell people about NANS, such as PTA meetings. We would not announce it during the official part of the meeting, but we would always have NANS membership applications with us, and we would talk to individuals and we passed the word around through the various organizations we belonged to.

DESCRIPT THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF NANS BOTH LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY.

Nationally, we have the President, the First Vice-President and the Second Vice-President, the Secretary, Treasurer, and the Assistant Treasurer, and then we have the Board of Directors. We try to have our Board of Directors made up of people from across the country and I think Ohio and Kentucky probably have the most representatives on the Board of Directors—Kentucky has four and Ohio has three.

The directors from Kentucky were very active and we attended all the meetings and we were there when NANS was founded and became incorporated. We all went into different areas. Bob DePres was a fine communication person, and that was the type of thing that Bob liked to do so he went into that area of it. Each one of us did what we felt we could to best. What I enjoyed doing, and what I did when I was President, was to speak to the various groups across the country that were forming and to try to give them a little bit of the history as to what happened here in Louisville, Kentucky, and Boston...the turmoil, the riots that occurred in Louisville and Boston. We were not proud of those riots. Innocent people were hurt and certainly we did not want anyone to go through what we went through here and in Boston. It was unfortunate that it happened. So we tried to point out, I did, in speaking to the various groups, that you must fight court-ordered busing. But do it in the way that it was put upon us—legally. Let's do it through Congress and through the courts.

So each Board of Directors in their own state will spread the word about NANS in their own community. And we invited our congressmen to become members of NANS, therefore they would be aware that there is an organization such as NANS. The two senators from Kentucky have been most helpful. Senators Ford and Huddleston have been most helpful to us in spreading the word about NANS and in recognizing NANS as a viable organization. Each Board of Directors tried to do that in their own area, then when we would have our
meetings, I would give a report back to our committee. The one from Nevada would give her report, one from Arizona, and California, and so on and so forth.

And we tried to help each other with ideas in ways of communicating with people and ways of trying to gain free publicity, letters to the editor, this type of thing, and we became quite successful in passing on ideas. What one person did in one state, we tried to decide if it would be good for us here in Kentucky. And if we thought it would, we'd give it a try. So we were helpful to each other in that way.

Our main purpose was to get NANS recognized as a viable organization, not as a fly-by-night, not as a money grabbing organization; of course we certainly had to have money to operate; what we wanted was people because we believed that people are the most important thing you can have. People that believe in what you're doing, that believe in your organization, and the volunteers; I think we were quite successful in that.

I WANT TO BACK UP A MINUTE. FIRST THERE WAS MR. SOUTHWORTH. WAS HE A TEMPORARY PRESIDENT?

Right. He was temporary.

WAS HE EVER REALLY A PART OF THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT?

Oh, yes, he was.

IS HE STILL INVOLVED?

Yes. He's on the Board of Directors and he's very much involved.

WHO CAME NEXT?

Jim Venema was elected President and then Joyce DeHaven from Dallas, Texas, and then me, and I had it for two years, and now Bill D'Onofrio.

HOW MANY NANS AFFILIATES ARE THERE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES?

That's rather hard for me to answer since I went out as President. I did not attend the last NANS board meeting; I was ill. I really don't know. I know we have affiliates in about fifteen to twenty states and in Kentucky there are four or five different local antibusing organizations that are affiliates. Probably Kaye Cook can answer that or Bill could answer that better than I could.
WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF NANS? YOUR DUES-PAYING STRUCTURE.

We have various levels of dues. We have an individual five dollar dues and for that five dollars a person becomes a member of NANS but they do not receive our newsletter. For ten dollars we have an individual membership. The person does receive a newsletter and anyone can have input into the newsletter. We can all send in articles or anything that we want printed in the newsletter. And then we have a one hundred dollar membership for local organizations, such as Save Our Community Schools. SOCS is an affiliate of NANS, Columbus, Ohio--their name is NANS of Columbus.

We were incorporated here in Kentucky back in 1971, and we felt that probably would not destroy our image, but we were known as SOCS; and we were an affiliate of NANS in the beginning. But we did not change our name. We do have a NANS of Kentucky and anyone can belong to that. You would have to understand back when busing started in any city or any community; you have your people like we were that started it before it started and then you have your groups that crop up over night, we we were probably better known. We had a name, people respected us in this community so we just didn't change our name. But that's the one hundred dollar membership and then we have a life membership which, I think, is five hundred dollars. And then we ask for donations for our lobbyist and local groups such as SOCS and the one from Wilmington, Columbus, those groups; we try to help with the expenses of the lobbyist expense.

DOES ALL MONEY COME FROM DUES?

Yes, We've never had any fund-raising events in NANS. Locally we have. We would sell bumper stickers, buttons, this type of thing. It was a very low-keyed fund-raising effort. When SOCS first started, we even had bake sales to get money. People donated. The first trip we took to Washington the three of us in that organization actually counted pennies for our plane fare to go to Washington. And it's been good. We still have and we retain a very small bank balance now. It's just about gone because people here locally feel that busing is here; there's nothing we can do about it; so why should I keep my membership up? We had a membership in SOCS of two dollars per person per year. We've never raised that. It's still that. We just never raised it because we felt that with the economy the way it is people couldn't afford it and I'm sure this is true in NANS. Some of them felt that we needed the ten dollar individual membership, but I think we would have more members if we had smaller donations. But that's the only way through donations.
APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE LOCALLY, STATEWIDE, AND NATIONALLY?

Locally we probably have about two hundred to three hundred members.

THESE ARE ALL OF THE NANS AFFILIATES? SOCS?

Right. NANS of Kentucky, right, that actually joined NANS as individuals.

APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE THERE WHO DO NOT PAY DUES BUT WHO ARE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF NANS?

I think there are a tremendous number of people out there. And I think it's like anything else. They probably don't want to take the time or perhaps they don't have the money to become a member but yet they wholeheartedly support what you're doing. And I think we have a much larger support of people than even we realize. People that agree and people have told me this: "We really appreciate what you all are doing." So that was our offer to them to join. We would give them an application and some would send it in and some would not.

HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE STATEWIDE?

Probably our biggest membership comes from Louisville and Jefferson County. We have some in Lexington and probably a few in Paducah, Kentucky, that would be probably three hundred.

NATIONALLY?

We had, it seemed, when I went out as President, something like twenty-one to twenty-five hundred. Again, I'm guessing at these figures.

WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH NANS AND WHAT ATTRACTED YOU TO THE ORGANIZATION?

I had been involved in so much locally; I truly believed that busing children for racial balance was so wrong, and I recognized that we had to do something. And I also recognized that locally we, as an organization, could do absolutely nothing. The problem is a national problem.

When some of us across the country communicated and decided to have the meeting in Denver, I went to that meeting with the intention of forming a national organization. I believe then and I still believe that it would take a national organization to accomplish our
goal. We could not stop it here in Louisville, Kentucky, alone. The people in Denver could not stop busing in Denver alone. It would take all of us in this country working together, and this is what attracted me to it.

And also what attracted me was the type of people that were there at that very first meeting. They were not radical people. They were conservative people. They believed in education. They were intelligent people. They believed that education is the most important part of a child's life. And this is what we wanted for all children. This attracted me. The type of people that helped form NANS and the type of people that were NANS members.

DO YOU THINK THAT ONE OF THE ATTRACTIONS TO NANS WAS THAT THE PEOPLE WERE NOT VIOLENCE-PRONE THAT THEY BELIEVED IN THE LAW?

As I told you earlier, I personally think that the wrong way to handle a grievance is to take it to the streets. And I firmly believe the way to stop or to disagree with the law, even though that law is there, we can disagree with it and we can work to change the law. This is what NANS tried and what we're still trying to do and I believe we will be successful.

I think that what we have to do is to have the laws changed and to get the Supreme Court out of education; and get our judges out of education; and it's going to take legislation to do that. I don't think we solve anything by marching up and down the street. I think we solve it where it started and that is in Congress and in our courts.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS ATTRACTED TO NANS? DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL NANS MEMBER.

I think the typical NANS member is the person I just described. I think the typical person is what we call the silent majority. People in this country who have sat back and they have agreed with NANS' theory and NANS' philosophy, yet they knew or realized that perhaps they could not do anything alone. This is what attracted people to NANS. People are attracted to NANS because they know we are a non-violent organization; that we believe in working through the courts; and I believe this is why people support us. Once they learned that we were sincere in what we were doing, and I think people across this country are now realizing that NANS is an organization that is responsible, that we do care and that we want to change these laws for everybody. I'm not only concerned about what happens in Louisville, Kentucky, I am concerned about what happens in Indianapolis, Indiana, and in any city in this country.
BUT IF YOU COULD GIVE A COMPOSITE DESCRIPTION OF A NANS MEMBER, WHAT WOULD THAT DESCRIPTION BE?

I would say that they were an average, middle-income person, very active in their community, very active in their schools, people who attend civic meetings, that type of person. People who care what happens to this country, people who want this country to remain a free country.

HOW DOES NANS WORK TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT RHETORICAL APPEALS HAVE BEEN USED? WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN ATTRACTING MEMBERS, MOLDING THEM INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT, AND KEEPING THEM INVOLVED?

We tried to appeal to everyone in this country that we could reach by telling them what happened in our city. What we basically tried to do was to get into a community before busing started. When I would go into a community I would tell them what happened. I did not elaborate on the riots that happened here. I would elaborate on that has happened to our school system--financially what's happened. Is the teacher spending all day disciplining students or is she spending all day teaching? This we tried to get across and this appealed to the people in Eau Claire, Michigan. We had a huge meeting there and the people listened to some of the things we told them that had happened in our school system here. And you could almost see the expression on those people's faces! I don't want that to happen to my school system or to our school system. And I think once we told them this story, not only what happened here, but what's happened in every community where busing has been implemented, I think these people felt they had to organize, form their own organization, not as a street-marching group but as a group who would work through their own legislature, their local legislature, as well as their congressmen.

WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN ATTRACTING MEMBERS, MOLDING THEM INTO AN EFFECTIVE WORK UNIT AND KEEPING THEM INVOLVED?

One of the biggest problems we had in attracting people to join NANS... You go into a city and they looked upon us as leaders of a national organization. Maybe they lived in South Bend, Indiana, and I'm in Louisville, Kentucky, and their first question is, "What can you do for me? What can you do to stop busing in Eau Claire, Michigan?"

I did not have an answer. None of us had an answer to that because we knew there was nothing we could do once that judge had ordered busing in that city; there was not one thing we, the national
organization, could do to stop that order. So that was our biggest
problem and it still is. I think we've overcome the problem of the
South vs. the North, the East vs. the West, because we now have
memberships all over the country. And we've gained that name;
gained recognition as a viable organization, as a true, competent
organization. But that was our biggest problem of people saying,
"Look, nobody offered to help us when...we started." And, of course,
our answer was, "The only thing we can do is apologize to you for
not coming forward and helping you, but if we could form a national
organization, someday we can help you and we are a sounding board.
We need your help; we need your experience; we need you in NANS
to help those of us that are just starting busing or these cities
where busing has not yet been implemented."

We have overcome that problem. But one of our biggest
problems right now is communication. We have financial problems; we
don't have the money to run ads on national TV. There's an awfully
lot of people in this country that are still unaware that we exist.
I'm sure they would agree with us and that they would be members.
Our biggest problem is getting our message out to the people who are
unaware that we exist.

Now, once we get to these people, once we tell those people what
our goals are and that we're not only working for the people in our
own communities, but we're going to work for the people in their
community and once we make those people realize that they cannot stop
it locally, I think this is how we mold them in with us. They come to
realize that's true. We can't stop it locally so what we need is a
strong national organization. Once they're drawn in and once they
see some of the things we have accomplished--such as our debate with
the Commission on Civil Rights, we definitely won that battle.
And once we tell these people about that, once they realize we are
not a violent group, they join in with us.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONFLICTS YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED WITH MEMBERS
AS TO DIFFERENCES IN PHILOSOPHY, TACTICS, STRATEGIES THAT ARE
EMPLOYED TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS?

Certainly, I think we have our own philosophy. At one time
we had a little problem. The people who felt as I did that you don't
stop it by marching in the street, you stop it through the courts
and by legislation. And there were some of the people who felt
that we need national attention and there was a problem there of our
philosophy, and even though all of us were willing to listen to each
side of this issue, then we finally decided, "Well, if you feel
that's what you have to do in your community that will be your
responsibility." But NANS did pass a resolution that said that NANS would not endorse any marches, anything of this nature. And those people who decided they wanted to do that—marches, anything of that nature, Cleveland did it, Boston did it, some of the other cities went ahead and did it—and they were members of NANS. But here again, they were doing that as individuals.

But what we try to stress was that we did not want to project or for people to get the idea that NANS was a violent organization and here we said from the very beginning we were a non-violent organization and we wanted to present that image that we have worked so hard to build-up, and we have built that up. So that was a problem.

I think you'll always have a communication problem. We ran into a few problems when I was President, of getting the word out, or perhaps me making a phone call to all the directors about a certain issue that was coming up, something of that nature. Maybe I had some personal things that had to be taken care of. It's a time element and a communication problem that I think you have in any national organization. I don't recall any major problem that we were never able to resolve. We resolved any matter or problem that came up.

HOW DID THE LEADERS OF NANS WORK TO REDUCE THE FRUSTRATIONS OF ITS MEMBERS AS TO THEIR FEELINGS ABOUT FORCED BUSING AND HOW DOES NANS WORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ITS MEMBERS?

When busing started here in Louisville, in '76, I was a school board member at that time as well as a parent. And I lived through that period and I think by me going into other communities, telling those people what happened locally, it was amazing to watch their faces. When you would talk to those people in public meetings and in some places we had two to three thousand people that came to our meeting, and to talk to those people individually before and after the meetings and meet with some of them in their homes, and to tell them what had happened here and I would always stress to those people, "I don't want to see this happen to you and your community." I think their reaction almost always was, "Here's a person from another city who cares about me and I'm two or four hundred miles from her city, yet she cares what happens in our community." And that was one thing—we had to introduce ourselves to these people and let them know that we did care what happened to them.

HOW DOES IT WORK TO MEET THE NEEDS OF ITS MEMBERS?

What we do now is that in our newsletter we share what is going on. This comes out monthly, maybe every six weeks. There's always a
little part of what is happening in Louisville, Kentucky, what is happening in other parts of the country. It always helps me or someone else to know that they've got the same problem in Dallas, Texas, that we have in Louisville, Kentucky. And once we get all these people to realize--again, it all goes back to the same thing the only way we can do anything is on a national basis--and once these people realize that, then they know that we are there; we're willing to help them; we can console them, we can sympathize with them and this is what people want. They want to know that somebody is on their side. And they know that we are on their side.

DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AUDIENCES NANS IS ATTEMPTING TO REACH.

The news media, the Congress, people going through it. Cities that are just going into busing; cities that have been busing, like Pasadena. They were back in the courts. All of these people need to know that we care what happens and we were there and I think we can use all of this together. As I said, letters to the editor, any type of meeting if we advertise that meeting and in most papers across the country they have a section that's called neighborhood section or whatever, you can have published notice of meetings. Okay, if we're having a meeting of NANS of Kentucky here or SOCS, we can have that printed for free. And if we have a speaker, congressman so and so will be there to speak, Representative so and so will be there, and what goes on. By sending out newsletters, this type of thing, I think we can reach the people too. We certainly could use more media coverage.

DO YOU THINK THERE'S A REASON THAT YOU'RE NOT GETTING THE MEDIA COVERAGE?

Oh, yes! Very definitely. I would say ninety percent of the news media in the country felt like the only thing they wanted to do, certainly the newspapers, their purpose is to sell newspapers. Well, the good things that are happening are not news. Now, if we were an organization that marched everyday up and down the streets we would make news. But that, in my opinion, is bad publicity. But they would cover that.

But, I think the news media, I don't think it's the individuals, and I know this for a fact, that reporters from our own local newspapers, we ran into several that were sympathetic to our cause; they never told us this, but I think you can judge that from their conversations; and we found out who those people were, who those reporters were, and when we would have a meeting we would find that individual. And they would write stories sympathetic or build up our organization or our cause. Well, it wasn't very long until that reporter left the newspaper. They were transferred somewhere else.
And a new one would take their place, somebody that did not know the background of Jean Ruffra, Joyce Bond, or Bob DePrez, or people that had been involved locally; so that person would come in and they would have to read all that had happened but yet maybe they weren't sympathetic. To me, it was the owners or publishers of those papers that would try to put the people on to us that were not sympathetic to our cause. This was a problem. And it still is.

And, I think most of the papers across the country and the news media, certainly on TV, it's hard to--unless it's a special panel show or something--to devote a half-an-hour to the anti-busing program or the groups. We had some of our stations say what's happening in the schools. And they'll do a series on it. But it's hard to take that much TV or radio time.

And certainly the newspapers, a lot of people would send letters to the editor. They would not print those letters. And the people would call and be told that the letter had been lost. It may be a very strong letter; it may be accusing certain congressmen of not being responsive to their people and their needs or their wishes. It may be against that editor or that owner of the newspaper, and they would tell us that they lost the letter. Locally, and I've seen this happen in not all the papers but a lot of papers around the country, they try to play us up as radical, violent people. Why? I don't know, but it did happen this way.

WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE NANS' MESSAGES?

The type of people that really formed this organization were dedicated to the cause and to what they believed in, and I guess I, for one, made my mind up back in 1971, that as long as I lived I would do whatever I could to fight forced busing and court-ordered busing. And I had dedicated myself to do what I personally could. And I think all these other people that were there, we never mentioned this, but I knew I had dedicated myself to that and I think they had too. I could sense it. And I think we agreed on the type of organization we wanted NANS to be, and we felt that we had to come back locally and get that message out as far as we could honestly do it ourselves. And then to work together on a national basis.

It was hard getting started but we had some dedicated people; we had some very intelligent people that helped out, the co-founders of NANS, and I think they're responsible for making NANS what it is today.
WHO CONDUCTS RESEARCH FOR THE ARGUMENTS DEVELOPED AGAINST FORCED BUSING?

We have several attorneys. We have one in Austin, and Professor Lino Graglia is, I guess, an unofficial director of NANS. He was with us at the first meeting. Certainly Bob DePrez does a lot of research for us. Bob is good at what he does in doing the research and he probably has read every book that's been printed against it. We have the attorneys who read the briefs that were filed like here and in other cities that have busing. And they do the research for us. I knew locally as a board of education member--I got a copy of the statistics of the number of drop-outs we had and the number of students that left the public school system that first year. As we started to compile this and Bob has a library and we try too--each city would try to get those statistics to Bob where we would have it at a central location. It's taken us some time to do that but I think we're getting there.

WHO DETERMINES THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL APPEALS THAT WILL BE USED?

The Board of Directors. As I said, we meet twice a year and then the Executive Committee probably meets three times a year. The Executive Committee will pass on to the Board of Directors--it's kind of hard since our Board of Directors has now increased to about twenty-four and we're spread out so far across the country--it's kind of hard to get together when part of the expense is paid by us to get to these meetings and it's almost impossible to get together as often as we would like.

So we have an executive meeting and we discuss things there and then we send the information out to the Board of Directors and then they, in turn, take it to their local organizations. But I don't think any one person makes a decision. Now, I think as President, there are some decisions you have to make on the spot. I received a call from the MacNeil-Lahrer public TV program to appear on a program there. And I had to make that decision. I didn't have time to contact my Board of Directors. But as President, and I felt that this was a national TV program and I had to do it. And I did. It didn't cost NANS any money. I did go to represent NANS but I felt they had elected me as President and if they had elected me to be the President then certainly they would trust my judgment to appear on a national TV program. And there was no problem there. But most of the decisions are made by the Board of Directors.

HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE?

There are the President, the Secretary--there are seven, I think, and then Vice-President, and then four Board of Directors.
WHAT ARE THE RHETORICAL EXPECTATIONS PLACED UPON YOU IN YOUR ROLE AS A NANS LEADER?

Things that I can live with and accomplishments I think I can live with and sleep at night with myself and live with myself is that somewhere, since my involvement with NANS, I have helped someone. I may never know it, but I know I have, and I know there are people that respect me and that's important to me to be respected in my community and to the people I know across this country. My opinions were respected, that meant a lot to me. My personality—people respected me as an individual and what I believed in. I think also with the respect that I have for my own family—my family, my sisters and brothers, my husband's family, and my own children. And I don't hope to have a lot of money to leave my children when I do leave this world, what I hope I can leave them with all the hours, all the volunteer hours, all the work I've done. I hope to leave them a free country. And I hope to leave them the inspiration to fight for what they believe in and to keep this country free for as many years as this world has. And that somewhere, somebody will look back and say, "Jean Ruffra had a big part in that. She contributed something positive." I don't want to be looked upon as a negative person. I want to be looked upon as a positive person, as a happy person and as a person who was not afraid to say what she believed in.

WHAT KINDS OF ROLE CONFLICTS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED? HOW HAVE YOU RESOLVED THESE CONFLICTS?

There had been an article in the paper about NANS and where the money from NANS came from which was all messed up. The article was all untrue. The man came to the board of education, the school board meeting, to speak against that. I was chairman and he started speaking about an article in the newspaper and I knew immediately what he was talking about (The Pioneer Fund) and I rapped the gavel and called the man out of order and told him that I would not allow him to continue his presentation. What he was talking about had absolutely nothing to do with the school board; it was not a school board matter; that was a personal matter for me as an individual. I would not discuss it with him at a school board meeting. If he was willing to wait until after that meeting I would be glad to talk to him and discuss it with him after the meeting.

The newspaper reporter wrote that up. That I refused to let a member of the public speak at a school board meeting. And there were several letters to the editor reflecting on that and I had to take my time to sit down and answer those letters to the editor back. That was really my biggest problem.
I don't have that problem now because I'm not on the school board and I'm a private citizen now and I can belong to what I choose. My children did face a little bit of flack from one or two teachers they had, not too much because I had told my children then that if anyone mentioned it to them, they were to give the teacher, anyone in that school, our phone number and that they were welcome to call and I would talk to them. They did this. We did receive threatening calls. I was harassed on the telephone. I received quite a few nasty letters in the mail. Some were signed; some were not. Those that were signed I answered; those that were unsigned went into my garbage can. That was about the biggest problem.

WHAT CONFLICTS PERTAINING TO RHETORIC, TACTICS, STRATEGIES, HAVE OCCURRED AMONG NANS LEADERS AND HOW WERE THEY RESOLVED?

Actually, we haven't had that many problems with those things. In any organization you have your differences of opinion, but I think we were all working for one end. Sometimes personalities would get into it; it happens, that's a human being. And we overlook those things. We may disagree with one another and say, "Well, you know, it should be this way." And someone else would say, "No, it should be the other way." And we would look it over and we'd talk about it and we resolved those things. Our by-laws spelled out what our organization was, what we stood for, so as long as we went by our by-laws, we really didn't have that many problems that I could see.

DO YOU THINK THAT BECAUSE THE ENTIRE PROGRAM AND YOUR OUTLOOK WERE ESTABLISHED AT THE TIME OF THE FOUNDING YOU ELIMINATED A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFICULTY THAT YOU OTHERWISE MIGHT HAVE HAD?

Yes. When the organization was founded, we had an excellent set of by-laws. And we worked on those by-laws into the wee hours of the morning. We tried to cover all these problems that we would encounter. So that if it was in the by-laws, then it was resolved by what the by-laws said. So, yes, that had a great deal to do with it.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT, LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL, AND HOW ARE YOU WORKING TO MINIMIZE THAT RESISTANCE?

I was elected to the school board as an anti-busing leader. I won that election. I had two opponents. I won it by a great margin. But I think the people knew that I was there; that I cared about education, not just the anti-busing issue. I cared about a lot of issues. I was labeled then as an anti-busing school board member.
WERE YOU THE ONLY ONE?

Yes. At that particular time. And it was quite a different role for me. Believe it or not, in my high school days and later to speak before a group of people, I don't think I could have done it and I taught myself how to do that, and my husband was a great help to me in that. We worked together on it and once I mastered that then I don't think anybody could throw a question at me that I never answered. I was accused of a lot of things, as using that as a way to vent my frustrations of anti-busing.

But once people found that I was really concerned about what would happen to our school system, the educational process, that anti-busing—I still had that anti-busing label—but it's not as strong now as it was back in those days and I think by being elected sort of proved that I was not a radical person or that type of thing.

I did run for the State Senate in 1979, and the man I ran against was a two-term incumbent, and at that particular time people knew I was still, they knew me then, I had built my own image as far as people in this community knew. I did lose by a very small margin and I felt that that did not dishearten me. Certainly, I think when you lose anything it's a little disheartening, but it didn't affect me, really, too much, because he was a two-term incumbent and he had been a good state senator. But I just felt he was not representing the people and that's when I decided to run. I had a lot of support there but when we get into politics it's a little bit different story than being into an organization. It's quite a different operation.

LET'S BACKTRACK JUST A MINUTE AND DEAL WITH THE KIND OF RESISTANCE THAT YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT. THE MEDIA HAVE BEEN RESISTORS AS WELL AS THE LEGISLATURE.

At first, the news media were very skeptical of interviewing me or even asking me questions. I think they had to learn about me as an individual. How would I project myself? Would I appear on a TV program and become a ranting, raving person representing the organization? I did not present that image. Some of the state legislators felt the same way. They were almost afraid to be seen talking to some of us in SOCS. We became actively involved in trying to elect representatives and senators to the state legislature that were sympathetic to our cause. And we were successful. And once we did that, now NANS does not do this, we endorse candidates locally, NANS does not do that, SOCS endorses. But once we were successful in getting out some of our "enemies," and electing people sympathetic to
our cause, we became recognized as a forceful organization. Once we were recognized in that manner, we became friends with the legislators and they became friends with us. They joined the organization. Even after I went off of the school board, I received a call from a reporter from a local TV station and asked if I would come down to tape a Sunday afternoon show. I told him that I was no longer on the board. And he said that I was President of NANS. We talked about the fact that there were problems within the school system with the superintendent and he said that he felt that I would be in a better position to give my true feelings then if I were a member of the board. So I thought about it and I did it. It was an hour show and there were just the two of us. We talked about the current situation with the board and the superintendent. I felt so relaxed during that interview and he did too; it was one of the greatest interviews I ever had. So then we got into NANS and he asked me what we were doing then and what NANS hoped to do.

I don't know how many calls from people who saw that program that said it was one of the best interviews they had ever seen. After the interview, I asked him why he called me. He was one of the persons who, when we had interviews in the past, was very much aloof from me—he would not get close. But in that particular interview, I think he looked at me as a person; he knew my past history; he knew I was not a very radical person; and we just had a good conversation. So I think that has changed. The media, a lot of the reporters call me today and they will ask what's going on with NANS or how I feel about what's going on with the board of education now. And I think I've gained their respect.

SOME OF THAT WAS THROUGH POLITICAL POWER?

Right.

ANOTHER WAY WAS THE IMAGE YOU PROJECTED THROUGH THE MEDIA?

Right.

KAYE COOK SAID THAT IN COLUMBUS THE MEDIA CREATED HER. THEY LOOKED AT THE CHOICES THEY HAD AND SELECTED HER. IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT AND WHO, AMONG THE ESTABLISHED STRUCTURE, ARE YOUR SUPPORTERS AND WHO PROVIDES THE MOST RESISTANCE?

I think certainly our courts are our resistance and some of our judges. The people that have helped were some of the state legislators, some of the news media, even some of our judges. They seek us out now; they want our help in their campaigns. We have made contacts. It's very hard for me to go someplace where people don't
recognize me. They hear my name and say, "Oh! You used to be on the school board; you were president of NANS; you were with SOCS!" This sort of thing. That has helped.

By the image that we presented people now come to me. I don't have to go to these people and if there is a certain candidate running in an election and if I want to work for that candidate, if I think he's the type of candidate that I would want in that office whether it be a judge—we just got through working for, I did personally, a judge who was elected over a very pro-busing judge. And I worked very hard for this man to get him elected. I don't expect anything from that man, personally. All I want him to do is to perform as a judge the way I think he will. And I'm sure he will. And that's all I want from him. I want him to be fair. The judge that ran against him was not fair, in my opinion, and apparently he wasn't to everybody else—he didn't get elected.

The most resistance that we have now is from the pro-busing groups, I would think. They still try to say that we're a radical group; we're bigots; we're racists; we're still called this by the pro-busing groups. We had a lot of groups that came in here, I can't even remember the names of them; it's been quite a while back when busing first started, and those groups are now gone. They were fly-by-nights and they are pro-busing groups. We still have some groups here certainly, the NAACP think if you're anti-busing you're a racist, this sort of thing. That's our biggest opposition right now.

HOW HAVE YOU CONSCIOUSLY ADAPTED YOUR RHETORIC TO MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR VARIOUS AUDIENCES, YOUR IN-GROUP AUDIENCE, THE MEDIA, THE LEGISLATORS, AND ANYONE ELSE YOU CONSIDER TO BE AMONG YOUR AUDIENCE?

There are different ways to handle those different groups. When you're dealing with the legislature and you're attending that session, and a bill is introduced, and you don't like that bill, and I go to my representative and I say that I'm opposed to this bill. He will probably ask me why. And then I have to know why I'm opposed to it. Therefore, I've got to be up on that particular piece of legislation. Now, if I can tell him why I'm opposed to that, and what the amendment to it should be, or how we think it should be changed to meet the needs of all the people in his district or in this community, it's accepted. But you have to know why you're opposed to it and then you have to have another solution to that particular problem. You can't just go in there and say that you're opposed to it, period.

Now, when you're dealing with people who have had their children bused—and I still get calls from people who will say that they know I'm not on the school board but that I was the only one they could think of to call and ask who they should go to—you have to know how to talk. Maybe they're hysterical and the first thing you do is to
try to calm them down and apologize, be sympathetic: "I'm very sorry that this happened; I wish I could help it; I wish I could have prevented it." You deal with that individual in that particular way.

I think you learn through the years how to deal with each class or each type of person and you apply that. There's a different way to talk to a parent whose child has never been bused than there is to a parent of a child who has been bused. And something terrible has happened to that child. And it's hard for those people to understand. So I think you learn through the years how to deal with those types of people. And how to talk to them.

WHAT MAJOR ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC., HAS NANS ENGAGED IN TO AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION?

Number one is by having our lobbyists who keep us informed of what bills are before Congress and what affects us. And there is the bill in the Senate right now--I don't have a copy of that and I'm now working full-time so I don't have time to read the paper and watch TV like I did before I worked. But from what I understand of this bill, it is the first major breakthrough that we've had since busing started. And I'm hopeful that it will pass. And if it doesn't pass Monday, I think it's to come up Monday; if it doesn't pass Monday, I feel sure it will be back next year, and it will pass next year. I think those are two of the greatest things that have happened to us.

AND YOU'RE STILL PUSHING FOR LEGISLATION?

Right.

THE AMENDMENT?

Right. The constitutional amendment is our ultimate goal. I don't know what we can do about judges until the Congress completely gets rid of the appointment for life by the President. That is the worse thing this country has--to appoint a man or a woman to a lifetime job and say that you will stay there until you die or until you resign. I think that's the worst thing we have; and I see that changing; I really do. I think this bill that's in the Senate right now is a great breakthrough. We've had bills passed; we've had amendments tacked on to other bills; they weren't strong. We didn't have the support in Congress that I think we will have now.
EACH YEAR YOU'VE BEEN GETTING MORE AND MORE SUPPORT. YOU'VE GOTTEN CLOSER AND CLOSER. WHAT IS NANS' FUTURE GOAL AND WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS WHAT WILL NANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

I think we will see the end of busing. I think Congress will pass laws. I think there will be a constitutional amendment. I think the Supreme Court Judges, the Circuit Court Judges—even though I'm not sure this will happen—will no longer be appointed for a lifetime, but I think the judges that are there now will give more consideration to public opinion. I think in the next five to ten years they will.

I think we will see a better school system in the next five to ten years, a more traditional type of school system and I'm talking about across the country. I think there will be more of an emphasis on education than there is on transportation. I think our state legislatures will pass laws that will require teachers to be competent to teach a particular subject...I think we'll see some laws changed there.

The ultimate goal will be the constitutional amendment and I think that will put an end to it. When that happens and I hope with all my heart that it does happen, but I also hope that when busing stops that those of us who have been opposed to it and have fought against it, do not stand up and say, "We won! We won!" and forget about the inner-city child, that poor child, that black child, that Mexican child, and those people who need our help and our attention. And I don't think it will because I truly think the majority of people really and truly care about education and children are educated. What I want to see is a traditional school and I want to see different types of education—or schools in education. I want parents to have a freedom of choice.

I know what I want for my children and I think most parents do. I know what I want them to learn and I would hope that in five to ten years from now that this country would be back on its feet again, that people would be responsive to other people's needs, that we care more about what happens to each other and each other's children, what happens to Columbus, Ohio, school system, Louisville, Kentucky, school system--what happens in general.

ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF THE VOUCHER SYSTEM?

I have reservations about that. I think if it were handled correctly, the fear I have about it is that it could get out of hand. I think there could possibly be a school that would start up over night as we've seen happen all across the country when busing started. They closed down a year later and I would be afraid
of the voucher system for that reason. If we could be assured that
parents would use that voucher system in the proper way, if schools
would use that voucher in the proper way, then I could support it.
But I do have some reservations about the voucher system.

HOW HAS NANS EVOLVED AND BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED SINCE ITS
INCEPTION? AND WHAT CONSCIOUS ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFINE
THE RHETORIC?

All of us in NANS have tried to speak the same language. We
have tried to present our goals to the people that we have come in
contact with. We've spelled out our by-laws, what we believe in.
If you're a member of NANS you adhere to these regulations, these
by-laws, and most of the time that has happened.

We've had a few who did not agree with our philosophy and they
said that they didn't want any part of us. And we'd say that that
was their freedom of choice. But I think that by all of us trying
to go into different parts of the country to preach or teach the
same type of philosophy--NANS rules, regulations, and by-laws--this
has helped us.

THE NEWSLETTERS OVER THE YEARS HAVE BECOME MUCH MORE SOPHISTICATED.
TO WHAT DO YOU ATTRIBUTE THAT?

Experience. In my opinion, experience is one of the best
features we have. When we first started out, our newsletters were
one page items--typed, run off on the mimeograph machine. We've
gotten to the point now where they are presented in a little more
educated, sophisticated manner; they are printed. It contains infor-
mation; it gives people hope.

Back when we first started I think maybe we projected the
negative side a little bit because we were all so frustrated from
our own local situations. We presented that image. Now we have
come to the point where we're positive about the future. We know we're
going to win because we know we're right. And I think that is pro-
jected in our newsletter now; it's more positive.

DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH YOU BECAME A LEADER.

That's one of those questions where you're asked to pat yourself
on the back. Again, I think by experience, doing a little research
on your own, by having your speech prepared, by knowing what type
of community you were going into. What type of people you were
speaking to. Do I talk over their heads with this speech? Do I look
like I'm--these are questions I ask myself--Will they get the feeling
that I think I'm better than they are because I'm President of NANS
or a leader of NANS?
I thought those things through and I sometimes would have a speech prepared and when I would stand up in front of that audience or that group, it would be changed completely. I had to get the feel of that audience myself. I don't know that I'm such an articulate speaker; I just try to research what I would say. I did study it and study the group that I was speaking to. I tried to prepare myself. I tried not to be grim. I tried to be positive. Certainly, I think I had to project the negative side of it a little bit to make those people realize that busing is not going to help your school system; it's not going to help your children gain the type of education you want them to get. But I think I always tried to close my speeches in a positive manner. There is hope. And as a national organization we can do something.

WHAT WAS THE PROCESS?

I started out as a member of the Order of the Eastern Star. I started as an officer and there's quite a bit of memory work in that organization. Then I was asked to go through the Chairs. It takes four years to become President. I went through the different offices and I did become Worthy Matron and that was really my first opportunity I guess to even stand up in front of a group and speak. I enjoyed that so much and I had to memorize extensive speeches and various things that we do in Eastern Star. I enjoyed that and it was such a beautiful ceremony to me that I thoroughly enjoyed doing that. And I found myself at each meeting become just a little bit more and more confident in myself that I could do it. By the time the year was over I was very confident. Speaking in front of a group of people did not bother me at all. When I first started out I picked one person that I knew in that audience and I looked at that one person to give my speech.

Then I went into PTA and I became President of the PTA. Locally, here in elementary schools when you're PTA president you have standing room only crowds because usually we used the children in programs and when their little child is in that program, then everybody's there. That was no problem because these were all community people and they were good people that I knew. We also threw in a little something into our PTA that I don't know of any other school in the country that's ever done it--the parents would put on skits and we would write them ourselves and we would act them out ourselves. They were funny little things. We had a great time doing it and that helped us because we were acting crazy. You could be yourself and yet throw in little jokes.....It was doing something in front of a group of people.

From there I went to SOCS. That was not too hard because when we first started out in SOCS it was a group of people. A church would let us use one of their Sunday school rooms. The schools at that time would not let us use the schools to have meetings so we had
to meet wherever we could find a place. And nobody really stood up in front of the meeting and said, "I'm going to be your speaker tonight." We just talked. So then when our meeting started, we gained a little momentum, and things started happening faster. We had to have somebody that could speak. So our president, Joyce Bond and I, I was the secretary, were encouraged by the other officers to do the talking. It was just natural for us to do it and we would get together on what part she would talk about and what part I would talk about.

I appeared before Senator Ervin which was my first national contact doing any speaking. Our local TV did cover that. I prepared that statement and I felt that it went off really well. The Senator was very pleased with it. And then going before the State legislature, appearing before committees, speaking before committees there, then on into NANS.

AND THEN YOUR SENATE RACE?

Right. And campaigning both for my school board and my Senate race. And appearing on TV, TV shows, and this type of thing, radio and TV panels. I appeared at many organizations in panels. Bellarmine College, University of Louisville, and organizations of that type. After a while it was something I enjoyed doing and I think I put myself into it. I had ways of expression, ways of getting my point across, and ways I could see the expression of the people change when my expression changed. I learned how to do that from watching other people.

AS THE LEADER OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT, WHAT WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEM YOU HAVE ENCOUNTERED TO DATE AND HOW DID YOU SOLVE THAT PROBLEM?

I think the most difficult part was in getting people to recognize us as a very serious organization, not as a fly-by-night, money grabbing organization. I think by appearing on TV panels or speaking to groups across the country and getting these people to realize what our goal was. That was the biggest problem because when you say National Association for Neighborhood Schools, immediately people that have had busing knew that had something to do with busing. At first they turned their ears off to you, but once you got through to them—you know, our goals are not to deny anyone an equal educational opportunity—our goal is to see that everybody gets it. But we don't believe that busing a child forty miles across town is going to do that. So I think that one of the biggest problems—and once we got that message across and people have accepted us that we truly represent what we say we represent. And we approve in ourselves.
WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED AND HOW HAVE YOU MET THESE CHALLENGES?

The biggest challenge was appearing before large groups and overcoming the bad things—the bad publicity. You pick up a newspaper and you read something about you, you see your name in print, and this reporter has written that she's an activist—Jean Ruffra—activist.

I thought, "What was this doing to my children?" They're reading this about their mother. They're hearing this on the news about their mother. The biggest part was explaining to my children what I believed in and telling them simply because I believe this, as you grow older I want you to have your beliefs. They may be different from mine, but I want you to decide for yourself. We have had round-table discussions here all the time and probably my children know more about the state legislature, about government, than some politicians know because they've grown up with it.

The time element was a challenge. How can I be a mother, how can I be a housewife and how can I attend to my obligations to the people in my community? There are only twenty-four hours in a day and there were times when actually we went about twenty of those hours a day with my housework, taking care of my family, going to meetings, etc. And then finally I quit worrying about it and thought things would take care of themselves—and it really did work for me. I thought that I wasn't being the kind of mother or housewife that I should be. I went to my family and told them that I had a problem within me and that I needed to talk. And we did. And they told me that they were behind me one hundred percent; my husband was behind me one hundred percent. I told them that I might not fix for supper what they'd like and they just told me not to worry about it. That was all I needed and I overcame that through their support and through their help. Their compliments to me, "Mom, you did a great job on TV tonight." They were proud. They would go to school and teachers and other students would tell them they had seen their mom on TV. They were proud. So that helped in part of it.

The public speaking—I don't think everybody can do that. I guess I had it in small enough doses. I was not exposed to a crowd of 5,000 people all at one time. I had it in doses and it's something I enjoyed. So, the challenge then became how I could improve myself in my next speech or in my next interview on TV; it was self-improvement.

WHAT CHARACTERISTICS OR TALENTS DO YOU POSSESS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR SUCCESS AS A SPOKESPERSON FOR NANS?

I thoroughly enjoy speaking before a group of people, not simply for a personal gain or a personal matter, but to inform
people. When all this is over, I would like to look back and think--I'm not as active today as I was a couple of years ago in NANS or even locally in SOCS but I did play a part in that and when this is stopped, I will have been a part of that. And it's something that I can be thankful for that my grandson may not, we may not have to worry about him being bused, if he attends a public school.

What have I contributed? When the day comes for me to leave this earth and this world, what have I contributed? Will people remember me for what I have contributed or will they say, "Well, she's gone, bless her soul." I would like them to think that somewhere along the way I have had influence on somebody that will make them--the younger generation, my daughter and her husband, continue fighting for what they believe in, whether it be forced busing, whatever the cause. They will remember what I have done and say, "My mother did it, my mother-in-law did it, I can do it." That whatever they believe in, to keep this country free that they will continue the fight.

AS A LEADER WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE YOUR GREATEST STRENGTHS AND SHORTCOMINGS?

I think my greatest strength is that I'm really not afraid to meet the opposition. I may not win one hundred percent of the time, but they'll know I've been there. I can probably be quick to answer some of their remarks or some of their questions. I can probably come back a little bit later and refer to something they said and turn that back around. I think that's a strong point. I'm not afraid to speak to a group of people; it doesn't make me nervous.

My weaknesses...probably talking too much, too lengthy. Maybe not projecting as well as I would like to. Trying not to be so formal and informal and combining the two together. To me, a good speaker can do that, or a person that's a good spokesman can tell a little light joke and work his way into it. I have a weakness there. I want to get right into my subject; I can improve on that.

WHAT HAS YOUR INVOLVEMENT WITH NANS TAUGHT YOU ABOUT YOURSELF, OTHER PEOPLE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT?

About myself, It's taught me that if you dedicate yourself and if you make up your mind that you can accomplish something, you can do it.

With other people, it's taught me that there are people out here in this country who are known as the Silent Majority, that all they need is a little push, and they need someone like me and the
people of NANS and other leaders of NANS to give them that little
push and say, "You can do it." And all of us can do it by working
together.

Now the establishment, I used to think they were a lost cause.
But I have learned that the wheel that squeaks the loudest gets
the most oil. And you have to become a squeaky wheel in order to
get people to listen to you. Yet, you have to be ladylike or gentle-
manlike; you cannot force yourself on other people. You cannot go
to the old saying, "You can't beat city hall!" You can beat city
hall! City hall can be beaten. You can knock on that door and
that door can be opened. If you do it in the right manner. Forcing
your way in will not get in. You have to be earnest; you have to be
sincere; and you have to get right to the point; these people are
busy people. You cannot take up all their time. You state your
point; you tell them why you're there; and what you don't like and
how you can resolve it; then you can offer your help; then you can
listen to their side of it. But city hall can be beat.

By working in campaigns, by electing the right people—whether
they are anti-busing doesn't matter to me—it's their philosophy
and what they believe in. Do they believe in America? America is
the greatest! It's not perfect, but it's the greatest country in
this world. And I think it can be even greater; all we need is the
proper leadership...Harry Truman...some of those types of people
back there. We need people that sincerely care about everybody in
this country. We need more people to care about their neighbors.
And I think that can happen. I think it will happen.

AS AN INDIVIDUAL, WHAT ULTIMATE EFFECT WILL YOU HAVE UPON THE SOCIETY?

A good effect, I hope. I hope I have given people a little bit
of incentive to speak up and to work and I dislike using the term
fight, but I will, and fight for what they believe in. I hope that
by what I have done when busing ceases that people will say, "She
worked as hard as she could; she did all she could." That will
give them the incentive. As I said about my own children and other
younger generation, to work and to fight for what they believe in.
To keep this a strong country and a free country. Where people that
come after me will have that freedom of choice.

WHAT KINDS OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN YOUR ROLE AS
A NANS LEADER AND HOW DID YOU SOLVE THESE DILEMMAS?

I think being called a racist. That probably hurt me more than
any encounter I had. People said that to my face. And they wrote
about it and I was called an activist or a racist or a bigot or what
have you. And deep in my heart I'm not. I believe there's room in
this country for everybody. We all have our ways of doing things
and the people we want to associate with and I think we ought to
be able to select that and have that choice.

HOW DID YOU SOLVE IT? DID YOU LEARN TO IGNORE IT?

I tried to prove to some of the people, the news media and some
of these people, that I was really not that type of person. I think
that once they realized that I was a person who had been misjudged--
and I have tried to prove that they were wrong in judging me this
way--I think they were convinced. There are some people that I'll
never convince, I'm sure. But I'm not worrying about it. Deep in
my heart I know what I am and that's what matters.

DID YOU EVER HAVE ANY SERIOUS DILEMMAS WITH THE PRO-BUSERS?

Yes. The problems were in debate or in TV panel shows or even
in school board meetings. I was accused of not caring or not wanting
an equal opportunity, not caring about what happens to the poor
child, to the black child. I always tried to come back to answer
that I do care about what happens and I would tell why, what I had
voted on when I was a member of the school board that would help all
children, the motions I made, the things I brought to that board
of education, the ideas that would help all children, not only white
children. But I do care about all children and I think I have found
that most pro-busers are a little bit different and I hope I don't
sound prejudiced when I say this, but I have found this to be true.
I am willing to listen; now, not all of them, but the biggest majority
of the pro-busers are not willing to listen to the reasons I was
against this. Now, I was willing to listen to why they were for it.
It didn't change my mind and I'm sure I didn't change their minds,
but that was the biggest problem there. They wanted to tell me
where I was wrong and not listen to why I believed I was right.
That was a problem.

HOW DID YOU SOLVE IT?

I really didn't solve that. I just learned to accept that this
is the way it is going to be. I will do my best and that's all I can
do. That problem was never solved.

ONE LAST QUESTION. WOULD YOU COMPARE THE LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ALL
THE DIFFERENT PRESIDENTS OF NANS?

Frank, the first president, was a past school board member.
He was a past state legislator. Frank knew exactly what to do and
when to do it. He could project himself very well.
Jim Venema was the type of person who could hold an audience captive. Jim was a very handsome man and he had a way to project himself quite differently than Frank did. It's hard to say which one presented the best image because I think all of our presidents have been good presidents in their own way.

Joyce DeHaven. Joyce was a very sincere person. Joyce came across, well, actually, Joyce had not been through the problems that some of us had been through so I don't think Joyce could speak from a personal background. The busing that they had in Dallas was completely different from the problems we faced here in Louisville or Denver or Wilmington.

Bill D'Onofrio is certainly up on legislation. Bill is a very learned person as far as laws, legislation, this type of thing. Bill does not speak. He's not as good a speaker as some of our past presidents have been.

Myself, I think my problem as president of NANS was that I did not have the time to devote and holding the office for two years was a burden on me and quite frankly financially it hurt me. I think that was my biggest problem. I don't think I had any problem communicating or speaking to the people, my research, my statistics, I had all that together and I would not say I'm a good speaker. Other people have complimented me on it and they have come to me and said that they certainly enjoyed my speech. But I myself do not say that I am the best speaker of all our presidents. No, I cannot say that. I would say Jim Venema was our best speaker. I think Joyce and I, as women, were looked upon as women by a lot of people. Where the men were looked upon as maybe a little bit stronger leaders than women.

DO YOU THINK THAT BEING A WOMAN DOES MAKE A DIFFERENCE? THAT MEN HAVE AN ADVANTAGE?

Yes. Yes, I do. And that's one part of the ERA movement that I agree with. If I can get up here and if I can hold this job as president, I should be respected for that job as president. And the time, I probably put more time into it than Jim, or Frank or Bill does. I would sit here and type my own letters and answer all the mail I received. They have had women to do it for them. I did my own; Joyce did her own. But I still think that's the way people in this country look at it.

If you have a woman president, you're not as strong an organization as if you've got a man's name up there. And I disagree with that very much. I think we can do just as great a job and I think it was proven that Joyce and I did.
DO YOU THINK THAT THE LEADERSHIP STYLES HAVE EVOLVED WITH THE MOVEMENT OR THAT THEY HAVE CHANGED THROUGH THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE MOVEMENT? HAVE DIFFERENT PHASES DEMANDED DIFFERENT LEADERSHIP STYLES?

I think that as we grew we had to give in a little bit to certain ways that we did things—such as the marches, this type of thing. People wanted to do it and so then we had to tell them that they could march, if they wanted, but it would not be in the name of NANS. You may do it as an individual. Yes, you have to give. And I think we grew and I think as time goes on, as we grow more we are going to have to have a full-time president, someone that can devote eight or ten hours a day specifically to that job and nothing else.

WHAT ELSE DO YOU SEE AS BEING NECESSARY FOR THE MOVEMENT?

Certainly more coverage—media coverage. Financial help somewhere along the way to get our message across, to send our newsletter. And certainly we need more members. We need a better system of advertising, letting people across this country know that we exist and what we are.

IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SAY?

I have enjoyed my association with NANS. It's been an experience for me and the greatest experience was meeting the people all across the country.
THE FOLLOWING EXCERPTS WERE TAKEN FROM A PRE-TAPE INTERVIEW WITH MRS. RUFFRA AND HAVE BEEN INCLUDED BECAUSE THEY PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS.

When we started in 1976, that was the second movement to form a national organization. But during that period there were so many groups of radicals, both pro and con busing, that people looked upon NANS as a radical group. We were labeled the ultra-conservative people of this country, that we really didn't care about education, all we cared about was busing children, which was totally untrue. What we did care about was the education. If you will look at the people on the NANS Board of Directors, people that have really been involved in NANS.

I have been involved in education for about thirteen years when my oldest daughter started school and when my other two started school my involvement was even more so.

I really became interested when we had a local organization, Save Our Community Schools (SOCS), of which I am a co-founder. At that time three of us went to Washington because we had been invited by several groups across the country from Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama--some of the Southern states that were involved in this movement then. That was about 1971. The meeting was a round-table discussion. We sat there and we talked to all these people who had been involved; they had bused children for years in some of these communities. And when it came our turn to stand up and tell what was happening in Louisville, Kentucky, we were embarrassed because we were not busing. We had the threat of busing; there had been a lawsuit filed. But we stood up and said that we are not busing in Louisville, Kentucky. Everyone in the room looked at us and asked why we were there. And our answer to that was that we knew it was coming and we wanted to learn first-hand from those people who had been through it what actually was going on. And we did; we learned quite a bit.

We came back to Louisville. We went to various organizations, various groups, people from the board of education, and tried to tell them what we had learned from the people from the cities that already had busing. Charlotte, at that time, was in the midst of all their problems. And no one would listen to us. "It won't happen here. They wouldn't dare do that to the people of Louisville." So we went on for two or three years and became rather inactive. We kept abreast of what was going on across the country but people laughed at us and said, "You know, these people are troublemakers." So we played a low profile.
At that meeting in Washington, we tried to build a national organization. But in 1971 we were not busing so there was no way we could come back to Louisville and get the support we really needed for a national organization. Joyce Bond and I were members of that group but it fell through simply because most of the states then that were busing were Southern states. We could not get the people in the North.

It's the same old story that happens in everyday life. It happened all through history and probably will always happen--unless the problem affects me personally, I don't get involved. And that's what happened here.

The decision that we would bus came down in 1975, but in the meantime, in 1974, I ran for the school board. I was elected and my term began in January, 1975. I was still labeled an anti-busing person and I was elected by a large majority. I represented the southwestern part of Jefferson County, which is basically middle to upper class income, blue collar, white collar workers, mixed-in; you have your neighborhoods. But we're not all white collar workers in this particular part of Jefferson County. So again we were looked upon as radicals, ultra-conservative people.

So when my term on the school board started and then busing started, I continued to speak out against it. But I tried to be realistic and I knew there was nothing we could do, or I could do as an individual or our own individual groups could do to counteract that Sixth Circuit Order. I was realistic enough to see that. And from the very beginning I believe and I felt that the way to stop this is the way it started. It did not start in the streets. I'm not opposed to people having marches and protesting however they want to do; I think we have that right in this country. Although that was not for me, Jean Ruffra. That was not my thing. I believed in voicing my opinion by contacting congressmen, judges, attorneys; that could help us in a more positive way. I think the people that did protest and that did march and had marches, I think that was a way to vent their frustration. I vented my frustration by writing letters and speaking on many TV and radio panel shows. I told them exactly how I felt.

To go back a little, after the 1971 meeting in Washington, when we had learned all that had happened to everybody, I decided that that could not happen to my children. That's when I realized that we are all born with a certain goal in life or a certain talent that we have to do; that's the reason we're put on this earth. I realized that what I had to do was not just for my children but for every child in this country. And that was to see that every child, black, white, Chicano, any foreign child that came to this country,
had the opportunity for a good education. But we were labeled as radical. Then when we would say this on these panel shows, people began to take a different look at us. Even our elected officials came to us and said that we were not really as radical as they thought. We responded by saying that we had told them that all along. We cared about what happens; we cared about the way in which tax money is spent; we cared about what will happen to this community that we live in; we care about the type of education that our children are getting; and it all works together.

Everything that we have predicted has come true. Our school system is literally destroyed, financially, educationally, although I have to say that it is now beginning to go back a little bit for the simple reason that while I was on the board of education we worked to develop the alternative traditional schools.

The year busing started and I was on the board of education, I received many threatening phone calls. My life was threatened; my children's lives were threatened; and it became such a problem that I even considered resigning from the board of education. But I felt such an obligation to the people in the district I represented, it's hard to decide where you draw that line from your personal family to what you owe to the people of the community. So our two younger children were taken out of public schools and they were placed in Catholic schools simply for their safety. One of them went four years; one of them went two. They are now back in the public schools.

Now, getting back to NANS....In 1976, when we first started NANS was looked upon as a radical group. The first time we tried to start the national organization it was all the Southern states. But by 1976, you had Detroit, Pontiac, Boston, Denver, Pasadena, a lot more of your Northern states, a lot more of your Midwestern and Western states that had come into the picture, not just Alabama, Mississippi, those Southern states.

And at that particular time, we went to some of the people in the South and told them that we wanted to start a national organization. We got mixed reactions from some of the people. A lot of the Southern people came right back and said that we've been busing in Mississippi for ten years. Where were you when we needed help? And I don't blame them. I could certainly understand.

If Congress had passed a law or if the Supreme Court would have said that every school system in this country will start busing in the year 1973 or 1974, you will integrate every school in your state. It would not have happened because the people in this country never would have. There would have been a war. People
would not have stood for it. They would not have accepted it. And they would have fought it. But they were too smart to do that. What did they do? They started in the South. They picked a few cities in the South. Then they came midwest across the state, they started moving up to Pontiac, and Detroit and Boston and those people revolted. This was adding to our list of cities. They were growing and growing and growing. Every year we were adding three or four new cities to the problems of busing. It has been proven--statistics prove it--if they would tell the truth--every city that has gone through this problem almost becomes bankrupt. They have to go back to the people for more tax money to run the schools. Once more cities were added to this list, they would come to us. They found out about NANS. We made appearances all across this country. We did it on our own time. We are not paid in NANS. The officers are not paid. When I was President in '78 and '79, I went to many cities to help form groups. Our expenses were paid but that was it. We did not receive one penny.

I enjoyed doing that and I enjoyed speaking to the groups, not only from my experience here, but I had read many, many articles. My library had really grown on the problems of busing pro and con. And I not only read anti-busing articles and books, I read the pro-busing too. And I talked to people that believed this would help their children--busing would help their children get an education. In going across the country and in talking to the various people, I think that helped NANS grow.

There were some of us back when NANS first started who you would call moderate people. I consider myself conservative, but I think a lot of people looked at me as moderate simply because I was willing to listen to the other side. And to me that's just being fair to the other side. I think people realized we were not the bus-burning type of organization they thought we were. There's no way I'm going to stand in front of a bus to keep that bus from rolling. There were people who did that. And there were also people who tried to do things to those people.

Once people realized that our goal was a constitutional amendment--I appeared before Senator San Ervin when he was in the Senate, before he retired. He was on the Judiciary Committee and I presented a paper to him. I will never forget what Senator Ervin said. When it was all over and he had listened to all the testimony which was both pro- and con-busing, he said, "We need legislation to kill this cancer, then we need a constitutional amendment to bury it." And I believe that with my heart and soul. Congress could stop it today. They could have stopped it years ago. But I think our Congress
was made up of such liberal people and their own children were not affected by it; they could not see what it was doing to people like me who had to put our children in public schools and wanted to.

But I think in this last election we have seen the trend of the country. And NANS is now almost four years old and we've had more people come into NANS. I'm still a board of director; I'm no longer president and I really do not have the time. I now have a full-time job so I don't have the time to devote as I did have.

We do have people that have taken over where I stopped. We now have a lobbyist in Washington who is keeping us abreast of everything that's going on. I think that was one of our problems in getting started. We didn't have the money to pay someone to lobby. It was not easy for us to watch the papers and to try to keep in touch with those congressmen whom we felt agreed with our position and when they notified us of an upcoming bill because it was a matter of time and money. For me to contact someone in California, Denver, New Jersey, Maryland--across the country--we had to do it by letter or long distance calling. So we set up a telephone tree and we tried that. And in the end it still cost us money. We had to pay for those long distance calls. And we didn't mind, but we did not have the type of communication that we now have because by the time we would get the word out to someone in California, the bill would already have been voted on. But now we have that opportunity.

Communication has improved because Bill is so close to Washington. We have the lobbyist there and he keeps Bill informed; he knows what legislation is coming up so Bill can make a phone call to either Bob or me or someone in Louisville who is on the board and then I can call someone in Nashville and she can call someone further on down the line. It's worked out fine that way. And also we now have time to get a letter out, or call our congressmen and tell him how I want him to vote. That is how we've improved. I see a tremendous change since we've had the lobbyist.

The lobbyist has also been instrumental in changing the image of NANS. We've been to Washington. We visited probably every office, walked those halls, tried to talk to congressmen ourselves, but we would be five or six parents from five states. They looked at us as frustrated parents who were there to pressure them. Now we have the lobbyist and he is up on what is coming up. There's something about a lobbyist that I personally learned several years ago. I registered as a lobbyist locally for our state legislature. And once your name goes in that book as a lobbyist and legislators know you are a lobbyist, they look at you in a different light for some reason. I guess they know that this man or this woman is here continuously.
They're watching what we're doing. And I think we saw this in the past election.

When NANS first started out one of our unwritten goals was to defeat those members of Congress and our own local representatives and legislators who were continuously voting money, putting money into busing, ordering busing. We did not have the national clout to do that. We had to depend on a small group here in Louisville, a small group in Denver, a small group in Wilmington, and different little groups across this country. We did not have the clout; we did not have the money for the advertising that it takes, so we couldn't do anything. But then there were four Senators that the Moral Majority set out to defeat and they were the very same that we set out to defeat four years ago.

I am a member of the Moral Majority but I did that as an individual because I believe in what they were doing. And they are not connected with NANS in any way.

I believe that there is a loose coalition with the single interest groups and this has helped the NANS. Along about '76-'77 people were beginning to look at what was happening, not only in education but in the welfare system. Now I personally believe in the welfare system. I think there are people who truly need it. But I also think it's abused. And I know there are people on it that should not be. People at that time were looking at other things that were happening in the country. The Vietnam situation--my husband is a veteran and I believe a man should fight for this country. And my brother is a veteran. I believe if my brother had not gone and fought for this country we probably--I am very, very anti-communist, I believe that if some of the men in this country had not gone into the service and gone to some of these wars today this country would be a communist country. And I don't want that for my children and I don't want it for my grandchildren. I believe in freedom and America is freedom. It's a free country and that goes back to the way I believe that if it's a free country then I have a right to believe and say what I think and those people on the other side of what I don't believe have a right to say what they think. I question whether the communists have a right to speak out in this country. I'm kind of discussing that within myself. Part of me wants to say to these people, if you believe that, then go to Russia. Live under a communist country. But don't bring it to America.

I think along that time there were a lot of things happening and I think that the Silent Majority has been spoken of so often and I talked to so many people. They would talk to me, my neighbors
would talk to me. I would go to a beauty shop, go to a grocery store, and talk to people. After church people would stand around and talk and they would say that they didn't like what was happening. We would say it to each other but we did nothing about it. And that's what, where I think the Conservative Caucus, the Moral Majority, NANS, our own local busing organizations, we were all forming at about that time, yet we sort of stayed to ourselves--

And anti-ERA or pro-ERA, well I wasn't sure if I wanted to get into that disagreement or that faction of social activity or not. I know how I believe and what I believe. And personally I have never had a problem with ERA or equal rights. My husband and I have an agreement--today's our anniversary--we've been married twenty-three years and we've never had a problem of me doing what I wanted to do or him doing what he wanted to do. We work together. And it was hard for me to realize there were women that have been discriminated against and I think it's grossly unfair. If I am able to do a job and a man is able to do a job, then I think we definitely should be paid equal pay for that job. If I have a man's job I should be given the same salary that man's given. But I don't want an amendment to the Constitution where a judge would come to me and say, "Mrs. Ruffra, your three daughters, one of them has to be a telephone company worker, one has to work for Louisville Gas and Electric, and one has to work for GE on the assembly line." I want my children to be able to pick their career and go into whatever field they want to go in. I want them to have that opportunity. Now, if one of them wants to work in a service station, climb telephone poles, that's fine with me. And she should be paid what that man is paid. But I don't want a judge telling her she has to do that. And this is what I'm afraid is going to happen.

But these people were getting together. Madalyn O'Hare, I think, caused a lot of people in this country--taking prayer out of school. One woman was responsible for the Supreme Court decision on taking prayer out of the school. Along that time there were people such as me. I very disgustedly read that story and I thought that if one woman can do this, what could a group of people do to this country? How can we turn things around? And I think that's happened. Like I said, I think that during that time there were little groups forming all across the country basically we all believe in the same thing and that is freedom of choice. And I firmly believe that. I believe every one of us that lives in this country has that right. I think our Constitution already gives us that right and I don't think it's Congress' place to pass a law that says you do not have that right. But yet I don't think they have a right to amend the Constitution such as the ERA. To say you must do this and in my opinion, that's what that will do. Congress won't do it but once that's added to the Constitution the courts will.
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Thank you, Kaye, I'm grateful to have this opportunity to be in Columbus. I've appreciated so much some of the fine work that people like Kaye and Paul Langdon and so many of the people in Columbus have been doing in a struggle which finds us pitted against some of the most powerful institutions in the country. We've had experiences with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and I think we've won when we've been engaged in battle. And I am somewhat perplexed at their latest moves—some of you may realize that Senator Hayakawa of California has charged them now with infringing on the textbooks that your children shall read. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is now saying that the textbook publishers must have their stamp of approval before textbooks may be sold in the United States. And I'm sure those textbooks will say marvelous things about all that busing has accomplished for your children.

Awhile ago I was talking to a buser—a pro-buser—and he didn't know my position and I told him that busing was a wonderful thing. And he said, "Is that right?" And I said, "I understand that every year a child is bused his I.Q. goes up fifteen points." And he said, "Really?" We've lived under myths for so long with respect to forced busing that it seems you can tell people most anything, at least some of the people some of the time. I'm saddened, in a way, that the busing issue has become so emotional because there are very few things more important to us than our children. And I feel that the viability of the neighborhood school is the most important single ingredient in a sound education. I'm afraid that we've gotten all wrapped in the bugaboos of busing and we've come to believe that it's black versus white. This is one of the myths in education, but it's simply not true. Poll after poll has shown that this is not true. Now if you watch your television programs—whether it's Louisville, Boston, or San Francisco—they're going to be showing black people saying that they favor busing and white people saying that they oppose busing. For some reason or another the media wants to perpetuate the myth that it's black against white, but it is not; because black parents, white parents, American Indian parents, all parents want the same things for their children.

As a psychologist, I'm sure that there's one ingredient that carries across all ethnic strains when it comes to a sound education; and that is that a child must build a sound sense of "self" before he can contend with the struggles of the world. And this is not easy to do because our society is changing so rapidly—there have been more changes in the last twenty years than the prior two thousand—our children are asked to make remarkable changes—and as we look at children grow we'll see that they develop that sense of self that is so
important—if they want to stay away from drugs and some of these other things—if we use the full power of the natural bonds of home, school, and community. And one of the reasons for the growing black opposition to busing—and it's not only growing opposition it's strong, emotional opposition—is that black parents can no longer be told that their children will derive benefits from forced busing.

There are other myths about busing; one of these myths is that if you oppose busing you're a racist. Now as a psychologist, I know why the opposition uses this technique: because Donald Broadbent has well demonstrated, he's one of the most eminent psychologists in the field, that if you call a person a racist it sets up a cerebral discharge—it goes all the way through your brain like a shocking form and you don't want to be associated with that person who's been called a racist, an extremist, or whatever. And that way, the opposition by using these terms, is attempting to isolate you from the mainstream of thinking Americans. And that's the strategy they're using; they've used it for more than twenty years and with remarkable success. And how ironic that the very people who over the years have said that there are no advantages to forced busing are the very individuals who offered the greatest promise of hope to minority children. And those who have been most harmful to minority children are those who have kept hyping an old, old lie—that minority children perform better if they go to school with white children.

There's something of a subtle racist nature of the idea that a black child is going to be smarter if he sits next to a white child. And there are now studies in several cities that have shown that black children perform better if they go to their neighborhood schools, irrespective of whether those schools are in all black or integrated neighborhoods. Because black children are no different from white children, psychologically and emotionally, they need those strengths that come from nourishing those bonds of home, school, and community. Weaken those bonds and you weaken the quality of education.

I come from Wisconsin and as I grew up as a lad—I'll confess that I like to tell fish stories now and then, but I'll never forget when one of my friends came up to me and was describing a trout he caught at Piper's Mill Pond. And he said, "Oh! Gosh, I never saw such a fish!" And I said, "I believe you." And that's pretty much what the pro-busers have been doing. They've been doing it in other ways. They've been trying to make the religious leaders feel that somewhere people are going to be more Christian or more Hebraic—depending upon their background—a better religious person if you favor busing. Father Burns, a distinguished monsignor from the East coast has written a little brochure in which he says that busing is indeed not helping children. And I understand we have some of those free brochures out on the table—I ordered fifteen hundred of them and I hope each one of you will take
a copy of Father Burns' speech there because it's a delightful one and it points out the major issues in which we are involved--and it's so good to have religious leaders starting to come to our side. Just as it's been so good after the years of loneliness to have black leaders come to our side. We don't just need the company, but we do like to have other people.

Monsignor Beroni, in a story which perhaps only a monsignor should tell, recounting a recent meeting in Rome, Pope Paul got his Cardinals together and said, I want you to know that I've got some good news and I've got some bad news. The good news is that the Lord has returned to Earth and I just received a phone call; the bad news is that he called me from Salt Lake City. (laugh) The pro-busers can get together now and say, "We've got good news and we've got bad news. We've never bused more kids than we're busing today; but now for the bad news: it's not doing any good."

My personal feelings about busing have changed very slowly over the years because as a country boy, you don't know too many minority members. I grew up in Central Wisconsin and I found it easy to believe the reports, the research, and the theories that I was taught at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Chicago, but what I learned at those institutions just simply did not fit what I learned when I got out in the field, whether it was the ghettos of Milwaukee or in the ghettos of Chicago. Because I learned that you don't help minority kids by just transporting them, by giving them special educational programs, spending more money--somewhere in the American psyche there's the idea that the more money you spend somehow or other the better it is. An aside that's rather interesting--the Westinghouse Corporation has found--you may believe this or not--that the more money you put in school at this point in today's education the worse the level of education can get--interesting. (applause)

As I was trying to bring together some of the theories I was taught at the University of Chicago with what I was finding when I was working in the ghettos, I'll never forget how depressed I was when I went home at night, knowing that I was not helping the children, my job was helping troubled kids. I can remember still talking with the school people and asking them if I couldn't go to the home of Felicia, a nine-year-old girl, who was having huge learning problems, but my testing of her indicated that she had average ability or perhaps a little higher ability. And the principal said that it would be alright if I went into the home to see what's going on there. So I drove down Madison Street--I don't know if any of you know Chicago--Madison Street, about the 2500 block of Madison Street--pretty rough neighborhood, and I located the hundred block and had to turn off several blocks to get to Felicia's home and there were old cars there
and broken glass and I left my car to walk the two blocks to get to Felicia's home which was an old decayed brownstone apartment and I was approached by several drug addicts as I worked my way toward her apartment.

I walked into the brownstone house--I'll never forget as I walked into that house, it was a bright fall day the sunlight was so positive, so good as I walked into the house it was so dark, so depressing and as I walked up to the third floor there was a body sprawled over one of the railings and I had to brush by him--so many times in my work or in my teaching I was so happy to have had infantry training--and I got up to the third floor; I knocked on the door; and Felicia's mother came to see me; she opened the door; and we talked. As I talked and learned about the problems she was having in the home and problems the mother was having trying to keep the children supervised, the problem of preparing food, the sanitary conditions of the home, the crime, the open crime that she reported in the neighborhood.

As I left Felicia's home, I didn't wonder about why she was having trouble in school, but I did wonder what we mean by spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to teach her how to read better because that obviously is not the answer. We've got to be dealing with the total environment of these kids.

And the more I got into the psychology of learning, the more convinced I am that the child's total environment is so important. I first ran into this theory long before it had any meaning to me. I was at the University of Wisconsin getting my Master's degree in psychiatric social work and we found that when we cured people in the mental hospital and they went home, cured, then everybody else in the family was likely to become upset. And from this we developed the idea of a satellite system of behavior. That every individual in the family goes in a certain order; but if one person slips out of order, then everybody else has to be in a different order.

You can apply the same thing to education; as I worked with children having learning problems I find, for example, that a boy may be having a reading problem, but do you know what might happen if you cure the reading problem? The father may become an alcoholic. Because the father's adjustment may be dependent upon the boy being inadequate and if the boy becomes a successful learner, the threat to the father rises; and as the threat to the father rises, the tensions become more great to the parents, the satellite system. The need it seems to me in education--if we're serious about helping minority children and I doubt that the liberals who brought up busing are serious about helping them--they've developed a whole industry, the desegregation industry, in which people are becoming rich by
serving as consultants for five hundred dollars or a thousand dollars a day—what do you think they want—to get out and work like the rest of us? So it's the total environment of the child, it seems to me that we've got to be concerned about.

But as I learned about Felicia and as more and more I found it difficult to reconcile what I had learned in the universities with what I found in the schools, especially in the ghetto schools, I started reading up on the background of busing. The Brown decision of 1954 and one of the outstanding experts who provided testimony at Brown was Otto Kleinberg, who had an interesting theory: that given the superior Northern environment, black children would become instantly more intelligent. That didn't make much sense to me, having worked with children like Felicia, so I conducted my experiment.

And what I did was find black and white children who lived in the so-called Northern environments—the so-called superior Northern environments—when they were in first grade and when they were in ninth grade. Now if all these fancy social scientists were correct, this is what would happen: I would find that black kids performing at about this average score and white kids performing at about this score (gestured with hands) but after nine years of going to school in the superior Northern environment we should have found the scores coming closer together. Instead of that, the scores drew slightly apart. Now, this simple study in and of itself was enough to stand American psychology on its head.

The Brown decision assumed, on the basis of testimony by Otto Kleinberg, that those Chicago blacks should be doing better and they were not. I submitted the article to the leading educational psychology journal and got back one of the nastiest responses I had ever received in my life. And I was told in no uncertain terms that if I wished to have articles published I had better get into the mainstream of American thought.

So then I submitted the article to the second most important educational psychology journal. I was working in Northwestern University Medical School at the time and this fellow was the chairman of the Northwestern University Medical School or chairman of the Northwestern University Psychology Department, and he called me up and said, "I'd like to talk to you." And he said, "You know if those articles are published it could cost you ten years of your professional life."

Alright, here's the conflict folks, should we go on forever busing kids, or go on forever with remedial reading programs, providing
special programs for kids in the schools, like we've done with kids like Felicia, or should we report the facts, which might eventually produce programs which can genuinely help them.

The article was published and became the first article, to my knowledge, that publicly refuted Otto Kleinberg. Otto Kleinberg was not the only social scientist who told some mighty strange stories to the Supreme Court in 1953 and '54. One of the interesting specialists who appeared before the Supreme Court in the 1950s, through his writings, was Kenneth Clark, considered one of the most outstanding social scientists in the United States.

Kenneth Clark told the Supreme Court, through his writings, that he had conducted an interesting experiment in South Carolina. In this interesting experiment sixteen black children, one at a time, were shown a black doll and a white doll, and they were asked, "Which doll do you prefer?" Ten of the sixteen preferred the white doll. Then they were asked, "Which doll do you think is nice?" Nine of the sixteen thought the white doll was very nice. Then they were asked, "Which doll do you think looks bad?" And eleven of the sixteen said they thought the black doll looked bad. The Supreme Court was almost in tears at this remarkable study. The Supreme Court of the United States. What Kenneth Clark did not tell the Supreme Court was that he had conducted a similar study in the so-called integrated schools of the North--he didn't tell them this--and he found one hundred percentage of the black children preferred the white doll; a higher percentage of the black children thought the white doll was nice, and a higher percentage of the black children thought the black doll looked bad.

Thurgood Marshall, who is presently a United States Supreme Court Justice, was a little troubled by this evidence, but he proceeded to use it to the fullest, and now we are saddled across the nation with a hopeless policy--a hopeless national policy--which is heavily politicized, of how forced busing inflicts the greatest harm upon the children who need the greatest help.

Now, the true story of busing must include, and I'm glad we have some members of the media here, the apparent refusal of the media to report basic facts to the American public. I was amazed, for example, when I read from one of my girls several years ago, this statement that had come out of the World Book, you know, the World Book is one of the most used encyclopedias in this nation. And the World Book said this, "School desegregation has contributed substantially to the improvement of the quality of education in a number of communities according to a study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I wrote to World Book and World Book sent me a copy of the
news article which appeared in the New York Times. And the New York Times quoted the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and gave the names of ten cities wherein busing of children had resulted in higher black achievement.

Being more than a little curious by this time, I wrote to the superintendents of these ten communities and I want to read you some of their responses.

From Tampa, Florida, remember these are the showcase cities, as far as the U.S. Commission is concerned. "Dear Dr. Scott, There are no such statistics. I can't imagine the U.S. Commission making such a statement." This is from the Superintendent of Tampa, Florida.

A superintendent from Pontiac, Michigan, says, "The school district of the city of Pontiac does not have evidence to substantiate the conclusion that the quality of education has been improved substantially as a result of school desegregation. I am at a loss to know where the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights got information that reaches this conclusion." And I could go on reading some of the other responses.

Now it strikes me that being inconsistent with the responsibilities we've vested in World Book, I don't expect too much from the New York Times, but World Book and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to give us this kind of sloppy information.

But maybe it's because I'm old-fashioned. On the other hand, and I've got so much confidence in this system, I was raised in a second generation Norwich-American home in which the values and virtues of this country were treasured even higher than the Norwegian Lutheran Church--and that's pretty high.

But I'm afraid we're slipping fast into the kind of thought control, and I don't mean to say that we're there yet, that Solzhenitzyn talks of when he talks of Russia. I'll read you some of the things Solzhenitzyn has said about Russia: "The permanent lie becomes the only safe form of existence." Let me assure you that on university campuses today, this is the only safe form of existence I know when it comes to forced busing.

They sent a minority student into my class because I testified against forced busing. The people who are hired to fight discrimination sent this minority student into my class to make notes to find some little phrase to be used as evidence that I'm a racist and could, therefore, be dismissed. After a year, this minority student came to me and told me that she had been sent in with this assignment. I said,
"Would you put this in writing?" And she did. I sent it to the President of the university and the U.S. Justice Department and a sense of deafness has never been impaired by their thunderous response.

To proceed with Solzhenitzyn, writing in Gulag Archipelago: "The permanent lie becomes the only safe form of existence; and the same way is betrayal." And I think that social scientists are engaging in betrayal, when they refuse to all the shots exactly as they are. "Therefore, every word of it does not have to be a direct lie, is nonetheless obligated not to contradict the general common lie." And here again Solzhenitzyn has far better words than I to describing and summing up what's happened. On summing it all up he states: "And the lie has, in fact, led us so far away from a normal society that you cannot even orient yourself any longer; in its dense grey fog, not even one pillar can be seen."

I guess my feeling is that when we are misled on such gross matters by World Book, The New York Times--one of the amateurs of the field--and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, we have a major problem.

Now, when I began inquiring into the matter of busing in the late 1960s, I submitted a request to the university for help and I was told by the dean and head of our department that it was too controversial. So they didn't see fit to support it; they supported one of the pro-busing activities. So I prepared a manuscript, spent a great deal of time on it, and sent it to a literary agent in New York. The literary agent said that that's one of the most amazing stories I've ever heard--that being the story of forced busing.

And she sent it to various agents and publishers, but not a one of them would take it. And there were many statements in the rejections such as, "This seems to be a great book, I think, but it seems that it might be seditious." What actually happens is that almost all the publishers are partially dependent upon educational sales and obviously a book like this would not help their educational sales. But in the late 1960s it was controversial to argue that forced busing would not help children. We are now in a position because there is no one--no one in the universities willing to debate that there's any educational merit to forced busing; no matter where I go they won't debate me, obviously. It's not possible to argue that not only is forced busing not helpful, we now have evidence that it is harmful (mild applause).

Forced busing weakens the natural bonds of home, school, and community. And I want to emphasize how important that is. Secondly, there are no achievement gains. Thirdly, it leads us away from
integration not toward integration; it fuels school violence. There is a strong and positive correlation between forced busing and school violence. It drains resources by taking millions of dollars away when we could be spending it much more wisely. It accelerates white flight. It causes resegregation by race and by social class. As an aside to that, I was talking with ________ who is an advisor to President Carter, and he acknowledged that forced busing was resulting in many children from lower class homes, whose parents could not afford private schools, or move to the suburbs, to go to the public schools. But says he, "In the future we intend to do something about social class segregation." Which means in typical Washington style, and I think Washington has been adequately described as sixteen square miles completely surrounded by sanity, which means that after they get through creating social class segregation in the schools by forced busing then they're going to have to break apart the private schools because there are no black children going to the private schools. And they're also going to integrate the suburbs. Now, here's an interesting report from the Louisville paper, November 9th, and the only way the media, and we've got two of them right here...but here's the Louisville Courier and this is a quotation, "Study says suburbs make busing work." Now that's what you read if you read the headline--suburbs make busing work--Do you know what this really says? What this really says is that the only way to pick up white bodies is to bus into the suburbs. That's what it really says. And they conclude by saying that large-scale busing is seldom popular, that's both blacks and whites, and that it doesn't necessarily produce educational benefits. Now, you see, the headlines says, "Study says suburbs make busing work." And then they say it's only a matter of body count. There are no advantages or benefits in forced busing. You've got to read more than the headlines today.

But my chief interest in talking when I come to individuals like you who at least are not going to believe everything that's told them is that our society is in serious trouble. I don't know if many of you have read this Time magazine, "High Schools in Trouble." When I was working in a number of suburban and inner city schools, there were many teachers who didn't even bother to teach. Things were that bad. You may not believe that. I can still remember the need to disarm an adolescent who was coming at me with a knife. And a lot of teachers don't want to have to do that. And the reason I had to do that was because I had expected some kind of standards. And we're losing out on the whole principle of standards.

I talked to a principal in Chicago, Illinois, not long ago and he said that in Chicago schools, many times very little effort is made to teach. The primary interest on the part of teachers is self-preservation. And he said the real crime is that many black youngsters
have been taught by example, by those who have gone on before them, and they don't have to study to get a full scholarship. If we think we're helping minorities by lowering the standards we're just kidding ourselves. But as we search for alternatives, and I think we do have to search for alternatives, we should bear in mind certain central facts.

One of those facts is that by the time a child is six, some studies indicate that two-thirds of his I.Q. is pretty well established. We can take first grade scores of children, for example, and predict with great accuracy what those children will be doing when they are in high school. By the time a child is old enough to be bused the die are cast. That's why my chief interest in education has been in Home Start, which was designated as a national U.S. model by the U.S. Office of Education. The project was initiated in 1967, when I disagreed with the Head Start idea, that you take a child out of his home, put him in a classroom, give him a few hours of help, put him back in his home, and that's all he's going to need.

I said, "No, you are going to have to go into the home." And it wasn't easy, but we developed Home Start and I'm credited with being the engineer of that. It was designated a U.S. model. The October issue of Psychology in the Schools carried the results of that program to the black youngsters.

We started when those kids were two years of age. We worked with the parents. And you know there's a myth in this country, a myth that minority parents aren't as interested in their kids as majority parents are, and it's not true. We found those minority parents eager to work with us. And when their kids were in third grade, as that report indicates, there was a significant difference in the performance of those children. They were performing significantly higher because we worked with them during the years two to five and that was when the brain was developing most rapidly.

And if we really want to help disadvantaged kids we should take advantage of the prime learning times which are before the school years. And in my judgment it should be done within the home where the child feels secure. I have great reservation about some of the government's great ideas in which they are going to become "big poppa" and "big mamma" to everybody. I think we have to do everything possible to make parents realize that when they have children they have a responsibility to those children. But when those children are going up under conditions of deprivation, that's the time for us to act. If we had time I could give you case studies on one hundred youngsters and the things we've had to do, working with doctors, working with a family agency where there was need for counseling, working with
employment agencies so that a father could get work; this is hard work. It's easy to bus kids around as if they were cattle; it's hard to work within the homes. But that, in my judgment, is where the pay-off lies. That's why I wish we could get off the dead horse of busing (applause) and get on with real help.

I've got to admit to you that when people clap I don't know what they're clapping about, whether they want me to sit down or say more, because I've been told when it comes to busing I'm like the sixth grade kid who has been told to spell the word banana...well, he says, let's see, I know it's bananana, I know how to spell it, I just don't know when to stop.

But just let me briefly tell you what I wish we'd do with the money that is being wasted on busing. Actually, we're spending millions of dollars to make things worse; if we'd just stop busing we'd at least make things even. And maybe a few of us could enjoy lower taxes. But some of the things that we should also be doing, it seems to me, is to improve the critical skills of teachers. And there is so much that the average classroom teacher could be helped to do better; that's my job. I've been doing it for years. I could give you some amazing figures on what the average classroom teacher cannot do and in a period of six or eight weeks can be helped to do, if we could reinstate the idea of standards.

I'm on the graduate council at the university. I don't know how I got elected to that because I'm the most conservative person on campus. But there are fifteen of us on the graduate council and they were saying the other day, "How should we decide which people go on to do graduate work?" I said, "Well, let's keep it fair, let's make it easy, let's say that before they can be admitted to a graduate program—now this is not the college, this is the graduate program—they should demonstrate that in reading, writing, and arithmetic they can do sixth grade work." Do you know how many people supported me on that? How many do you think? Guess! I'll buy a coke for the person who comes closest! Not one. And the president of our faculty said that the EOP would be in on us the next day—the Equal Opportunity people. And I said, "If this is discrimination or racism, let them come!"

If there is an injustice we have done to minorities in this country it's by making them feel that they are wounded animals. If there's an injustice to the dignity of minorities, it's by making them feel that standards should be tailored. If there's an injustice to black kids in this country it's by allowing teachers to serve on a quota system so that inadequate teaching can be done. Now a lot of people say that they don't care if a teacher doesn't know how to teach,
but I don't want doctors who don't know how to operate. In my opinion, they're both cut from the same cloth. I don't want my kids going and learning from teachers who don't know the multiplication tables. And I think that it's about time that we considered, out of our interest and love, for minority children, because none of us would be here tonight if we didn't feel that there was something fundamentally wrong with forced busing. The easy thing is to nod your head like one of these gitchy birds you see in dime stores.

There are other things I'd like to emphasize...one of these is the importance of discipline. As long as I live I will not forget my teaching experience in ghetto schools. All of these namby-pamby teachers trying to give permissive education to kids who have no control in the homes. And how those kids would love it when they would stand up and say the "Pledge of Allegiance" and when they would salute the flag. And I don't know if you believe it or not, they might be in jail today, some of them; but the quest of these kids was for order in their lives. And this is true of all of us.

I'll never forget my second daughter--well she's very different from my oldest daughter--as a psychologist I knew all the answers until I had my own kids...when my first daughter came along I went to the hospital and I looked at her and said, "No problem." You could just tell that that kid wasn't going to present any problems. And to this day--you know all kids are different--that kid really doesn't need any punishment. Now, the second kid came along and I went to the hospital and said, "Holy smoke! This kid is a cat of another breed." Man, she was thrashing in there, you know, and I thought she was going to fight Ali Khan or something. She's just completely different and to this day, our second daughter, Ingrid, she's a terror, she's a lovely kid. I just love her, but boy she's rugged. Kids are different.

But all of them want discipline. All of them want the security of knowing how far they can go. I'll never forget one time when one of the school board members was at our house and Ingrid had been acting up and I swatted her on the fanny and I marched her upstairs and swatted her again in the place on her anatomy that nature provided for such ammunition long before I came on this earth. And I said, "Now you'll stay there until I tell you to come back." And the school board member said, "Now that was not like a psychologist." And I said, "Well, that wasn't a psychologist; that was a father!" (applause) And when Ingrid came down, she bounced down, she was the most cheerful little kid you had ever seen in your life, and she said, "Daddy, I love you best of all!" Well, that kind of took me aback and I said, "Why is that?" And she replied, "Because you spank Kristina the hardest!" (laughter)
You know, kids have a tendency to give you a signal on one level and the real signal is down below. What was she really saying? What was she really saying? That wasn't the real content. What was she telling me? (response from audience member) What's that? That's it. I'm so glad you care enough to love me. Because kids are so filled with fear when they don't know how far they can go.

Now, isn't it strange that I try and argue that if we're really concerned about majority and minority kids--and I think that we should get off this thing of race, it's totally irrelevant--we should get on with quality education. But one of the things we should be emphasizing in the schools is consistent, fair discipline. Because I don't know how in the world we can ever have successful education for anybody unless first we have order and then we grant freedom. Liberal educators have turned this on its head and said, "We will give them freedom and hope they develop order."

So in brief, I want to say how I have enjoyed coming and how I welcome the comments or questions you have. I don't know how much time we have, or if you'd like to ask Kaye some questions. She has done a marvelous job here in Columbus. I think that you should know that nationwide a lot of institutions like the Justice Department and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights know that NANS, people like Kaye, are waking people up. They don't like it. One of the recent times I was testifying in a court case, a reference was made by a Justice Department attorney to my involvement in NANS. I think that's a compliment that they know we're here and I want them to know that. So I appreciate what you folks are doing in Columbus and if you ever have any questions I hope you'll ask Kaye. Of course, you have such a terribly able man, Paul. I've been asked by Howard. My book The Busing Cover-Up is back there; it's been published under another name, Edward Langerton. The reason I published it under another name is that if I put my real name on it the liberals would try to punish me.

And I rather enjoyed flying around the country telling people the "Home Start Story." It was a national model program and I went around the country telling people how they could develop strong programs, especially for minority kids in the home during those crucial years. But I was in Wilmington, Delaware, the president of the school board and the school superintendent admitted that the statements that had been printed in the paper were false, but nonetheless, without any explanation I was dismissed as a consultant after having developed the program in its beginning period. So I did have Edward Langerton on those first two prints. On the third, I will have my real name.

But as we see the majority black opinion and the majority white opinion swinging in a strong demand for improved education for children of all races, I think it will not be too long before we enter the third phase of social change. And a friend of mine tells me, that when you
try to bring about social change, first of all those in the establishment ignore you. Now, if you begin to become effective enough they begin to attack you. And then if you become so effective that your ideas begin to be adopted, they'll take the credit for this adoption. We're presently in the second stage; I feel so good about it. I told Kaye earlier, that everytime they attack us we come out stronger. But I do appreciate your concern on this issue, whether you are for or against busing. If you have questions, I'd be glad to answer them.