Chyou

COPY TO CHRIS WALKER FOR REPLY
'97 FEB 15 PM3:36

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON
20250-0100

February 12, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

From: **Secretary Dan Glickman** Dan Glickman

Subject: **Seasonal Base Plans for Southeast Dairy**

I read Congressman Norwood's letter to you on seasonal base plans in Federal milk marketing orders and want to let you know the background and status of this issue.

The authority to operate these plans, which reward producers for shifting production from the spring to the fall, when milk is often in short supply, expired on December 31, 1996. We fought to extend the authority in the 1996 Farm Bill as well as in our appropriations legislation but were unsuccessful. Efforts to extend this authority in the FY 1997 omnibus appropriations measure also failed.

We will seek legislative authority again this year. Usually, the Department must conduct rulemaking before it implements changes in Federal milk orders. However, we have drafted our current legislative proposal so we can simply reinstate the previous seasonal base plans without going through a new rulemaking and thus avoid any delays. The proposal is in the clearance process and will be sent to Congress as soon as possible.

Senators Cochran, Coverdell, and Helms recently introduced legislation, S. 277, to accomplish the same outcome as the Department's proposal. While the Department has not taken a position on this legislation, we would be able to support it if some technical changes are made so that it achieves effectively the desired result. We will be providing Senator Cochran with these changes. Congressman Norwood has indicated that he wants to introduce a similar bill, and we will provide him technical assistance.

The Administration supports seasonal base legislation because it encourages stable milk production and results in higher dairy prices for dairy producers in marketing orders with seasonal base plans. Five marketing orders in the following 16 States had seasonal base plans at the end of 1996: Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, West Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. Dairy producers in the following 9 States market milk to handlers who are regulated under these orders: Missouri, Vermont, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, Florida, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. There is strong interest in reinstating seasonal base plans because many dairy producers in these States were expecting the higher returns received under a seasonal base plan. The lapse of these plans is creating financial hardship on these producers.

Administration support of this legislation would be well-received by the States that have had seasonal base plans in their milk marketing orders. However, Congressman Stenholm, ranking Democrat on the House Agriculture Committee, has not supported legislation to extend the seasonal base plan authority in the past. While seasonal base plans do not have any adverse effect on dairy producers in other regions of the country, these regions, particularly the Midwest, have not supported such legislation, and are likely to object to the Administration's legislative proposal.

I will keep you posted on our efforts.

[illegible]
Cleared
[illegible]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

CHARLIE NORWOOD
10TH DISTRICT
GEORGIA

February 5, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. President,

Last fall the milk excess base plan expired. This will have a significant negative impact on dairy farmers throughout the southeast. I would appreciate any help that you might be able to provide. Secretary Glickman can certainly provide you further information on the subject.

I look forward to working with you in the future. If there is anything I can do for you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Charlie Norwood

Charlie

Mr. Panetta and Mr. Obey did this on the last Vote of the 104th. It was uncalled for and punative, to say the least!

T J. Glauthier
02/13/97 07:41:11 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP, Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP

cc: Franklin D. Raines/OMB/EOP, Jacob J. Lew/OMB/EOP, Rebecca R. Culberson/OMB/EOP
Subject: Request for Information on Dairy Prices

Sylvia, the attached email responds to the question you raised earlier this week about dairy prices. This was a response to a comment from Rep. Norwood to the President. If you need additional information, please give me a call.

------------------ Forwarded by T J. Glauthier/OMB/EOP on 02/13/97 07:35 AM --------------------------

Daniel D. Heath
02/12/97 06:17:55 PM

Record Type: Record

To: T J. Glauthier/OMB/EOP

cc: Ronald M. Cogswell/OMB/EOP, Mark A. Weatherly/OMB/EOP, Alecia Ward/OMB/EOP
Subject: Sylvia Mathews' Request on Dairy

The President has requested background on Rep. Norwood's comment to him that a "milk excess base plan" would have a positive impact on dairy farmers in the Southeast U.S. Mr. Norwood is urging legislation to reinstate a provision that expired last year. (I'm sending you a copy of his letter to the President.)

The comment reflects a broad and perennial dairy industry theme, dissatisfaction with the Federal pricing of dairy products. It is provoked by the 25 percent decline in prices from September to December 1996. (The 1996 annual average price was a record high, and even after the drop prices remain above levels of most years and recently have risen.) The price swings resulted from market forces (high feed prices, and farmers' responses), but the Federal milk pricing regime is seen by the dairy industry either as the underlying problem or the solution to disenchantment with prices.

More narrowly, the "milk excess base plan" refers to a former scheme in the Federal marketing order system for the Southeastern U.S. to smooth seasonal swings in milk production and corresponding price and income effects of the milk price cycle. This "seasonal base plan" paid farmers higher-than-normal prices throughout the year for a "base" level of production established in the months of short supply, but paid below-normal prices for "overbase" production in the flush months. The effect was to generate more milk in the Southeast from local supplies in the short supply periods, and to boost incomes for Southeast dairy producers. The scheme was authorized in past farm bills, was officially supported by the Administration in the 1996 Farm Bill deliberations, Many dairy producers are concerned about the recent decline in milk prices, and Secretary Glickman has suggested that the issue may be raised during the National Governors Association meeting. Despite reaching record highs during 1996, milk prices declined sharply in the fourth quarter. The price of 40-pound blocks of cheddar cheese on the National Cheese Exchange, for example, fell by 30 percent between early October and mid-December. Over the past few weeks, milk prices have strengthened -- but dairy state Governors, Senators, and Members of the House are still pressing for Administration action. The Department of Agriculture has taken several steps to strengthen milk prices, as described below, but has resisted establishing a price floor as some dairy interests are advocating. A price floor would be incongruous with the Congressional mandate embodied in the Farm Bill, and would pit regions against each other since some are disadvantaged by price floors.

Q: What are you going to do about milk prices? Are you willing to establish a Floor price for milk?

A: I am aware that milk prices declined sharply at the end of last year, and that the Department of Agriculture has already taken several steps to strengthen milk prices, including:

- Purchasing $5 million worth of cheese for use in domestic food assistance programs, in addition to the accelerated school lunch purchases already underway;
- Stimulating exports by reactivating the Dairy Export Incentive Program for butterfat, which has been idle since mid-1995; and
- Working with private voluntary groups to boost the flow of dairy products into international food assistance programs

In addition, Secretary Glickman announced on January 29 that he is taking steps to address concerns raised by dairy producers about how milk prices are calculated.

I also understand that prices have strengthened in recent weeks. So I hope we can continue to work together to address the concerns that have been raised.

[If pressed on a price support: As instructed by Congress in the Farm Bill, we are moving away from price supports and toward a consolidation and reform of the federal marketing order system. Milk pricing is complicated and has been subject to extensive government intervention over a long period of time. The Farm Bill instructs us to reform this entire pricing system, and it's best to consider any proposals for a price floor within the context of reforming the federal marketing order system. I am confident that Secretary Glickman will continue to work with the industry to address your concerns in ways that are consistent with the thrust of these reform policies.]

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 2/21

TO: Bruce Reed
T.J. Glauthier

FROM: Staff Secretary

Sylvia wanted you to be sure to see Sec'y Glickman's follow-up to Cong. Norwood's letter.

Phil Caplan

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON
20250-0100

'97 FEB 15 PM3:36

February 12, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

From: **Secretary Dan Glickman** Dan Glickman

Subject: **Seasonal Base Plans for Southeast Dairy**

I read Congressman Norwood's letter to you on seasonal base plans in Federal milk marketing orders and want to let you know the background and status of this issue.

The authority to operate these plans, which reward producers for shifting production from the spring to the fall, when milk is often in short supply, expired on December 31, 1996. We fought to extend the authority in the 1996 Farm Bill as well as in our appropriations legislation but were unsuccessful. Efforts to extend this authority in the FY 1997 omnibus appropriations measure also failed.

We will seek legislative authority again this year. Usually, the Department must conduct rulemaking before it implements changes in Federal milk orders. However, we have drafted our current legislative proposal so we can simply reinstate the previous seasonal base plans without going through a new rulemaking and thus avoid any delays. The proposal is in the clearance process and will be sent to Congress as soon as possible.

Senators Cochran, Coverdell, and Helms recently introduced legislation, S. 277, to accomplish the same outcome as the Department's proposal. While the Department has not taken a position on this legislation, we would be able to support it if some technical changes are made so that it achieves effectively the desired result. We will be providing Senator Cochran with these changes. Congressman Norwood has indicated that he wants to introduce a similar bill, and we will provide him technical assistance.

The Administration supports seasonal base legislation because it encourages stable milk production and results in higher dairy prices for dairy producers in marketing orders with seasonal base plans. Five marketing orders in the following 16 States had seasonal base plans at the end of 1996: Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, West Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. Dairy producers in the following 9 States market milk to handlers who are regulated under these orders: Missouri, Vermont, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, Florida, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. There is strong interest in reinstating seasonal base plans because many dairy producers in these States were expecting the higher returns received under a seasonal base plan. The lapse of these plans is creating financial hardship on these producers.

Administration support of this legislation would be well-received by the States that have had seasonal base plans in their milk marketing orders. However, Congressman Stenholm, ranking Democrat on the House Agriculture Committee, has not supported legislation to extend the seasonal base plan authority in the past. While seasonal base plans do not have any adverse effect on dairy producers in other regions of the country, these regions, particularly the Midwest, have not supported such legislation, and are likely to object to the Administration's legislative proposal.

I will keep you posted on our efforts.

[illegible]

THE PRESIDENT
2-6-97

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

CHARLIE NORWOOD
10TH DISTRICT
GEORGIA

February 5, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. President,

Last fall the milk excess base plan expired. This will have a significant negative impact on dairy farmers throughout the southeast. I would appreciate any help that you might be able to provide. Secretary Glickman can certainly provide you further information on the subject.

I look forward to working with you in the future. If there is anything I can do for you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Charlie Norwood

Charlie

Mr. Panetta and Mr. Obey did this on the last Vote of the 104th. It was uncalled for and punative, to say the least!

T J. Glauthier
02/13/97 07:41:11 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP, Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP

cc: Franklin D. Raines/OMB/EOP, Jacob J. Lew/OMB/EOP, Rebecca R. Culberson/OMB/EOP
Subject: Request for Information on Dairy Prices

Sylvia, the attached email responds to the question you raised earlier this week about dairy prices. This was a response to a comment from Rep. Norwood to the President. If you need additional information, please give me a call.

------------------ Forwarded by T J. Glauthier/OMB/EOP on 02/13/97 07:35 AM ---------------------------

Daniel D. Heath
02/12/97 06:17:55 PM

Record Type: Record

To: T J. Glauthier/OMB/EOP

cc: Ronald M. Cogswell/OMB/EOP, Mark A. Weatherly/OMB/EOP, Alecia Ward/OMB/EOP
Subject: Sylvia Mathews' Request on Dairy

The President has requested background on Rep. Norwood's comment to him that a "milk excess base plan" would have a positive impact on dairy farmers in the Southeast U.S. Mr. Norwood is urging legislation to reinstate a provision that expired last year. (I'm sending you a copy of his letter to the President.)

The comment reflects a broad and perennial dairy industry theme, dissatisfaction with the Federal pricing of dairy products. It is provoked by the 25 percent decline in prices from September to December 1996. (The 1996 annual average price was a record high, and even after the drop prices remain above levels of most years and recently have risen.) The price swings resulted from market forces (high feed prices, and farmers' responses), but the Federal milk pricing regime is seen by the dairy industry either as the underlying problem or the solution to disenchantment with prices.

More narrowly, the "milk excess base plan" refers to a former scheme in the Federal marketing order system for the Southeastern U.S. to smooth seasonal swings in milk production and corresponding price and income effects of the milk price cycle. This "seasonal base plan" paid farmers higher-than-normal prices throughout the year for a "base" level of production established in the months of short supply, but paid below-normal prices for "overbase" production in the flush months. The effect was to generate more milk in the Southeast from local supplies in the short supply periods, and to boost incomes for Southeast dairy producers. The scheme was authorized in past farm bills, was officially supported by the Administration in the 1996 Farm Bill deliberations, Many dairy producers are concerned about the recent decline in milk prices, and Secretary Glickman has suggested that the issue may be raised during the National Governors Association meeting. Despite reaching record highs during 1996, milk prices declined sharply in the fourth quarter. The price of 40-pound blocks of cheddar cheese on the National Cheese Exchange, for example, fell by 30 percent between early October and mid-December. Over the past few weeks, milk prices have strengthened -- but dairy state Governors, Senators, and Members of the House are still pressing for Administration action. The Department of Agriculture has taken several steps to strengthen milk prices, as described below, but has resisted establishing a price floor as some dairy interests are advocating. A price floor would be incongruous with the Congressional mandate embodied in the Farm Bill, and would pit regions against each other since some are disadvantaged by price floors.

Q: What are you going to do about milk prices? Are you willing to establish a Floor price for milk?

A: I am aware that milk prices declined sharply at the end of last year, and that the Department of Agriculture has already taken several steps to strengthen milk prices, including:

- Purchasing $5 million worth of cheese for use in domestic food assistance programs, in addition to the accelerated school lunch purchases already underway;

- Stimulating exports by reactivating the Dairy Export Incentive Program for butterfat, which has been idle since mid-1995; and

- Working with private voluntary groups to boost the flow of dairy products into international food assistance programs

In addition, Secretary Glickman announced on January 29 that he is taking steps to address concerns raised by dairy producers about how milk prices are calculated.

I also understand that prices have strengthened in recent weeks. So I hope we can continue to work together to address the concerns that have been raised.

[If pressed on a price support: As instructed by Congress in the Farm Bill, we are moving away from price supports and toward a consolidation and reform of the federal marketing order system. Milk pricing is complicated and has been subject to extensive government intervention over a long period of time. The Farm Bill instructs us to reform this entire pricing system, and it's best to consider any proposals for a price floor within the context of reforming the federal marketing order system. I am confident that Secretary Glickman will continue to work with the industry to address your concerns in ways that are consistent with the thrust of these reform policies.]

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 10, 1997

2/21/97

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Charles F.C. Ruff
Counsel to the President

Bob J. Nash
Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Personnel

Re: Policy Decisions Regarding United States Attorney Nominations

---

Background

There are 93 Districts for which the President nominates, and the Senate confirms, a United States Attorney. During your first term, nominations were made and confirmed for 88 Districts. In three Districts -- Northern Mississippi, Western Texas, and the Virgin Islands -- a nomination was made but not confirmed. The 104th Congress only confirmed four of the seven nominations made by you; and in 1996 no nominations for United States Attorney were confirmed by the Senate. We anticipate recommending to you the renomination of these three candidates to the 105th Congress. During the first term no nominations were ever made for two districts -- Puerto Rico and Guam -- for political and vetting reasons.

In addition to the foregoing five Districts where there were no confirmed nominations, vacancies have been created by death, resignation, or elevation to the bench in the following five Districts:

Northern District of Alabama
Southern District of Florida
Middle District of Georgia
District of Kansas
Southern District of Ohio

We are currently reviewing candidates for nomination to three of these Districts, and are awaiting recommendations for the other two Districts. Over the course of the next four years based upon our experience in your first term, we anticipate that an additional 10 Districts will be the subject of U. S. Attorney nominations.

U. S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President but are appointed for a four-year term. The four-year terms of U. S. Attorneys nominated by you and confirmed in your first term will begin expiring July 26, 1997. During 1997, the terms of 51 U. S. Attorneys will expire, with another 18 expiring in the first quarter of 1998.

At the conclusion of the term, a confirmed U. S. Attorney may "hold over" for an unlimited period of time until a successor is nominated and confirmed. Such a holdover U.S. Attorney possesses all of the powers and authority of a renominated and reconfirmed appointee. The decision whether to hold over or to renominate a U.S. Attorney with an expired term turns therefore largely on political considerations (including the wishes of the sponsoring Senators) and not at all on considerations of legal authority.

President Reagan in his second term retained almost half of the U. S. Attorneys he nominated, 41, and of that number renominated 24. The remaining 17 U. S. Attorneys simply held over throughout President Reagan's second term, and some continued to hold over through President Bush's term.

Issues

1. Should we undertake a review of the performance of each U.S. Attorney as his or her term expires, and reach an individual judgment as to his or her continuance in office? Or should we presume that U.S. Attorneys who wish to remain in office as their terms expire may do so absent special circumstances?

2. Should we renominate United States Attorneys who are to continue in office, or should we hold over incumbents and direct our resources to vacancies which are currently pending and which will occur during the next four years?

Discussion

1. Our consultations with the Justice Department have led us to conclude that it would not be worthwhile to conduct a general review of all U.S. Attorneys wishing to continue in office as their terms expire. Because in many cases our political maneuvering room will be severely limited, it would not be a productive use of Administration resources and might raise unrealistic expectations about the amount of turnover there will be. Of course, where there are individual appointees whose tenure should be evaluated because of their performance, Justice, working together with the White House, can deal individually with those situations.

2. Some sponsoring Senators will want their U.S. Attorneys renominated because of local or other political considerations, but there is no reason to make this the norm. Holdover U.S. Attorneys possess exactly the same legal authority as those who are reappointed. Renominating all U.S. Attorneys who are to continue in office would cost us dearly with respect to judicial and other nominees who must be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee has budgeted a certain amount of time for hearings with respect to Justice Department nominees, including U.S. Attorneys, and judicial nominees. Every U.S. Attorney "renominee" we add to their docket will inevitably reduce the amount of time available for judges and may provide a pretext not to move a number of your judicial nominations forward.

Given the number of Justice Department nominations forthcoming in the next few months and the number of judicial vacancies, a decision to renominate all U. S. Attorneys who wish to remain in office would substantially reduce the time available to the Judiciary Committee to focus on nominations for judges. In addition, there may very well be individual appointees who are already confirmed, but who might not now be confirmable in this Senate for political reasons.

Recommendations

The Department of Justice, the Counsel to the President, and the Director of Presidential Personnel believe that given our resources and the limited time that the Senate Judiciary Committee will allocate to nominations, (1) we should not undertake a general review of U.S. Attorneys who wish to remain in office, but should instead presume that such appointees will be permitted to continue in office absent special circumstances, and (2) we should hold over rather than renominate as many of such U.S. Attorneys as possible.

__√__ Agree

_____ Disagree

_____ Discuss With Me

COVER NOTE
NOT SENT
TO RUFF/NASH
MRM
2-22-97

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN
2/21/97

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 21, 1997

MR. PRESIDENT:

The attached Ruff/Nash memo recommends that you: ***1)*** not conduct a general review of U.S. Attorneys, and instead permit them to continue in office after their 4-year terms expire absent special circumstances; and ***2)*** hold over rather than renominate as many U.S. Attorneys as possible.

Background. U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, and once nominated by him and confirmed by the Senate, serve for a 4-year term. However, a confirmed U.S. Attorney may "hold over" for an unlimited period of time until a successor is nominated and confirmed. For example, President Reagan held over 17 U.S. Attorneys throughout his second term. Hold over U.S. Attorneys possess the same legal authority as those who are reappointed.

There are 93 U.S. Attorney Districts, and during your first term, the Senate confirmed 88 U.S. Attorneys. In 3 districts your nominations were not confirmed, and in 2 Districts you did not make nominations due to political and vetting considerations. In addition to these 5 vacancies, 5 additional vacancies have been created by death, resignation, or elevation to the bench, so you now have 10 vacancies to fill.

Rationale for recommendation. The decision whether to hold over or renominate a U.S. Attorney with an expired term turns largely on political considerations. Ruff and Nash argue that the Senate Judiciary Committee budgets a certain amount of time to DOJ nominees, and that every U.S. Attorney "renominee" we add to their docket will reduce the amount of time available for judges, and may provide a pretext for not moving your judicial nominations forward. In addition, some of your U.S. Attorneys may not be confirmable in this Senate for political reasons. *Erskine concurs with the recommendation, and Podesta agrees that we should permit U.S. Attorneys to hold over, but thinks we should be prepared to nominate new U.S. Attorneys where there is weak performance.*

agree

_✓_ Agree ___ Disagree ___ Discuss

Phil Caplan Phil
Helen Howell Helen

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

DATE: 2-22

TO: Bob

FROM: Staff Secretary

This is a good guy who has been very supportive of our Administration. Can you guys get him on the right list.

[signature]

1008 N. Livingston Street
Arlington, VA 22205
(703) 532-2771

February 17, 1997

Todd Stern
Staff Secretary
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Todd:

Thank you for returning my call and for your kind offer of assistance. As promised, I am attaching a copy of my resume. This letter should acquaint you with the details of my predicament.

As I mentioned by phone, I have been meeting with officials at State, Treasury, Defense, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative regarding various employment opportunities. The problem I have encountered is that the Office of Presidential Personnel has not been forwarding my resume to the White House liaisons in these departments. Without White House backing, they are reluctant to provide much assistance.

As I mentioned to you, I was helpful to the Administration last December on Bosnia. In the weeks leading up to the Congressional vote on U.S. participation in the Bosnian peacekeeping mission, Dan Dutko and I put together the Coalition to the Support the Peace Agreement to coordinate the lobbying efforts of major ethnic, religious, and humanitarian organizations supportive of the Dayton Accords. We organized a press conference of ethnic and religious leaders on the steps of the Capitol and mobilized the members of these organizations to contact targeted congressmen. Because of these efforts, which I undertook for free, Dan wrote Bob Nash in November urging that I be considered for a political appointment.

I have been a lifelong and very committed Democrat. Most recently, I served on the Democratic staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee — where I continued to be a vocal supporter of U.S. involvement in Bosnia. I have also worked as a national staffer on two previous Democratic presidential campaigns, as well as a volunteer in several congressional races. I remained on the sidelines for the 1992 race because I was working as the executive director of an international non-profit and could not take a leave of absence, though both my wife and my brother were on the national staff of the campaign. This election cycle found me finishing my Ph.D. dissertation and with a wife who was eight months pregnant. I did volunteer when the campaign asked members of the Senate Foreign Relations staff for help on foreign policy issues, but I was never actually called upon.

Thanks again for your help with this matter. Any assistance you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

With warmest regards,

Stephen R. Grand

STEPHEN ROSS GRAND

1008 North Livingston Street
Arlington, VA 22205

phone: (703) 532-2771
e-mail: stevearl@aol.com

EDUCATION

Harvard University, Ph.D., Department of Government, Spring 1997 (awaiting defense)
Dissertation examines the effects of neo-orthodox economic reforms on firm-level industrial restructuring in the Czech Republic. Course work in international and comparative political economy, international relations, international and development economics, American and comparative government, and political theory.
Principal advisors: Professors Peter Hall, James Alt, and Grzegorz Ekiert.

Teaching Fellow, "History of International Conflict" with Professor Joseph Nye, Spring 1990

University of Virginia, B.A. with honors, Department of Government, 1982-7
Prize-winning thesis was a comparative study of political conflict in Northern Ireland and Cyprus. Honors program included two years of Oxford-style tutorials in political theory, American government, comparative government, and international relations.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

June 1996 to January 1997

Professional Staff Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Served as the minority's point person on legislative issues concerning Europe and the New Independent States. Helped draft legislation pertaining to the region. In conjunction with the majority staff, arranged hearings, briefings, and diplomatic receptions. Wrote speeches, statements, and issue briefs for the ranking minority member, Senator Claiborne Pell.

October 1990 to January 1993

Executive Director, Civic Education Project, New Haven, CT
Created this "academic peace corps" that sends American and West European scholars to teach at, and help rebuild, social science departments at universities throughout Central and East Europe. Sponsored by Yale University and the Central European University, the project currently has 140 social scientists teaching in fourteen countries. Funding for its $3 million annual budget comes from the Open Society Institute, the Eurasia Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the European Union. Continue to serve as chairman of the organization's board of directors.

June 1989 to October 1989

Project Consultant, Center for National Policy, Washington, DC
Arranged several symposiums and policy conferences for this Washington-based, public policy think tank, including a panel discussion on China's political and economic future featuring distinguished China specialists and a roundtable discussion on global corporate strategies with prominent Silicon Valley CEO's.

September 1987 to December 1987

National Issues Staff, Dukakis for President, Boston, MA
Researched and wrote issue briefs for Governor Dukakis on health and senior citizen issues.

February 1987 to May 1987

Legislative Assistant, Congressman James Bilbray (D-NV)
Tracked foreign policy, welfare, health, and senior citizen issues pending in Congress. Wrote speeches for the Congressman, solicited co-sponsors for his bills, and responded to constituent requests.

June 1986 to September 1986

Summer Associate, Francis, McGinnis, and Rees, Washington, DC
Designed and co-managed extensive survey of the political, economic, and demographic characteristics of the 50 largest cities in the United States for a major educational organization.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

December 1987 to July 1988	**National Advance Staff**, Dukakis for President Traveled across the country in advance of Governor Dukakis, organizing his political rallies and speaking engagements. **Convention Site Manager** Designed, constructed, and supervised the Dukakis trailer operations off the floor of the Democratic National Convention.
May 1984 to November 1984	**National Advance Staff**, Mondale-Ferraro Campaign Worked with five-member team coordinating the candidate's general election campaign stops. Supervised phone banks, recruited volunteers, and organized motorcades.
Summer 1986	**Event Coordinator**, Milliken for Congress Organized twenty-six mile bicycle tour through congressional district by candidate and his supporters.

VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

January 1993 to present	**Chairman of the Board**, Civic Education Project, New Haven, CT
December 1995	**Coordinator**, Coalition to Support the Peace Agreement, Washington, DC Coordinated a campaign by major religious, ethnic, and humanitarian organizations to build congressional support for U.S. participation in the Bosnian peacekeeping mission.
1988 to 1989	**Math and Reading Tutor**, Billerica Prison, Billerica, MA

PROFESSIONAL HONORS

1995	Finalist, White House Fellows Program
1994-95	Institute for the Study of World Politics Dissertation Fellowship
1994	Junior Scholar, Woodrow Wilson Center and American Council of Learned Societies' Junior Scholars Training Seminar
Summer 1994	Center for European Studies Dissertation Summer Travel Grant
1987-90	National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship, Harvard University
1988	Phi Beta Kappa, University of Virginia
1988	Stevenson Honors Thesis Prize, University of Virginia
1982-86	Jefferson Scholar (four-year academic scholarship), University of Virginia
1982-87	Echols Scholar, University of Virginia

TALKS AND PUBLICATIONS

"Clinton's Foreign Policy: An Assessment of the First Year," talk delivered at Department of American Studies, Charles University, Prague, November 1, 1993.

"Statecraft for the Policymaker," book review in Harvard International Review, Summer 1989.

Researcher for U.S. Agriculture: Myth, Reality, and U.S. Policy, Center for National Policy, March 1991.

Researcher for chapter on the sponsorship of presidential debates in Joel Swerdlow, ed., Presidential Debates: 1984 and Beyond, League of Women Voters Educational Fund.

PERSONAL

Nearly fluent in Czech; strong background in French; some knowledge of Hebrew.
Top Secret and Codeword clearances.