TOM CRONIN
AND
BOB LOEVY
IN THE NEWSPAPERS

2017

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2016 two professors of Political Science at Colorado College, Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy, were offered the opportunity to write periodic opinion columns for the local newspaper – the *Colorado Springs Gazette*. This launched a longtime project of the two professors writing for the newspaper for a number of years.

Previously Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy had written together for the *Denver Post*, but only periodically. They also collaborated on a book on government and politics in Colorado.

This book is a collection of the newspaper stories Cronin and Loevy wrote for the *Colorado Springs Gazette* in the year 2017. The dates on the stories are when they appeared in the printed newspaper and the on-line digital version.

This book offers the opportunity to read the facts, ideas, and opinions of two scholars of Colorado and United States politics all in one place for the calendar year 2017.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Denver's Dominance Carried State for Clinton 7

2. It's Time to Eliminate the Electoral College 10

3. Colorado Legislature Opens with New Powers 13

4. King Played Key Role in Civil Rights Legislation 16

5. Majority of State's Voters Live Along Front Range 20

6. History-Changing "Sit-In" Day Took Place 57 Years Ago 24

7. Governor Hickenlooper Comes to Colorado Springs 28

8. Surprise Turn Historic for Working Women 31

9. Filibuster Politics 34

10. Total Politics 37

11. Trump's Challenge: Stop Blaming Others 40

12. Presidents Rise and Fall in Survey of Historians 44

13. Happy Birthday – Colorado Born 156 Years Ago 47

14. Reapportionment and a Listless Legislature 51

15. Colorado Highway Politics 101: It's All About "Safe Seats" And "Swing Seats" 54

16. Let’s Really Plan Colorado Springs 58

17. A Capital Salute to a CSU Professor 61

18. Blue State Residents Pay More Federal Tax 64

19. A Lot of Blame to Go Around for Transportation Failure 67

20. Colorado Can Serve as Example of How to Fix Gerrymandering 71

21. Voters Should Consider Runoff Primary Elections 74

22. Unaffiliated Will Play Role in Gubernatorial Primaries 58

23. Novels about Colorado 81

24. Time to Give Civic Leader His Due 85

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-2-2017

DENVER'S DOMINANCE CARRIED STATE FOR CLINTON

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Colorado in 2016 was one of ten so-called "battleground" or "swing" states. Seven of these ten went for Republican candidate Donald Trump. Colorado, along with New Hampshire and Virginia, voted for Democrat Hillary Clinton.

Save for New Mexico, all of Colorado's neighboring states were handily won by Trump. For example, he won 70 percent of the vote in Wyoming and 65 percent in Oklahoma, yet Trump got just 43 percent of the total presidential vote in Colorado. Clinton won the state with 48 percent of the total vote.

How and why did this happen? Why did Colorado not vote similar to seven of the ten swing states? Why was it so different from its immediate neighbor states? Here are some likely explanations, though each probably accounts for only a small role in Clinton's five percent Colorado victory.

Colorado' economy, especially in the Denver Metropolitan Area, rebounded much faster than the nation from the 2007-2009 Recession. And Denver has become a "hot city" for attracting well-educated and progressive millennials who are likely to vote Democratic.

Colorado is much more of an urban state than most of its neighbors. The Denver Metropolitan Area dominates the state in terms of population, politics, finances, culture, and in many other ways. The more urban an area is, with a few exceptions, the more Democratic.

Colorado is a more secular state measured in terms of religious beliefs and practices. Secular people by and large vote Democratic – religious folks vote more Republican. And Colorado has a much higher proportion of

people with college degrees. The Denver area has become a growing center for U.S. Government research and for regional offices of the U.S. bureaucracy. All that favors the Democrats.

Colorado, and especially the Denver region, has a younger population than neighboring states and an unusually large number of independent and unaffiliated voters. There is more advantage to the Democrats.

Colorado has more in common with other metropolitan-area dominated states, such as California, Washington state, Virginia, and Massachusetts, than its more rural and agriculturally dominated immediate neighbors. That also helped Clinton.

There is some indication also that Hillary Clinton's "ground game" did a better job of turning out Democratic voters than Donald Trump's many rally events in Colorado did of motivating Republicans. Of note here is that more Coloradans voted this year than ever before. Turnout was 71 percent in Colorado compared to 58 percent nationally.

Former Secretary of State Clinton won Colorado because she did especially well in Denver and the seven-county Denver Metropolitan Area. She swept Denver by 80 percent of the two-party (Democratic and Republican only) vote. By way of contrast, Trump won traditionally Republican El Paso County (Colorado Springs) by only 62 percent of the two-party vote.

But the larger story is that 57 percent of the two-party vote in Colorado in the 2016 presidential election was cast in the Denver Metropolitan Area. This area went for Clinton 61 to 39 percent.

Here is another noteworthy statistic. Although 57 percent of the two-party vote in Colorado was cast in Denver Metro, that area provided 66 percent of the Democratic votes cast for Hillary Clinton statewide. That means slightly less than seven out of every ten Clinton voters in the 2016 presidential election lived in Denver Metro.

Trump won most of Colorado's poorest counties – and he narrowly defeated Clinton in working-class but heavily Hispanic Pueblo County.

Colorado voters have now cast an average of 53 percent of their two-party vote for the Democratic candidate in the last three elections for U.S. president. But this is offset in Colorado by the Republicans holding three of the four major statewide offices, four of the seven U.S. House of Representatives seats, and a decisive two-to-one margin in the number of county commissioners.

We may now have a better understanding of what happened in Colorado in the 2016 presidential election. Still the election was close for Clinton. Colorado will continue to be a purple (swing) state.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-4-2017

IT'S TIME TO ELIMINATE THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

By Robert D. Loevy

Early in the New Year is the time for resolutions, and that includes political and governmental resolutions for the United States. Here are my recommendations:

Resolution 1 – Abolish the Electoral College and arrange for popular plurality election of the U.S. president. Let's elect the president the way we do the governor of Colorado – with a simple plurality election (nationwide) in which the candidate with the most votes wins, even when the winner does not get a majority.

Resolution 2 – Get rid of the haphazard and unrepresentative system of primaries and caucuses that is used to nominate our major party candidates for president. Let's nominate our presidential candidates the way we elect the non-partisan mayor of Colorado Springs – with a nationwide pre-primary election in each party followed by a runoff election (in each party) between the top two finishers in the pre-primary.

First consider the Electoral College. The Founders of the United States originally intended for the Electors to cast their votes as individuals for the person they felt was best qualified to be president. That ideal was overcome when individual states began passing laws requiring all of the state's electors to vote for the candidate that won a plurality of the presidential vote in the state.

The reality now is that the Electoral College occasionally misfires and elects a president who came in second in the popular vote. This unfair and undemocratic outcome has occurred twice in the last sixteen years. Democrat Al Gore won the popular vote in 2000, but Republican George W.

Bush went to the White House because he won the Electoral College vote. Hillary Clinton won the popular vote by almost 3 million votes in 2016, but Republican Donald Trump took the Electoral College and became president.

It is Congress that must start the process of reform with a constitutional amendment rather than a law. The amendment will require a 2/3 vote of both Houses of Congress and the approval of 3/4 of the state legislatures. The constitutional amendment should provide that the presidential candidate who receives a plurality of the popular vote shall be elected (and the party vice-presidential candidate as well). Elections close enough to be disputed by one party or the other will be decided by the Supreme Court.

There is nothing radical about this proposal. It is the way we elect almost all our governors (and other statewide elected officials) and our U.S. senators in the 50 states of the Union.

There have been many calls to get rid of the Electoral College since Donald Trump edged our Hillary Clinton there, but very few definite proposals for a replacement. This proposal is specific, easy to understand, and fits perfectly with current U.S. electoral practices.

The major drawback of the primaries/caucuses system we use to nominate our candidates for president is that it greatly increases the power of the early-voting states. Two states – Iowa and New Hampshire – get to go first and have an undue influence over who wins a party nomination. The small populations of these two states maximize the unfairness. The extra attention paid to the voters of Iowa and New Hampshire by the news media is grossly unfair to citizens in states that vote later in the process.

The primaries, with turnouts that average around 30 percent, are bad enough. Presidential caucuses are even worse – they are one of the most unfair and unequal democratic institutions ever invented. They limit participation to party members who can devote 2 to 3 hours of evening time to go to a meeting and cast a caucus ballot. This results in low turnouts of eligible voters at around 15 percent.

Those who have to stay home with small children or work in the evening are left out completely. A distorting aspect is Republican caucuses tend to favor conservative voters and Democratic caucuses are partial to liberals.

If we are to have equal treatment of all American voters in the presidential nominating process, Congress must pass a national law (a constitutional amendment will not be necessary) creating a two-phase national presidential primary.

In the first phase, party members in each political party in the entire nation will cast their vote for their favored party candidate for president. Several weeks later, in the second phase, the top two plurality winners in each party will runoff nationwide against each other. The majority winners of those two races will be the party nominees and run against each other the following November.

If one candidate in a political party wins a majority in the first phase, the second phase runoff election will not be necessary.

The president of the United States (and his or her chosen vice-president) is the only nationally elected official in the country. It stands to reason that Congress should pass a national law granting nominating equality to every American voter no matter what state they live in.

This is a very ordinary proposal. Most states use statewide primaries to nominate party candidates for state offices such as governor and U.S. senator. Many cities do too. And many cities, including Colorado Springs and Denver, have runoffs between the top two finishers to guarantee majority support for the winning candidate.

Both the Electoral College and the primaries/caucuses nominating system err from the U.S. ideal of treating voters equally. It is time to replace both of them with systems that give every American an equal vote in both parts – the primaries and the general election – of the presidential selection process.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
January 11, 2017

COLORADO LEGISLATURE OPENS WITH NEW POWERS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The Colorado state legislature, which begins its 2017 session today, has been newly strengthened by a recent constitutional amendment making it more difficult to initiate citizen votes on constitutional amendments. But old challenges to the legislature's authority and importance, such as term limits and strict limits on raising revenues, will continue to hamper the effectiveness of the Colorado Senate and the Colorado House of Representatives in the upcoming session.

The new constitutional amendment requires initiated constitutional amendments to be passed by 55 percent of the voters rather than the 50 percent previously required. In addition, signatures on initiative petitions must be gathered in each of the state's 35 state senate districts rather than anywhere in the state (no more getting all the required signatures in just Denver and Boulder, or some other limited area).

If the new constitutional amendment accomplishes its purpose and reduces the number of initiated constitutional amendments, business should pick up in the state legislature as interest groups go to the legislature to accomplish their goals rather than running directly to a vote of the people. That should mean more bills, more lobbying pressure on legislators, and, in the end, more legislative output in the form of new laws.

Most important, the steady loss of power of the state legislature, as initiated constitutional amendments put more and more legislative functions in the state constitution, will be slowed if not stopped.

But term limits – limiting each state senator and state representative to only eight years in the legislature – will continue to effect legislative

operations. The most obvious effect is that, with seasoned and experienced legislators being forced out of office after eight years by term limits, Colorado has a House of Rookies and a Senate of Novices. Another big effect of term limits is they reduce the time that legislators from both parties are together in the legislature. This results in a loss of collegial bipartisanship and moderation.

Term limits also cause legislative committees to lose power to political parties in the legislature. Legislators have less time to gain committee expertise and thus find it easier to simply vote along party lines. Parties began to replace committees as the major source of legislative proposals.

Committee expertise is also a victim of term limits. Committee chairs no longer possessed deep knowledge of the committee's subject area. Rather than being expert in a policy domain, committees under term limits exhibit a knowledge deficit. The end result: legislators have less confidence in committees in Colorado and their recommendations are ignored on the floor.

Still another consequence of term limits has been the frequent turnover of those in top legislative leadership positions. Speakers of the Colorado House or presidents of the Colorado Senate now turn over every two years or so. Some of these leaders come to their positions with a lot less experience than use to be the case before term limits. And they leave their leadership offices after relatively brief tenures.

The 2017 session of the Colorado legislature will be characterized by the perpetual quest for new sources of money. Initiated constitutional amendments, such as TABOR, have removed control over the state's financial affairs from the state legislature and placed them under rigid constitutional rules. Legislators with ideas for new state functions and services will be frustrated because, in most cases, there is no money to pay for these new functions and services.

This chronic shortage of state money has led to a decline in the influence of the Joint Budget Committee, the small six-person committee that writes the initial draft of the budget for the state legislature.

When hard economic times hit Colorado following the major recession that began in 2008, the Joint Budget Committee stepped back and let the governor take the leading role in announcing unpleasant budget cuts. There was awareness that the tight financial conditions forced on the state by the TABOR Amendment had taken most of the fun out of being on the Joint Budget Committee. About five-years-ago, a Boulder Democrat noted that any state legislator "would love to be on the powerful Joint Budget Committee and hand out wads of cash to every constituency, but we don't have wads of cash."

Once again the 2017 session of the state legislature will have to wrestle with the dreaded "Three Go Up and Two Go Down" problem in Colorado state finance. Because of Colorado constitutional mandates and U.S. Government mandates, three areas of state expenditures go steadily up and two move drearily down:

Increasing are: (1) Constitutionally mandated annual increases in K-12 education. (2) The U.S. Government program mandating state spending for Medicaid, which provides medical services for the poor. (3) The increasing cost of operating state prisons, which go steadily up as the state's population increases.

The two that go steadily down are:

(1) The state's contribution to higher education (state universities and colleges). (2) All other functions of state government (state highways, state parks, state mental hospitals, the state contribution to welfare services, etc.).

Do not worry. The 2017 session of the Colorado state legislature will deal with the effects of term limits and constitutional limits on state revenues. And somehow, with a financial patch here and a fiscal band aid over there, the job will get done and Colorado will go on for another year.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-16-2017

KING PLAYED KEY ROLE IN CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

By Robert D. Loevy

Today is Martin Luther King, Jr., Day. King will be remembered for his stirring speeches in behalf of civil rights and the protest demonstrations he led that defied legal racial segregation in the United States. This day is also a time for taking stock of the present state of minority rights in the nation and calling for needed further steps to achieve human equality.

But there is an additional aspect of Martin Luther King's life and accomplishments that needs to be celebrated. That is his key role as an instigator of congressional legislation – the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Housing Rights Act of 1968. In all three instances, actions by or events concerning King directly produced legislative results.

The story begins in January of 1963, when President John F. Kennedy sent a tepid civil rights bill to Congress. His proposed bill did virtually nothing to end racial segregation in public places in the United States. It mainly made minor amendments to voting rights laws and called for additional studies of the civil rights situation.

King's response was to organize a major protest against racial segregation in downtown restaurants and other places of "public accommodation" in Birmingham, Alabama. As one congressional observer later put it: "No Birmingham – no civil rights bill." King's demonstrators, many of them school students, were met in the streets by the clubs, police dogs, high-pressure fire hoses, and electric cattle prods of T. Eugene "Bull" Connor, the outspoken racial segregationist who was the police commissioner in Birmingham.

The commotion orchestrated by King in Birmingham was too much for the President. In one of his most famous speeches, Kennedy said:

"The fires of discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act – to make a commitment that race has no place in American life or law."

The new civil rights bill Kennedy sent to Congress was a strong one. It banned racial segregation in all places of public accommodation. It cut off U.S. government funds to any organization that discriminated. It guaranteed equal employment opportunity regardless of race, religion, or national origin.

Kennedy was assassinated before his strengthened civil rights bill could be enacted by Congress. His successor in the presidential office, Lyndon B. Johnson, took up the cause and led the fight to beat back a southern filibuster in the U.S. Senate of what was then called the Kennedy-Johnson civil rights bill

At this time I was working in the Senate as an aide to Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, the Republican floor leader for the civil rights bill. He sent me to represent him at a small dinner (80 people) for Martin Luther King in Washington. King's impressive after dinner speech was filled with his main message – pass a law that grants black people the same rights given by the Constitution and Bill of rights to white Americans.

Shortly thereafter, in July of 1964, Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act of 1964. King's actions in Birmingham had been the spark that lit the fuse on this landmark piece of legislation.

The following spring of 1965 found voting rights moving to the top of the list of needed reforms for racial equality. Early demonstrations and parades in Selma, Alabama, were drawing minimal attention when Martin Luther King, Jr., decided to join in. He offered to lead a protest march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, the state capital.

Opposing King was the most outspoken opponent of racial integration and black voting rights in the South – Alabama Governor George Wallace. Wallace sent police on horseback to beat back King and the marchers with night sticks as soon as the marchers had crossed the Edmund Pettus bridge south of Selma.

Once again, a U.S. President acted in response to a King-led protest demonstration. Lyndon Johnson ordered U.S. government protection for the continuation of the march from Selma to Montgomery and simultaneously sent a voting rights bill to Congress. Action was fast as southern opposition in the Senate was quickly beaten back and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed into law.

The new law sent U.S. voting registrars into the southern United States to directly see to the proper registration of blacks to vote.

And then it was 1968, and Martin Luther King, Jr., was in Memphis, Tennessee, helping African-American garbage truck drivers in a strike for higher wages and safer working conditions. King was shot to death by a sniper as he stood on the second-floor balcony of his motel in Memphis.

A housing rights bill was pending in Congress at that time. Congressional leaders decided to accelerate passage of the bill as a legislative memorial to the slain civil rights leader. The Housing Rights Act of 1968 banned discrimination in the sale and rental of homes and apartments.

The three great civil rights acts of the 1960s, each of them the result of efforts by Martin Luther King, Jr., to further the rights of minorities in the United States, are still in active legal use today. They have become, although in legislation rather than in the Constitution, the Minority Bill of Rights.

Furthermore, the protections in these three laws have been extended by Congress to other oppressed groups in our society – the disabled, the elderly, women in athletics, etc.

The three laws are living, functioning memorials to Martin Luther King, Jr., and should be heartily celebrated on this day set aside to honor him.

Bob Loevy, a retired Colorado College professor, was working as a U.S. Senate aide when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were enacted.

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-27-2017

MAJORITY OF STATE'S VOTERS LIVE ALONG FRONT RANGE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The words "Front Range" are often used in Colorado, particularly in newspapers, but few in Colorado seem to know exactly what the words mean. When asked about the Front Range, many Coloradans will answer, "The range of mountains that run to the west of Denver, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, etc.

To political leaders and demographers, however, the Front Range is the heavily urbanized north-south strip of cities and suburbs that sits at the foot of the mountains, extending from Pueblo on the south through Colorado Springs and Denver Metro to Fort Collins and Greeley on the north.

Further confusing the situation, there actually is a Front Range of mountains. They form the western boundary of Boulder County and are one of the mountain ranges running along the Continental Divide through Rocky Mountain National Park.

Front Range is used even if its exact meaning is unclear. There are more than 60 businesses with Front Range in their name listed in the Colorado Springs telephone directory.

For purposes of voting analysis, we define the Front Range as the populous counties, plus Broomfield and Teller counties, that run south to north from Pueblo to Fort Collins and Greeley. Thus: Pueblo, El Paso (Colorado Springs), Teller (Cripple Creek), Denver, Douglas (Castle Rock), Jefferson (Golden), Arapahoe (Littleton), Adams (Brighton), Broomfield, Boulder, Larimer (Fort Collins), and Weld (Greeley) counties.

This is also the definition of Front Range used by the Colorado demographer in the state Department of Local Affairs.

The Front Range constitutes Colorado's mini-version of a megalopolis, a string of cities linked together in a corridor. It is our own little Bos-Wash (Boston to Washington), the interconnected urban area that runs up the northeastern coast of the United States.

For people who like cities, and the intellectual and cultural activities that flourish in cities, the Front Range is a major addition to their quality of life. It is loaded with some of the state's best public colleges and universities (University of Colorado, Colorado State University, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State-Pueblo, etc.). Art museums, local musical venues, and theater groups thrive up and down the Front Range.

The Front Range is also known for its congested and drab strip retail streets, such as Colfax Avenue in Denver and Academy Boulevard in Colorado Springs.

Most Coloradans understand that the state's population is concentrated on the Front Range. Year in and year out, it contains more than 80 percent of the people in Colorado. In the 2016 presidential election, 83 percent of the statewide two-party (Democrat/Republican) vote in Colorado was cast on the Front Range.

Because rural Colorado (actually non-Front Range Colorado) is so Republican, the Democrats have to poll a formidable lead on the Front Range in order to win Colorado statewide elections. That is what happened in 2016. Democrat Hillary Clinton polled 55 percent of the two-party vote on the Front Range, enough to enable her to carry the state with 53 percent of the two-party vote.

One effect of so many people living and voting on the Front Range in Colorado is that candidates for statewide office can campaign up and down I-25 and reach most of the state electorate without having to drive great distances. Short detours off of I-25 are required – U.S. 36 to get to Boulder, U.S. 85 to get to Greeley, and U.S 24 to get to Woodland Park.

Candidates who want to campaign up in the mountains or out on the Eastern Plains have to do a lot of driving (or flying sometimes) to reach relatively small numbers of voters. What many statewide candidates do is visit the mountains and the Eastern Plains early in the campaign, then concentrate those last critical weeks before Election Day pursuing votes on the Front Range.

By the way, the word "Front" underscores that our nation grew from east to west and this was the first, or "Front," range of mountains. Note that we don't refer to Rifle, Ridgway, and Durango as on the Back Range, but rather on the "Western Slope."

Then there is "Post Card" Colorado. It sits in a rough quadrangle from Canon City to Estes Park to Craig and to Sawpit (okay—that's near Telluride) and then back to Canon City. Within or close to this quadrangle are most of Colorado's 14,000-foot mountains, its several national parks, its destination ski areas, its best rivers for fishing and rafting, and many of its national forests.

Only about 7 percent of the two-party presidential vote was cast in Post Card Colorado in 2016, but this is the Colorado we play in – and came to, or stayed in, Colorado to be close to.

The tourist brochures and the calendars disproportionately concentrate on this part of Colorado. There are some splendidly scenic spots on the Front Range, such as the Garden of the Gods in Colorado Springs, Red Rocks amphitheater outside of Denver, the Flat Irons in Boulder, etc., but the incomparable natural beauty of Colorado is in the Post Card part of the state.

Post Card Colorado has wealthy areas, such as Aspen and Vail, although few Front Range residents get to these upscale places except for meetings and conferences. Post Card's economy is a blend of tourism, agriculture, mining and energy. Post Card Colorado splits its vote. The ski resort areas trend Democratic while the less-gentrified counties like Delta and Montrose trend Republican.

There are other areas of the state including the Eastern Plains, Southern Colorado and greater Grand Junction. Each of these is distinctive

and has natural beauty and appeal. But, in general, the vast majority of Coloradans live along the Front Range and regularly plot to head westward to recreate and savor the ever beckoning Post Card Colorado.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
***2*-1-2017**

HISTORY-CHANGING "SIT-IN" DAY TOOK PLACE 57 YEARS AGO

By Robert D. Loevy

Fifty-seven years ago today, on February 1, 1960, four black college students staged an impromptu "sit-in" at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. This particular sit-in, because it involved college students, received extensive coverage in the national news media.

All at once students at other black colleges throughout the South began staging sit-ins in an effort to end racial segregation in nearby eating places. Students at white colleges joined these sit-in demonstrations. By January of 1961, one year later, over 70,000 black and white youngsters had participated in college sit-ins.

I was working as a newspaper reporter at the time in Baltimore in the Border State of Maryland, which had strict Jim Crow laws providing for segregation of the races in restaurants, hotels, movie theaters, swimming pools, etc. Two experiences of mine illustrated the importance of what happened in Greensboro on this date in 1960.

The first was in 1958. "Get up to Mondawmin Shopping Center," my city editor said. "A group of protesters is sitting-in at restaurant tables. The White Coffee Pot won't serve them, and the protesters are refusing to leave."

At that point, my city editor gave me the real scoop. "Look, kid," he explained, "all we want you to do is keep an eye on things. We're not going to do a story unless things get violent."

It was called the "Cotton Curtain" – the refusal of southern and Border State newspapers and TV stations to cover non-violent protests against racial segregation.

Out at the shopping center, there was a group of six pickets walking up and down in front of the restaurant. Inside, other protesters were sitting at tables waiting to be served. The pickets were racially-integrated. Most of the pickets were middle-aged.

The manager at the White Coffee Pot was simply ignoring the protesters, not making any attempt to physically force them to leave. A white Baltimore City police officer was standing outside the restaurant door. Similar to me, the police officer had been sent to keep an eye on things. He was bored. He was happy to answer my questions.

"This is the third time we've had this," the police officer said. "It's working. People are walking up as if they are headed to the White Coffee Pot to get something to eat. Then they see the pickets and their signs. Then most of them walk away. They figure they'll get a meal someplace else today."

Nothing ever came of that sit-in demonstration. There was no violence, and therefore no newspaper or television coverage. The protesters gave up and accepted defeat.

This much was certain. The White Coffee Pot continued to serve only white patrons.

Four years later, in 1962, I was teaching political science at Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College in Baltimore. It was two years after the historic Greensboro sit-in.

There was an African-American college in Baltimore – Morgan State College. There was a nearby movie theater, the Northwood Theater.

Unfortunately for students at Morgan State College, the Northwood Theater limited its clientele to white persons. When Morgan State students wanted see a movie, they had to drive or ride the bus to one of the all-black movie theaters elsewhere in Baltimore.

Following the example set by the four young men in Greensboro, a group of black students from Morgan State College began a "line-in" at the Northwood Theater. The black students got in line to buy a ticket to the movie. Then they refused to step aside when the ticket seller refused to sell

them a ticket. The Northwood Theater's owner responded by having the protesting students arrested and jailed.

Students from Johns Hopkins and Goucher, almost all of them white, joined the Morgan State students in the line-in at the Northwood Theater. A number of the Johns Hopkins and Goucher students had taken, or were taking, my courses in political science. I was proud of them for providing leadership where most adults were unwilling to take a leading role.

On the scene were all three major television stations in Baltimore and a flock of reporters and photographers from the city's two newspapers. Radio stations were broadcasting live reports.

I marveled at the scene. Where had all the cameras and reporters been some four years earlier when I covered the sit-in demonstration at the White Coffee Pot in the Mondawmin Shopping Center?

Because so many college students were arrested, there was no cell space for them at City Jail. The prison authorities herded the students, men and women, into a large indoor recreation area, thereby, sidestepping the problem of putting college students in the same jail cells with hardened criminals.

When the newspapers appeared the next morning, there were photographs of a giant crowd of college students in jail. In the foreground, in their "poor boy" T-shirts and Bermuda shorts, were two women students.

In the background of many of the photos, one could see barred doors and windows. Behind those bars were the hardened criminals who were the jail's regular clientele. The photographs in the newspapers left no doubt that the college students were close to potential danger.

The afternoon of the day the photographs from City Jail were in the newspapers, a man appeared at the Northwood Theater who was the theater owner. He asked for a bull horn to address the protesting college students in the parking lot.

"The Northwood Theater is closed for today," the man said. "Tomorrow, the Northwood Theater will open as a racially integrated movie theater." As he spoke, all of the arrested students were released from the Baltimore City

Jail with all charges dropped. The protest at the Northwood Theater was over. The students had won.

To me, the successful college student protest at the Northwood Theater was a major tribute to what had been started at Greensboro by four black college students 57 years ago today.

Bob Loevy is a retired professor of political science at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-5-2017

GOVERNOR HICKENLOOPER COMES TO COLORADO SPRINGS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Popular second term moderate Democratic Colorado Governor John W. Hickenlooper comes to Colorado Springs tomorrow to give an adapted version of his "State of the State" address, previously given at the state capitol and to the City Club of Denver.

Hickenlooper would probably have been appointed to a Hillary Clinton cabinet position, but now instead he is back in the thick of trying, with the legislature, to find ways to balance next year's budget and beg for new monies to meet the needs for transportation improvements, education, hospitals, and finding new effective ways of dealing with unanticipated side effects of legalized marijuana.

Hickenlooper finds himself in a budget mess. He has had to recommend sweeping cuts in the budget to make up a $500 million shortfall in the state's proposed $28.5 billion budget. He noted: "It's one of those budgets where I'm certainly going to be the least popular person in the state with an awful lot of people." He said the best he can do is try to "minimize the pain."

The good news is that Colorado's economy is among the best in the nation and its unemployment rate is low. Hickenlooper deserves credit for luring major companies to the state and cheerleading projects such as the Colorado Springs Cybersecurity Center.

The bad news is that the state's infrastructure needs a major infusion of new funds. Hickenlooper shares the view of most Colorado Springs area leaders that I-25 should be widened to three lanes between Monument and

Castle Rock. He hopes that regulations can be tweaked to allow the construction of badly needed condominiums along the Front Range.

Colorado's constitution falsely implies that the state has a powerful governorship. "The supreme executive power of the state shall be vested in the governor." In fact, Colorado governors have to share power, not only with an often feisty state legislature but also with several other separately elected officials.

The list includes the state attorney general, the state treasurer, and the state secretary of state (who maintains state records and regulates state elections). All three are elected in their own right and can oppose the governor when they want to.

The Colorado governor also loses power to independent boards and commissions. A separately elected Board of Regents governs the University of Colorado system. A separately-elected state Board of Education helps supervise the state Education Department. Other than appointing department heads, the governor has less control over the state bureaucracy than most people think.

But Colorado governors possess many informal powers. They include handling periodic state crises such as forest fires and floods; exploiting "bully pulpit" opportunities to passionately argue for needed improvements in state policies and infrastructure; and lobbying the U.S. Government to obtain needed and deserved funding.

In the 1990s and the 2000s, Colorado governors began to realize that a big part of their job was getting the Colorado electorate to vote for or against particular statewide ballot proposals. Overall, Colorado governors did a better job of drumming up support for what they considered good proposals (suspending parts of TABOR, constructing highways, etc.) than they did mobilizing opposition to what they considered bad proposals (TABOR, discrimination against gays, recreational marijuana, etc.).

A Colorado governor who best illustrated governors accomplishing things through winning voter support for key ballot issues was Bill Owens. He backed a statewide bond issue to improve roads (including T-REX on I-

25 south of Denver) and to pushing for a 5-year timeout from the revenue limitations in TABOR. In addition, Owens pressed for voter enactment of a Denver metropolitan area "light rail" line to parallel the T-REX highway project. All three measures were adopted by the voters and became highlights in Bill Owens's career as governor.

Despite his success with ballot issues, however, Bill Owens was well aware of his limitations as governor. He said: "[Coloradans have] a long history of liking their governor but not following [the governor's] lead on issues."

Hickenlooper and the state legislature have no choice but to get voters in a future election to approve tax increases or some form of major transportation bonds to invest in highway upgrades and rebuilding bridges. Similar measures may be needed to address growing needs and inequities in our K-12 public education system.

Coloradans often forget that taxes in this state are among the lowest in the country, but Colorado is among the fastest growing states in terms of population. Hickenlooper faces this dilemma: Coloradans love low or no taxes, but they demand better highways, schools, hospitals, and other services. It is a recipe for dashed expectations for the governor.

Colorado Springs own former Governor John Love (1962-1973) said it well: "Colorado governors have the responsibility but not the authority to run the state."

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-12-2017

SURPRISE TURN HISTORIC FOR WORKING WOMEN

By Robert D. Loevy

Fifty-three years ago today events occurred that came to be called "Ladies Day in the U.S. House of Representatives." On February 8, 1964, in a surprising stroke of legislative genius, women were added to the Equal Employment Opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It's an amazing story. It included a southern segregationist legislative trick gone awry, two women members of the U.S. House seizing a unique opportunity, and strong supporters of civil rights for Blacks and Hispanics finally giving in and letting women ride along on the employment section of the bill.

On February 8, 1964, Representative Howard Smith of Virginia, an ardent racial segregationist, offered an amendment to the 1964 civil rights bill. The amendment prohibited discrimination in employment due to sex.

Representative Smith gave a high spirited speech in support of his amendment: "It is indisputable fact that all throughout industry women are discriminated against and that just generally speaking they do not get as high compensation for their work as do the majority sex."

Smith's strategy was to weaken the bill under consideration by broadening its effects. Women's rights were not a particularly important issue in the early l960s. The women's liberation movement would not occur in great strength until the early l970s.

If Smith could get the word "sex" added to the employment provisions of the bill, he might steal away the votes of those civil rights supporters who were opposed to equality of the sexes.

Of course the Democratic floor leader for the civil rights bill, Emmanuel Celler of New York, and his Republican counterpart, William McCulloch of Ohio, opposed Smith's amendment. They urged their colleagues to not complicate the issue of racial discrimination with the separate and different issue of sex discrimination – and possibly cost the bill some votes.

To Smith's amazement, and the total surprise of Celler and McCulloch, Smith's amendment received strong support from two female members of the House. Democrat Martha W. Griffiths of Michigan pointed out that Black women would be protected under the employment provisions of the act but that white women would have no protection at all. She stated on the House floor:

"White women will be last at the hiring gate. You are going to take Black men and Black women and give them equal employment rights, and down at the bottom of the list is going to be a white woman with no rights at all. A vote against this amendment by a white man is a vote against his wife, or his widow, or his daughter, or his sister."

New York Republican Katharine St. George suggested that the amendment was "simply correcting something that goes back, frankly, to the dark ages... The addition of that little, terrifying word 's-e-x' will not hurt this legislation in any way."

Speaking directly to her male colleagues, Representative St. George noted: "We outlast you -- we outlive you -- we nag you to death. We are entitled to this little crumb of equality."

Only one woman member of the House opposed the amendment. Edith Green, a Democrat from Oregon, was a staunch civil rights supporter who did not want to take any action that might jeopardize final passage of the bill.

Celler and McCulloch joined Representative Green in calling the women's employment rights amendment inopportune. They were unable to offer any substantive arguments against the amendment, however, and it was subsequently approved by a standing vote of l68 to l33.

I was working as a Senate staffer at the time for Thomas H. Kuchel, who would be the Senate floor leader when the civil rights bill got to the Senate. When the House first added the women's employment amendment to the bill, we all said it would be taken out in the Senate.

By the time the bill got to the Senate, however, almost all the senators in the civil rights camp wanted to support working rights for women. The amendment stayed in the bill, and President Lyndon Johnson signed it into law in July of 1964 with the rest of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Several years after enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Representative Martha Griffiths, by then one of the leading women members of the House, told an interviewer she had originally intended to sponsor the equal employment for women amendment but held off when she learned of Howard Smith's intention to introduce it.

Griffiths knew that if she let Smith introduce the amendment, he would bring about 100 Southern Democratic votes with him, votes that Griffiths needed to get the amendment added to the bill.

The event went down in congressional history as "Ladies Day in the House." The amendment gave government protection to the large numbers of women that poured into the work force in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s. Today is the anniversary of a day that every woman should celebrate.

Bob Loevy is a retired professor of political science at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-6-2017

FILIBUSTER POLITICS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Tenth Circuit Federal Appeals Court Judge Neil Gorsuch from Colorado will doubtless be confirmed to a U.S. Supreme Court seat. Democratic U.S. Senator Michael Bennet of Colorado will likely cast a vote to confirm Gorsuch.

The only real question is whether the U.S Senate will have to change its internal rules on how it conducts filibusters of Supreme Court nominations.

Senate rules first allowed for filibusters in 1806. The idea behind the use of this delaying procedure was to ensure that minority opinions were heard and understood before the senators cast their votes. Filibusters have been used hundreds of times – most famously by Southern Democratic senators in the 1960s trying to stop the Senate from voting on civil rights legislation.

And in the movies, actor Jimmy Stewart launched a successful filibuster in the famous Frank Capra directed film *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*.

Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., announced last week he and other Democrats will filibuster the nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch of Colorado to the U.S. Supreme Court. Schumer did this despite the fact that most people believed Gorsuch did well in his confirmation hearings.

Under present Senate rules, the Republicans will need 60 votes to stop the filibuster, a process called cloture, but the GOP has only 52 of the 100 senators.

Are you expecting Democratic senators to tie the Senate in knots for days, weeks, or months on end by continuously debating the Gorsuch appointment? Will needed legislation be stopped dead in its tracks while the drone and drawl of an endless Democratic filibuster turns the Senate into a place of many words and no action?

That's how it used to be. And in 1964, in the longest filibuster ever, southern Democratic senators tried to stop the Civil Rights Act from ending racial segregation in America. They tied up the Senate for more than three months but were ultimately unsuccessful.

Such a lengthy filibuster will not happen this time.

The filibuster is based on Senate Rule No. 22, which provides that no senator when speaking in the Senate can be interrupted. Many people think the filibuster is based on the U.S. Constitution, but it is no more than a Senate rule.

Cloture came along in 1917. This rule provided for a two-thirds vote of the Senate to end the filibuster and bring the bill to a simple majority vote (now 51 of the 100 senators).

A few years after the 67 votes for cloture were mustered to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Senate changed the rules again and lowered the required vote to stop a filibuster from two-thirds (67 votes) to only three-fifths (60 votes). This rule remains in effect. The 52 Republicans in the present day Senate will have to find eight Democrats to vote with them to get the 60 votes to cloture the Democratic filibuster of Neil Gorsuch's appointment to the Supreme Court.

In 1970 the rules were changed to allow the Senate to bypass the filibustered bill and go on to other business. If 60 votes for cloture were available, the bill could be "clotured" immediately and then passed by majority vote. If 60 votes for cloture were not available, the bill (or the Supreme Court nomination) was dead.

That rule change gave the minority party in the Senate tremendous power. As long as the minority leader had 41 votes in his pocket (enough to prevent cloture), the minority party could stop anything the majority wanted

to do with a filibuster. This has been a major contributor to the gridlock that currently grips the national government in Washington, D.C.

It is noted now there are a number of Democratic senators elected from Republican trending or purple states who will not want to vote against Gorsuch's appointment. But note that Senate Democratic leader Chuck Schumer has 48 votes (including the votes of two independent senators). He can give seven of his followers permission to vote to cloture the filibuster and still have 41 votes to stop the filibuster from being clotured.

Then there is the misnamed "nuclear option" of abolishing Rule 22 altogether for Supreme Court appointments and letting a simple majority of 51 votes, all from Republican senators, put Gorsuch in a Supreme Court black robe. The nuclear option is misnamed because the rule, as we have just discussed, has been changed several times over past decades. Changing it will be important yet hardly "nuclear."

Gorsuch has picked up some support among liberals and Democrats outside of the Senate, especially in Colorado, and also among some former top legal advisors to President Obama. This may not be the best time for Democrats to force a showdown. On the other hand, President Trump's first two months in office have not gone well. His popularity is faltering and there definitely is a rising liberal resistance movement in the country.

Our prediction is that President Trump and Republican Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell probably will move to change the Senate rules if they have to – and Gorsuch will go to the Supreme Court. Stay tuned.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. Bob Loevy worked as a Senate aide when the 1964 Civil Rights Act was filibustered and then clotured.

Not Used
2-15-2017

TOTAL POLITICS

By Robert D. Loevy

Welcome to what we call the Age of Total Politics, an era in which political dominance is pursued relentlessly by both political parties, with the battle going on continuously and every possible weapon of verbal attack being utilized.

We see Total Politics being waged in the U.S. Senate, where some of the cabinet appointments of President Donald Trump have been bitterly opposed by his Democratic opponents and a number approved only by a straight party-line 52 to 48 vote.

The battle continues at the Colorado legislature in Denver, where attacks are launched on the Republican president in Washington over immigration issues, even though these issues have little to do with the immediate problems of state government.

And, more than ever, hundreds of protesters gather, wave signs, and shout political slogans in Acacia Park and on the steps of City Hall in Colorado Springs.

We base Total Politics on the concept of Total War that developed during World War II. Total War was the idea that war had become so serious a business that every economic and human element in society should be devoted to winning it. No other goal of the nation state mattered than winning the war.

An integral part of the concept of Total War was that the ordinary citizen could not avoid it. Thanks to the technological breakthroughs of aircraft and bombs, the civilian populations of some nations were subjected

to daily bombings. The thought of losing such a war became intolerable, so nations fought with every means at their disposal.

In the present era of Total Politics, the conflict between the Democrats and Republicans is unavoidable to the average citizen. Entire sections of the news media carry the battle flag for one party or the other (the main stream media for the Democrats, talk radio for the Republicans, etc.).

Many people, otherwise uninformed, get their political ideas from watching late-night talk shows. And the latest communications gimmick is a succinct and oversimplified "tweet" from the president of the United States designed most times to disparage the rival political party.,

And the political bitterness shows up in unexpected places, such as when a vice-president elect (Mike Pence) attends a Broadway show (*Hamilton*) or a political broadside is launched at an awards show (the Golden Globes).

Total Politics was waged by U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell, the Republican leader in the Senate, when he refused to advance most major proposals from President Barack Obama, a Democrat. In turn, Democrats are proposing to use the powers of state and city governments to resist as strongly as possible actions by the current Republican government in Washington.

Total War called for the vilification of one's enemy, mainly because you could not morally use atomic bombs and incendiary bombs on average human beings. They had to be regarded as less than human, and enemies in World War II were portrayed in propaganda as sub-human monsters who deserved to die.

In Total Politics, the same vilification of the enemy occurs. There is no insult or derogatory comment that cannot be used when the stakes are so high. Thus in the just completed 2016 presidential election campaign, one candidate was harangued with the battle cry "Lock Her Up," and the other side responded by referring to white working class Americans as "deplorables."

In our view, the waging of Total Politics is getting in the way of good government. In Total War you cannot seek a surrender agreement with your opponent (a form of compromise) because you have portrayed the enemy as evil (you cannot do business with the devil). In Total Politics, the extreme pushing of one's own position and the constant disparaging of the other party makes compromise agreements (and thus progress) next to impossible to achieve.

We attribute the rise of Total Politics to three things – three words that start with the letter P:

More partisan – In recent decades, the American people and their elected representatives have become more committed to their political parties. This has sharpened the differences between the two parties and made it harder for them to reach bipartisan compromises.

More philosophical – In short, Democrats have become more liberal and progressive and Republicans have become more conservative. The ideological range of each of the parties has narrowed, with moderates being unwelcomed and driven away in both parties. The parties are more different from each other than they used to be.

More polarized – As our political parties have drifted apart philosophically, they have settled into warring camps with little incentive to cooperate with one another. This polarization is strengthened geographically by settlement patterns in which Democrats crowd into cities and inner suburbs and Republicans accumulate in outer suburbs and rural areas.

So get used to living in the era of Total Politics. Expect more bitter political competition and less peaceful political compromise. If it seems like a war – Total War – that's what it is.

Bob Loevy is a retired political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-20-2017

TRUMP'S CHALLENGE: STOP BLAMING OTHERS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The first month of Donald Trump's presidency has been activist, ambitious, and full of adjectives. He is making a difference, as new presidents seek to do, and this is most assuredly a different kind of presidency.

Here are a few of his successes. He has nominated, as he said he would, a respected conservative constitutionalist for the open Supreme Court seat. (We expect Neil Gorsuch to be confirmed by the U.S. Senate this spring). He has gotten his four top inner-Cabinet members (State, Defense, Treasury, and Attorney General) nominated, confirmed by the Senate, and off and running. Two of them have traveled abroad already doing the diplomatic business of the United States.

Some of his appointments, such as Nikki Haley to be United Nations ambassador, have been widely supported. Other lesser appointees, such as his Budget Director and Environmental Protection Agency administrator, have been controversial but were narrowly confirmed and are in office nonetheless.

Trump has had cordial diplomatic meetings with four important U.S. allies – Britain, Japan, Canada, and Israel. He has sent stock market indexes climbing with his moves to shrink U.S. Government regulations in the finance and energy sectors and with his pledges to cut corporate tax rates. He has jawboned a number of corporations to build factories and offices in America rather than moving them abroad.

He has totally dominated the news. His challenging relationship with the press has created a situation where the reporters and pundits, from left,

right, and center, have no choice but to give extensive coverage to his every action. Just like during the presidential election campaign, wherever he goes and whatever he does – he is the story.

Trump has done a great job of keeping in touch with his political base of middle income white males in mid-America. He lets his most avid political supporters know that he is still a "rogue elephant" fighting for their jobs and to keep "America First."

And Trump has softened if not changed many of his most strident campaign issues. Maybe the wall along the Mexican border will only be a fence. Obamacare will be replaced rather than repealed. A controversial executive order on immigration may be rewritten to make it more constitutional. And maybe the United States does need the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

That's a lot for a new president to get done in just one month.

But this first month of Trump being a "White House Apprentice" has had its unsettling aspects. Trump has found it hard to transition from campaigning to governing. A top Ronald Reagan advisor once noted that presidential campaigns are all about "destroying your adversary," while governing requires the art of "making love with your adversary."

Trump spent an inordinate amount of his first month in office blaming other people when things were going wrong for him. He blamed the media as the "enemy of the American people." He blamed intelligence agencies for leaks.

Trump blamed U.S. Judge James Robart, a Republican of unquestioned character, for ruling against him. He blamed former-President Barack Obama for leaving "a mess" and the "Obamacare disaster." And he even continued to blame his defeated opponent, Hillary Clinton.

We have declared him "Blamer-in-Chief."

This nation needs Hamiltonian strength and energy in the Oval Office at the White House. Here are some tried and true maxims of leadership that, in light of his tumultuous first month, Trump and his advisers should consider:

- Sometimes you win and sometimes you learn. Leadership is not a zero-sum activity where there have to be losers. If you do not win, you can improvise and bargain and reframe the issue, etc.
- Effective politicians learn to disagree without becoming disagreeable. We are concerned that Trump has been so disagreeable and confrontational during his first month in office. Insulting your defeated rivals only makes it harder to make progress at some future time.
- The best policy is to assume you have no permanent allies and no permanent enemies. Someone who is with you today may have good reasons to be opposed to you tomorrow, but someone who is not with you today may be an indispensable ally tomorrow. A person who is with you 80 percent of the time is your friend, not your enemy. Trump has burned too many bridges behind him with his combative presidential style.
- Political leadership is very hard to do in a constitutional republic that is inherently ant-government and anti-politician. It requires great patience, steady determination, a great team of advisors, and the ability to gather support from multiple centers of power.
- Understatement is better than exaggerating the facts. Trump's repeated claim that the people elected him is a dubious assertion. Forty-two percent of Americans did not bother to vote at all, and Hillary Clinton got more popular votes than Trump did. Then 8 million voted for third party candidates. At best perhaps 25 percent of Americans voted for Trump. It is a situation that calls for humility rather than braggadocio.

Virtually all the polls show the American people disapproving of Trump after one month in office. It is time for him to stop blaming others, take ownership of the nation's many problems, and begin to solve them. That is his challenge, not blaming others.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-20-2017

PRESIDENTS RISE AND FALL IN SURVEY OF HISTORIANS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Abraham Lincoln is solidly in first place. Dwight Eisenhower is coming on strong and is now in fifth place. A fast-gainer is Bill Clinton, who advanced six places and now sits in fifteenth position.

But for each gainer there is a loser. Woodrow Wilson dropped five places from sixth to eleventh. And poor James Buchanan, who was president just before the American Civil War, is mired in last place at 43rd.

Sounds like a horse race? It is, but it is one of the most exclusive ever. In order to get into it, you have to be elected president of the United States. Then a group of well-known presidential historians rank the presidents from 1 to 43.

One of us, Colorado College presidential specialist Tom Cronin, has participated in the ranking process over the years.

This nation has had 43 former presidents, including Barack Obama, who entered the sweepstakes for the first time in 2017, having just left office, and was rated 12th best.

As you might expect, the listings favor recent presidents over the bulk of the old timers. Eight of the top eleven occupied the White House during the 20th Century. They were Franklin D. Roosevelt (3), Theodore Roosevelt (4), Dwight D. Eisenhower (5), Harry S. Truman (6), John F. Kennedy (8), Ronald Reagan (9), Lyndon Baines Johnson (10), and Woodrow Wilson (11).

The three who were not from the 20th Century were three of the great ones historically – Abraham Lincoln (1), George Washington (2), and Thomas Jefferson (7).

Bill Clinton's gained six points from 21st in 2000 to 15th in 2017, the biggest gain of any modern president. Having his wife, Hillary Clinton, run for president in both 2008 and 2016 may have helped to up his score. He also probably gained because the technology boom made his years as president relatively peaceful and prosperous.

Other 20th Century presidents were scattered throughout the lower part of the list. George H. W. Bush was at 20th, William Howard Taft at 24th, Gerald R. Ford at 25th, Jimmy Carter at 26th, Calvin Coolidge at 27th, and Richard M. Nixon, the Watergate scandal president, at 28th.

The only 21st Century president other than Barack Obama was George W. Bush, who finished a weak 33rd out of 43. The Iraq War probably lowered his score, as did the stern recession of 2008, which occurred right at the end of "W's" presidency.

Only two 20th Century presidents were lower than George W. Bush. One was Herbert Hoover, who ranked at 36th. He was president when the stock market crashed in 1929, an event that marked the beginning of the Great Depression of the 1930s. The second was Warren G. Harding (40), whose presidency was marred by scandals such as Teapot Dome.

A surprise loser was Woodrow Wilson (1913-1921), who slumped five spots from sixth to eleventh between the 2000 and the 2017 survey. Recent attention to his support for racial segregation in the early 20th Century may have hurt him.

Another surprise loser was Andrew Jackson, who occupied the White House from 1829 to 1837. He dropped five positions from 13th to 18th. He may have lost ground because of his hostile policies toward Native Americans.

A surprise gainer was Ulysses S. Grant, who jumped from 33rd to 22nd for an eleven point gain. The 150th anniversary of the Civil War may have

helped Grant, as perhaps did the publication of two major new biographies about him.

If there is one thing proved by these presidential rankings, it is historians' attitudes toward presidents change as time goes by. Presidents swing up and down in the rankings as subsequent events to their presidencies, and changes in public attitudes, have a decided effect.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. They are the authors and co-authors of many books on the presidency and presidential elections.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-26-2017

HAPPY BIRTHDAY – COLORADO BORN 156 YEARS AGO

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

On this day 156 years ago [February 28, 1861], the Colorado we know was born in Washington, D.C. Colorado was given its name, had its territory carved out of four other territories, had it boundaries legally determined, and was designated a territory.

And all of this happened while the nation was drifting rapidly into Civil War. Congress passed the territorial legislation, and then President James Buchanan, on February 28, 1861, signed the bill. Buchanan left the presidency and was soon replaced by Abraham Lincoln.

To us today is Colorado's birthday. It arguably outranks the day 16 years later, August 1, 1876, when Colorado became a state. The anniversary of that day is celebrated as Colorado Day.

The birth of Colorado almost did not happen. But for a lucky gold strike close to the present day city of Denver, what we know as Colorado would probably be less inhabited countryside divided up between four other states.

Three years prior to 1861, in 1858, what we know as Colorado was made up of western Kansas, northern New Mexico, eastern Utah, and southwestern Nebraska. Then everything changed when William Green Russell and a party of miners from Georgia struck gold at the point where Dry Creek flows into the South Platte River, just a few miles from where Cherry Creek flows into the South Platte.

Word of the gold strike quickly reached the Midwest and the East, and thousands of gold seekers began flocking to what is now Colorado. Because

the mineral wealth was close to a high and prominent mountain 70 miles to the south, the rapid influx of population was called the Pike's Peak Gold Rush.

The city of Denver was founded at the confluence of Cherry Creek and the South Platte River. As more gold strikes were made in the mountains west of Denver, that city became the "supply city" for the booming gold towns at places such as Central City, Black Hawk, and Idaho Springs.

Because the gold strike had taken place in Kansas Territory, Denver was named for James W. Denver, the territorial governor of Kansas.

As the population grew, would-be office holders began organizing governments. Arapahoe County was established as a Kansas county to provide law and order and other government services in the Denver region. The people who came, not to mine gold but to set up governments and businesses, were said to be "mining the miners."

With the capital of Kansas some 500 miles east in Topeka, there soon was talk of forming the new gold mining region into a territory and then eventually into a state. One group attempted to have Congress organize a territory and chose the name of Jefferson. Their effort failed, but if it had succeeded many of us would be living in the state of Jefferson in the city of Jefferson Springs.

The situation was being controlled by the politics of the oncoming Civil War. Pro-slavery Southerners in Congress would not vote for Kansas territory to be a state because they feared the two new U.S. senators from Kansas state, both likely to be Republicans, would vote to abolish slavery.

But the election to the presidency in 1860 of Abraham Lincoln, a Republican committed to "no slavery in the territories," changed all that. As Lincoln's inauguration (held in March at that time) neared, Southern states began seceding from the Union and Southern senators and representatives began resigning their seats in Congress.

Suddenly, early in 1861, with all the Southern departures, there were enough votes to make Kansas Territory a state. At the same time, Congress

carved Colorado out of Kansas, New Mexico, Utah, and Nebraska, gave it its name and set its boundaries.

The name Colorado? Many accounts say the name came from the new territory containing the headwaters of what Spanish explorers called the Rio Colorado. It was the red color of the silt in the river that gave it that name.

Others say it was named for the red rocks of the Garden of the Gods and nearby Colorado City. The name Idaho was also considered, but Colorado was written into the law.

The boundaries? Take a look at the map, and you will see that Colorado is essentially a "big box" drawn around Denver. That is why the state is rectangular in shape and conforms in no way to natural boundaries such as the Continental Divide or the major rivers that rise in and flow through the state.

Congress gave territorial status to the large population in the Denver region and just added what looked like an appropriate amount of basically uninhabited territory around it. Colorado thus might be construed (or misconstrued), at the beginning and still today, as the "city-state of Denver."

And keep this in mind. At the time Colorado was designated a territory, the agricultural frontier – the leading edge of farming and ranching spreading westward across the nation – was way off to the east in Kansas and Nebraska.

Because of the gold rush and the industrial aspects of gold mining, Colorado was founded as an urbanized-industrialized area rather than a rural-agricultural area, as so many surrounding states were. The gold mining gave Colorado a wealth and even some urban sophistication many of its surrounding states lacked. Agriculture on the Eastern Plains of Colorado did not develop in a major way until the 1880s and 1890s.

So Happy 156th Birthday Colorado. From the happenstance of a gold strike and the political effects of an oncoming Civil War, you started on your way to becoming the incomparable state which we love today.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
3-19-2017

REAPPORTIONMENT AND A LISTLESS LEGISLATURE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

So far this seems to be a mediocre and somewhat listless session of the Colorado state legislature at the state Capitol in Denver. Majority control of the two houses of the legislature is split along partisan lines – the Democrats controlling the state House of Representatives and the Republicans with a narrow one-vote majority in the state Senate.

Bills favored by the Democrats routinely pass the Democratic House and then are killed in the Republican Senate. At the same time, Republican bills are adopted in the Senate only to die in the Democratic House. Worst of all, the leadership of both parties is dawdling over writing a bipartisan bill to fix the state's deteriorating roadways and propose a tax increase (to be approved by the voters) to pay for the roads.

Could the state reapportionment commission that met in 2011 and drew the present state legislative district lines, for both the state House and the state Senate, be responsible for the present partisan stand-off between the two houses? Did the commission's efforts to end gerrymandering (drawing district lines to favor one political party over the other) and create more "swing seats" actually lead to the present stalemate at the state capitol? We think so, and here's how.

The Colorado state reapportionment commission's composition and duties are laid out in detail in the state constitution. The 2011 commission of 11 members was composed of five Democrats, five Republicans, and one unaffiliated voter, Mario Carrera, a Spanish-language television executive.

Although an unaffiliated voter, Carrera was elected chair of the commission.

Following constitutional instructions, the commission held public hearings throughout the state, reviewed redistricting plans proposed by both the Democratic and Republican members of the commission, looked at plans presented by non-partisan staff, and worked up a final plan and prepared to vote on it.

Then something happened that always happens with legislative redistricting in Colorado. Overnight, the five Democrats on the commission joined with the unaffiliated chair of the commission to adopt a completely new plan, one that gerrymandered the state House and state Senate in favor of the Democrats, or so it seemed.

One of the cute tricks in the surprise plan was to gerrymander three Republican legislative leaders into seats already held by Republicans. This meant three or the six Republicans involved would not be returning to the legislature. Notice they were forced to leave, not because the voters failed to reelect them, but because the Democratic Party dominated the reapportionment commission and doubled them up in their districts.

One of the Republicans gerrymandered out of office was Keith King of Colorado Springs, who declined to run against the other Republican gerrymandered into his district, Bill Cadman, who later became president of the of the Colorado state Senate.

What had become of the original bipartisan redistricting plans drawn as specified in constitutional procedure? According to the Capitol Hill rumor mill, they were in a wastebasket in the offices of the teachers' union, where the Democrats had drawn up their overnight plan.

But let's not be so fast in declaring a Democratic victory. The Democrats had gotten the sixth and winning vote for their gerrymandered plans from Mario Carrera, the unaffiliated chair of the commission. Carrera had exacted a high price.

He insisted that the Democrats include in their instant final plan a substantial number of competitive seats – seats in the state House and state Senate drawn in such a way that either political party could win them. Such seats, often called swing seats, are created with a near equal balance of

Democratic and Republican voters so that the seat can vote either way in an election, depending on the mood of the electorate at that time.

Carrera had insisted that 38 of the 100 seats in both houses of the legislature be swing seats, an unusually high number.

The result is, since the new redistricting went into effect in 2012, the legislature has been districted to favor swing voters rather than either the Democrats or the Republicans. And since Colorado is a "swing state" that can vote either Democratic or Republican in statewide elections, quite naturally the swing state redistricting has produced a state legislature narrowly split between the two major political parties.

As luck, or more accurately probability, would have it, the close balance between the two parties now takes the form of the Democrats controlling the state House of Representatives and the Republicans the state Senate.

This is an environment, created by the Mario Carrera inspired swing-seat redistricting, that calls for the legislative leaders in both parties to emphasize bipartisanship and real compromise (where you really give something up to get things moving). It calls for advancing beyond treasured party principles, such as "No New Taxes" (Republicans) and "More Money for Education" (Democrats), and all the other partisan clutter that appears to have bogged down this session of the state legislature.

How the legislative district lines are drawn makes a real difference in the composition and character of the state legislature. A believer in swing districts, Mario Carrera, insisted on district boundary lines that created many swing seats and created a partisan divided legislature.

The present legislative leadership should accept that reality and get going with the bipartisan compromises, particularly where fixing the state's roads is concerned.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. Bob Loevy was a Republican member of the 2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission.

Colorado Springs Gazette
3-11-2017

COLORADO HIGHWAY POLITICS 101: IT'S ALL ABOUT "SAFE SEATS" AND "SWING SEATS"

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

By and large, Colorado state senators and state representatives sitting in "safe" Republican seats in the state legislature in Denver are going to have a tough time voting for the just proposed roads and highways bill (HB-1242).

A "safe" Republican seat is in a legislative district where the voters always elect the Republican candidate, no matter which way the political winds might be blowing in the remainder of the state. In safe seats, the successful candidates for state senator or state representative are essentially "elected" in the party primary rather than in the general election.

The increase in the state sales tax (from 2.9 percent to 3.52 percent) in the roads bill is what will pressure most safe-seat Republicans to vote against it. Republicans have made a credo of "no tax increases."

HB-1242 would likely mean a tax increase of $100 to $125 a year for the average Coloradan, unless he or she was making a large ticket purchase such as a new car.

Voting for a tax rise also is an issue that incumbent safe-seat Republican legislators would not like to see being used against them in future party primary elections – despite that most Coloradans agree that the state's highways and bridges desperately need repairs and upgrades.

Safe-seat Republicans, coming mostly from rural and outlying city and suburban parts of Colorado, also will not like the provisions for mass transit in the new roads bill. Mass transit mainly benefits cities and close-in suburbs, where express buses and light rail lines make sense, and where more voters are Democrats.

On the other hand, safe-seat Democrats (sitting in seats that always vote Democratic) will have little trouble voting for the statewide roads and highways improvement bill.

Ever since the New Deal of the 1930s, when Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt used massive public works projects to increase employment and revive the national economy, Democrats have been partial to large scale government projects financed with tax increases and borrowed money.

The roads bill (with the tax increase) will generate $677 million per year. Of that, $350 million will go toward payments on a $3.5 billion bond issue. The remainder will be divided 70 percent to local governments for road work and 30 percent for mass transit.

A top priority for the $3.5 billion bond issue will be to widen I-25 from Monument to Castle Rock and from north of Denver to Fort Collins.

Caught in the middle on this roads bill are the state legislators who sit in so-called swing seats. These are legislative districts seats where the electorate is almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats and the seat can shift from one party to the other from election to election.

About one-third of the members of both the state Senate and the state House of Representatives sit in swing seats, which are mainly decided by voters in the general election rather than the primary election.

The legislature is closely divided at the moment between the two political parties. The Democrats narrowly control the state House and the Republicans even more narrowly (18-17) control the state Senate. The swing seats thus are occupied by both Democrats and Republicans.

Swing-seat Democrats will feel pressure to join their safe-seat Democratic colleagues and vote for the roads bill (with the tax increase), but they run the risk of having "Hey – you increased taxes" being brought up against them in their next general election.

Swing-seat Republicans also will feel pressure from their safe-seat party colleagues, but in their case safe-seat Republicans will be urging a no vote on the bill because of the tax increase. Swing-seat Republicans,

however, run the risk of antagonizing their constituents who want better roads and will not mind paying the necessary taxes.

Safe-seats and swing-seats have been a long-standing way for political scientists to analyze state legislative behavior. Over the years, safe-seat Republicans are the most conservative anti-tax members, safe-seat Democrats are the most liberal big-spending members, and the swing seats, occupied by either Democrats or Republicans depending on the political winds, occupy the moderate ground in between the two safe-seat party extremes.

The biggest difference between safe-seat and swing-seat legislators is the difference in the size of the electorates that send them to the state legislature. Studies show that four times as many people vote in general elections as vote in primaries.

That means safe-seat legislators are accountable to smaller numbers of voters, and these are voters that tend to be committed to the more extreme wing of the political party (extremely conservative for Republicans and extremely liberal for Democrats).

The roads and highways bill is a bipartisan bill resulting from a series of compromises between state Senate President Kevin Grantham, a Republican, and state House Speaker Crisanta Duran, a Democrat. It will doubtless undergo changes as it winds its way through the legislature.

The roads bill has a good chance to pass in the House yet will be tougher to pass in the Senate. Conservative interest groups have blasted it while the Colorado Construction Association is predictably in favor of it.

Will swing-seat Republicans join with swing-seat and safe-seat Democrats in supporting this roads bill, tax increase and all? We think that is the most likely, perhaps the only, path to final adoption. Governor Hickenlooper and Colorado business leaders will have to lobby hard for this measure to get it out of the legislature.

But that's just part of the struggle. Because of TABOR, the roads bill must be approved by the voters in the November elections this fall. And that

will require even more bipartisan public and private leadership if Coloradans want upgraded highways and transit systems.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. They are coauthors of "Colorado Politics and Policy: Governing a Purple State."

Colorado Springs Gazette
4-15-2017

LET'S REALLY PLAN COLORADO SPRINGS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

PlanCOS is a major effort by the City of Colorado Springs to plan our community for ten years from now. The best and most active minds in town are pondering the future of our city at the foot of Pikes Peak. Here are our ideas for the PlanCOS agenda:

Financial planning: There is no point in making grandiose plans if there is no money to pay for future projects. With TABOR tax limitation in both the City Charter and the state constitution, the City is chronically short of money for anything new and imaginative. Consider getting TABOR out of the City Charter. And, within state TABOR requirements, develop a series of gradual proposed tax increases that will give the City enough revenue for a decent future.

An eastern interstate: With the mountains to the west, Colorado Springs will mainly grow in population to the east. Sooner or later a new interstate highway paralleling I-25 will be needed so the vast expected populations settling out there can quickly move north and south. Despite the opposition of the ranchers, tough choices for a new north-south interstate highway (let's call it I-27) 50 miles or so east of I-25 need to be made now.

City-county consolidation: Colorado Springs and Pueblo are the two best candidates for city-county consolidation in Colorado, because those two cities contain about two/thirds of their county population. In highly urbanized places like the Black Forest, Security, and Widefield, the El Paso County government is already providing city-type services such as local road paving and police protection. If not a combined city-county government

such as in Denver and Broomfield, at least plan for combining some city and county services such as parks and open space.

Corridor coordination: Colorado Springs is not a city sitting alone in the middle of empty prairie. It is an integral part of a corridor community known as the Front Range. It extends from Pueblo to Fort Collins and Greeley and contains 4 million people and is growing fast. The crowds of automobiles moving up and down I-25 every day between Colorado Springs and Denver illustrate just how many of us are living "corridor" lives rather than "city" lives.

Already we rely on Denver for our big league professional sports, our best museums and professional theater, and the more frequent and less expensive airplane travel from Denver International Airport (DIA). Should we plan for intercity passenger rail service (connecting to DIA) up and down the Front Range? What services should we leave to Denver and not replicate in Colorado Springs? We don't really need our own Museum of Nature and Science, do we? And what contributions can we make to the Front Range community? We already contribute the Broadmoor, a five-star hotel, and all the Olympic activity. Is there more we can do that will be unique in the corridor?

Metropolitan-wide water and sewer plan: El Paso County and Teller County comprise the Colorado Springs metropolitan area. In the city of Colorado Springs, where City Utilities makes long range plans for future water supplies, things are looking good. But the outlook is not so great in rural El Paso County and much of Teller County, where wells are the order of the day. When and if those wells run dry, the citizens of Colorado Springs are not going to sit idly by and watch their surroundings depopulate from lack of water. The time is now to come up with a metro-area wide water plan. And let's think about a metro-wide sanitary sewer plan while we are at it.

Metro-wide school system: Colorado Springs and El Paso County have individual school districts rather than a county-wide system. The result is shocking differences between per-pupil expenditures in the various school

districts. The end result is Twelve and Twenty Disease, where the highest expenditures and thus the best students can be found in District Twelve (Broadmoor and Skyway) and District Twenty (northern Colorado Springs and Air Force Academy). If not a county-wide system where per-pupil expenditures are all the same, at least consider and plan for various ways in which the spending in the school districts can be equalized.

You say you thought future city planning such as PlanCOS was only about where to put the schools, the parks, and the bike trails. Sorry. Done right, there's more to it than that.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Denver Post
4-17-2017

A CAPITAL SALUTE TO A CSU PROFESSOR

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

What do Republican U.S. Senator Cory Gardner, former Democratic Governor Bill Ritter, Democratic state Senator Matt Jones, and former Republican state Senator Dan Nordberg all have in common?

They studied politics and learned to love political participation at the knee of John A. Straayer, the Colorado State University (CSU) political science professor who is retiring after a 50-year teaching career.

Meanwhile, Colorado state elected officials have not approved this year's budget and are haggling over key legislative measures, such as a major highway bill, but they will be coming together in noteworthy bipartisanship on April 27th to formally salute Straayer.

His trademark legislative internship program has brought student interns from CSU to the state capital in Denver for the last 37 years.

John Straayer has not only supplied over a thousand interns who have worked at the state legislature. He personally drove himself and the students in one of the university's vans from Fort Collins to Denver every Tuesday and Thursday in the spring semester when the legislature was in session.

That's 64 miles each way four days a week for four months or so – about 140,000 miles over 37 years..

His interns have put in seven to eight hour days assisting legislators in all facets of their jobs. The students have worked at constituency service, policy research, attending public hearings, and much more.

Straayer arranged all these internships, monitored them at the state capitol, and graded their reports of their experiences. Dozens of Straayer's interns have later risen to high electoral office or become key legislative

lobbyists. And not just in Colorado. One of his former students is a City Alderman in Chicago.

State Representative Jeni James Arndt praises Straayer for "nurturing two generations of young people in the most important forms of civic engagement." Prominent lobbyist Ed Bowditch says John Straayer's "dedication to his students, his state, and representative government is unmatched."

Straayer is also a widely cited writer on both Colorado and American politics. His book *The Colorado General Assembly* is must reading for any legislator or anyone else who deals with the legislature. He has become one of the staunchest advocates of a strong, independent, and sovereign legislative branch.

He believes term-limits and a number of other citizen initiatives, such as TABOR, have seriously eroded legislative governance in Colorado – and he unapologetically yearns for the way the legislature operated in the 1980s when it exercised more authority and was less handicapped by various constitutional amendments on raising taxes.

He notes that various "reform" efforts, such as Amendment 41, under the guise of ethics improvements have had the unanticipated consequence of wrecking collegiality among the legislators.

He is not optimistic that these so-called reforms will ever be repealed.

John Straayer has earned "tenure" in the Capitol's basement coffee shop and has become part of the community at the Capitol. He not only is one of the state's experts on how the General Assembly operates, he also is a fountain of inside gossip on what goes on under the Capitol Dome.

"People should not blame the legislature for failing to solve all our transportation and higher education problems," says Straayer. They are doing the best that can be expected with all the taxing restraints we put on them through the citizen initiative process."

Straayer has nothing but high praise for those who serve in the legislature, yet he emphasizes that mindless eight-year term-limits foolishly

"kick out the seniors and bring in the freshmen." To him, it is now a legislature of "rookies and novices."

Hooray for John Straayer and his invaluable work as a civic educator, scholar, and tenacious champion of representative government. And hooray for his being honored April 27th from 11:30 A.M. to 1:30 P.M. under the Capitol's Golden Dome.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College and coauthors of "Colorado Politics and Policy: Governing a Purple State."

Colorado Springs Gazette
4-30-2017

BLUE STATE RESIDENTS PAY MORE FEDERAL TAX

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Many rich people still vote Republican, and Democrats still gain voting strength from lower income voters. But states with higher average incomes have been trending Democratic lately, and states with lower average incomes have been moving toward the Republicans.

A few days ago, on Income Tax Day on April 18, 2017, another indicator showed that wealthy people are beginning to favor the Democrats and less financially well-off people support the Republicans.

States that voted for Hillary Clinton, the Democrat in the 2016 presidential election, paid a good bit more per capita in federal income taxes than what was paid in states that voted for Republican Donald Trump – $2,555 more.

When the newspapers published the per capita amount paid in U.S. income taxes in each state, ranked from the most-paid states to the least-paid, it was easy to notice that nine of the eleven highest tax paying states per capita had voted for Hillary Clinton. The data also revealed that seven of the bottom ten tax-paying states had voted for Donald Trump.

In only took a few minutes to put the state per capita income tax figures into the computer, sort them by states voting for Clinton and states voting for Trump, and get the expected results. Clinton state voters paid $9,764 per capita while Trump state voters paid only $7,209.

Since the United States has a progressive tax system, where tax rates go up as incomes go up, it is safe to assume that people who pay more taxes are, generally speaking, the people who have more money. President Trump,

who apparently is very rich but pays very little income tax, is an exception to this rule.

The solid support the Republicans once enjoyed among wealthy and well-educated people has been decreasing. Polls following the 2016 presidential election showed that upper-middle class voters, at one time solidly Republican, split their votes evenly between Clinton and Trump.

The role of white working class voters supporting Donald Trump, rather than Democrat Clinton, was one of the biggest stories last year.

This per capita tax data by state is just one more set of figures confirming the class realignment that has occurred in American politics over the last 50 years.

The Republicans, once the darlings of the rich and well-born, are increasingly the party of the South, rural voters, and working class white Americans. The Democrats, with their great Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal tradition of helping the little guy, are now attracting well-educated professionals, urbanites, and many suburbanites as well.

The Democratic Party's support for civil rights, abortion, and gay rights has won it many new voters but at the same time has driven away many others.

Law and order, anti-immigrant stands, and pro-military spending folks have migrated in noticeable numbers to the Republicans. These people disliked school busing, affirmative action policies, and globalizing trade agreements that, they thought, threatened to take away their jobs.

The U.S. income tax bill paid by Colorado voters in 2016 was $9,030 per capita. That was relatively close to the top of the list – 15th out of 50 states. Colorado, similar to most of the other high taxpaying per capita states, voted for Democrat Hillary Clinton in the 2016 presidential election.

Colorado's average $9,030 per person was only $87 higher than the U.S. average of $8,943 per person.

The difference between the highest per capita taxpaying states and the lowest per capita taxpaying states was significant. At the top of the list was

Delaware, which voted for Clinton and paid $16,322 per person. At the bottom was West Virginia, a Trump state that paid only $3,616 per person.

Income, and the taxes that go with it, is obviously not equally spread out among America's 50 states. Colorado's per capita U.S. tax figure of $9,030 was more than twice as high as New Mexico's $4,032.

The study was based on income, employment, estate, and trust taxes collected by the United States during 2016.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College and have been studying and writing about elections for forty years.

Colorado Springs Gazette
5-30-2017

A LOT OF BLAME TO GO AROUND FOR TRANSPORTATION FAILURE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The Colorado General Assembly just ended its regular 120-day session. It was a reasonably good legislative session, but the legislators and the governor "kicked the can" down the highway on one major challenge. A major state highway financing bill failed to pass.

At the start of the legislative session in January, there was considerable agreement that something had to be done about the crumbling roadways and clogged interstates that are the Colorado highway system. And several senior Democratic and Republican legislators came together to offer a compromise approach. Here's what went wrong.

Governor Hickenlooper said action on jammed and disintegrating highways needed to be taken, and he gave some nice speeches around the state pointing out that Utah was doing a better job on highways than Colorado. But he did not send a well-worked out bill to the legislature with his name on it. He stood aside, which is his habit, and left the responsibility of writing the actual bill to the legislative leadership.

We understand it is not the usual procedure in Colorado for the governor to send bills to the legislature. But the Colorado governor's main strength is the "bully pulpit" – the ability to command the news media and draw attention to the state's problems and the best ways to solve them.

Our relatively popular governor, using the resources of the state's highway engineers and the state's fiscal experts, should have drawn up a bill that improved the state's highways – and only the state's highways – and paid for it with a sales tax increase. Then the governor should have "gone

long," as they say in the NFL, and undertaken an emphatic media blitz calling for the legislature to pass the "Hickenlooper highway bill" and do it quickly.

The governor did not do that, so the legislative leadership – Democratic Speaker of the House Crisanta Duran and Republican President of the Senate Kevin Grantham, wrote the bill.

Inexplicably, they waited until 60 days of the 120-day session had gone by before presenting their bill, House Bill 1242, to the legislature.

Getting your bill in early so there is plenty of time for the bill to get through the legislature is one of the first rules of legislative procedure. When the bill got in trouble in the Republican-controlled state Senate late in the session, there was no time left to save it.

There was another problem. Typical of legislators, Duran and Grantham wrote a long and complex bill that, instead of just fixing state highways, tried to deal with too many other projects. Their bill provided for repairing local roads as well as state highways. It added money for bike trails and mass transit (bus and passenger rail) or whatever a local government wanted.

The whole shebang was to be paid for with a 0.62 percent statewide sales tax increase that, under the TABOR amendment, would have to be approved by state voters in November 2017.

We appreciate Duran's and Grantham's efforts to get votes for the bill by loading it with extraneous vote-getting programs, but they would have done better to keep the bill on state highways – and only state highways – because that was where the critical problem is and where the interest lay in improvement.

Then providing money for local roads – rather than only for state highways – became a negative for the bill. The mayor of Colorado Springs, the El Paso County commissioners, the Douglas County Commissioners, and other local officials complained that their cities and counties had already raised the local sales tax to fix local roads.

They publicly opposed the bill because their citizens were going to be taxed twice for local road improvements and would not get back as much money in local highway funds as they were paying in increased state sales tax.

When Duran and Grantham first presented their bill to the legislature, news reports characterized Grantham as intimating "expect plenty of changes" and this is "not the final product." Really? We prefer that legislative leaders announce bills – particularly bi-partisan bills – and call for "No amendments!" The reason for this is amendments generally tend to weaken bills and in many cases are secretly designed to serve special interests.

A negative amendment was quick in coming. The Senate Transportation Committee dropped the sales tax from 0.62 percent to 0.50 and offset the tax cut with $100 million from an already cut-to-the-bone existing state budget.

As expected, House Bill 1242 came to a sorry end. Three tax-increase opposing Republican senators voted it down in the state Senate Finance Committee, and the bill was dead.

The real problem was, because the bill involved a statewide sales tax increase, no one wanted to put their name on the state highway bill and be seen as avidly supporting it.

All actions seemed to be perfunctory, from the governor's inadequate call for legislative action (but providing too little political muscle on his own part) to a legislative leader calling for amendments (as if to say I do not want to be associated with the final product). And instead of being about state highways, the bill had become a Christmas tree laden with too many ornaments of pork.

Everyone seemed to be hoping someone else would take the lead and accept the responsibility of getting a major sales tax increase to fix state highways through the legislature and on to the governor's desk. When no one had the courage to do that, the bill was doomed.

Paradoxically, our highways are jammed and deteriorating because traffic is way up due to our booming state economy. But instead of finding the money to invest in infrastructure, and keep the state economy growing, the governor and the legislature fumbled the ball in the Red Zone. This was the way not to do it, and to shoot ourselves in the economic foot at the same time.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
7-2-2017

COLORADO CAN SERVE AS EXAMPLE OF HOW TO FIX GERRYMANDERING

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

As the U.S. Supreme Court takes up the issue of gerrymandering of state legislatures to favor one political party over the other, Colorado comes into focus as a good example for the Court of how to do the process fairly.

Back in 2011, the Colorado State Reapportionment Commission, which redistricts both houses of the state legislature in Colorado, devised a new redistricting process for the state legislature that emphasized creating "competitive seats" rather than letting one political party redistrict to gain strong electoral advantages over the other party.

When the 2011 Reapportionment Commission finished its work, Colorado's 100 state legislators (65 in the state House of Representatives and 35 in the state Senate) had been divided into three categories: 27 "safe" Democratic seats; 35 "safe" Republican seats, and 38 "competitive" seats.

Voters tend to make similar housing choices. In several large areas of Colorado, voters are predominantly Democratic or predominantly Republican and do not change their votes from one election to another. The result is "safe" seats for both parties where one political party always wins.

Democratic safe seats tend to be concentrated in Denver and Boulder. Republican safe seats proliferate around Colorado Springs, Castle Rock, and Greeley.

There are other areas of the state, however, that fluctuate between the Democrats and the Republicans as legislative elections go by. They constitute the fertile ground for creating competitive seats that will shift from one political party to the other depending on which party is more popular in that particular election.

Competitive seats in Colorado are most likely found in the Denver suburbs and high in the Rocky Mountains where the Democratic voters in the ski area towns can be balanced off against Republican farmers and ranchers.

Since Colorado went on its "competitive seat" redistricting plan in the 2012 elections, the legislature has been more or less evenly balanced between the two political parties. That was to be expected, because Colorado is regarded as a swing (some would say "purple") state.

For instance, in the current state legislature elected in 2016, the Democrats control the state House by five votes while the Republicans control the state Senate by one vote.

In the fall the U.S. Supreme Court will be reviewing a case from Wisconsin, a state where in 2011 a Republican majority in both houses of the state legislature drew state legislative district lines that greatly favored the GOP. In the 2012 elections the Republicans polled 48.6 percent of the statewide vote in Wisconsin but captured 61 percent of the state legislative seats.

Declaring such outrageous gerrymandering unconstitutional will only be part of the Supreme Court's job when it takes up the Wisconsin case. It will also have to propose a workable plan for curing the problem.

This is where Colorado comes into the picture. It has been successfully operating its competitive seat redistricting plan through three elections (2012, 2014, and 2016) and has a state House and state Senate that come close to replicating the even balance in the state's electorate.

An important merit of the Colorado competitive seat plan is that it is statistically specific. The 2011 redistricting carefully defined a competitive seat as one that ranged between 45 percent Democratic and 55 percent Republican in the 2010 state treasurer election, an extremely close race won by incumbent state treasurer Walker Stapleton.

Thus the U.S. Supreme Court, if it chooses to follow Colorado's example, could require that each house of a redistricted state legislature will have to have 30 percent of the seats in the competitive range (45 percent

Democratic to 55 percent Republican). Due to "similar housing choices," the remaining seats would be either safe Democratic or safe Republican.

Such a direct statistical requirement will be easy for lower courts to enforce on resistant state legislatures.

If the U.S. Supreme Court does not want to use a previous close election as the standard for competitive seats, voter registration figures will work just as well.

Colorado has Mario Carrera, a Spanish language television executive, to thank for creating Colorado's competitive seat redistricting system.

Carrera, a registered unaffiliated voter, served as chairman of the 2011 redistricting effort in Colorado. When the redistricting commission deadlocked between 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans, Carrera cast the swing vote that put the usual gerrymandering aside and required the creation of 38 competitive seats in a 100 seat legislature (both houses).

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy has acknowledged that he is willing to do away with excessively partisan redistricting (gerrymandering) if a workable system can be found to replace it. He said he has not found a workable system so far.

Hey! Justice Kennedy and the U.S. Supreme Court! Next fall, when you are looking for a workable replacement for state legislative gerrymandering, take a good look at the Colorado competitive seat redistricting plan.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are retired professors at Colorado College. Bob Loevy was a Republican member of the 2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission.

Colorado Springs Gazette
8-4-2017

VOTERS SHOULD CONSIDER RUNOFF PRIMARY ELECTIONS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

If there was ever a moment that Coloradans should be considering runoff political party primary elections, this might be that moment.

As of late July of 2017, there were eight announced candidates for the Republican nomination for Colorado governor and three more candidates thinking about running for the GOP nod. On the Democratic side of the primary ballot, there were four announced candidates and one thinking about it.

That totals up to 16 candidates in all, an unusually high number for the Colorado gubernatorial election that will be held in November of 2018, 15 months from now.

We are concerned about this plethora of gubernatorial contenders, many of them well-qualified to sit in the governor's chair in the state capitol in Denver?

When you have many candidates running in a primary election, and it is a plurality election in which only one candidate can be nominated, you can get some pretty weird results. Often highly-qualified candidates will knock each other out, thereby allowing lesser-known candidates, with somewhat outlier views, to gain the party nomination.

Another frequent result in crowded plurality primary elections is that a candidate from the extreme wing of the political party – far-right conservatives for the Republicans and far-left liberals for the Democrats – will eke out a victory while more moderate candidates are eliminated.

One cure for this problem is the runoff primary election. Under this reform, the top two finishers in the first, or "open," primary election run against each other in a "runoff" election and the winner gets the party nomination.

Runoff elections are thought to produce more moderate winners of primary elections, because a majority of the primary electorate will vote for the winner in the runoff. The extreme left-wing or right-wing views that might guarantee a victory in a one-election plurality primary will be much less likely to triumph with just two candidates competing in the runoff and a large electorate choosing between only those two candidates.

At least 1 million Coloradans are familiar with the runoff election system. Both the mayor of Denver and the mayor of Colorado Springs are selected with an open election, in which as many candidates as want can run, followed by a runoff between the top two finishers. The runoff has been tested and works well in both cities.

A technical note - if one candidate gets a majority of the vote in the first election, no runoff is held and that candidate is nominated.

Let's look at how lack of a runoff might affect the Republican primary for governor in 2018. There are highly qualified candidates (and potential candidates) to consider – George Brauchler, District 18 district attorney; Cynthia Coffman, Colorado attorney general; Victor Mitchell, former state legislator; and Walker Stapleton, Colorado treasurer.

What if those four well-known office holders (or former office holders) split the vote between them. That might allow Steve Barlock, a Donald Trump co-chairman in Colorado in 2016, to gain the nomination with a plurality vote that could be as low as 25 percent. Or perhaps Jack Graham, the former athletic director at Colorado State University, could rely on the votes of Colorado State University alumni to give him a 25 percent or so winning plurality.

In both the theoretical instances cited above, a runoff Republican primary would give the 75 percent or so of party voters who voted for

someone other than the plurality winner a second chance to choose a candidate more to their liking.

On the Democratic side, there are fewer politically-qualified announced candidates – Jared Polis, 2nd District U.S. representative; Mike Johnston, former Colorado state senator; and Cary Kennedy, former Colorado treasurer. Here's a plurality scenario: Polis and Johnston, both major candidates, split the vote between them, thereby giving Cary Kennedy the plurality win. With a runoff (assuming Polis or Johnston came in second), many voters in the Democratic primary would get a second chance to make their preference known.

Between now and the 2018 governor primaries in Colorado, some candidates will drop out and perhaps others will decide to run, but it does look like there are going to be long primary ballots for governor in both parties with many candidates running.

Runoff primary elections would give moderate majorities in both parties a bigger say and lessen the chances of party nominations going to outsider candidates with few qualifications for higher office or extreme political views.

Colorado voters recently approved of allowing registered unaffiliated voters to participate in the party primary election of their choice. This was intended to expand the franchise for the one-third of Coloradans who are unaffiliated and to have a moderating influence on the kinds of candidates we get for the general election.

No one knows what impact this will have. Our prediction is that something less than 10 to 20 percent of our unaffiliated voters will participate in one or the other of the party primaries. More unaffiliated voters, however, will participate in a primary runoff, if the state of Colorado adopts it.

Now is the time for party and elected officials to give serious attention and debate to the idea of runoff primary elections for Colorado.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-9-2017

UNAFFILIATED WILL PLAY ROLE IN GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARIES

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Colorado is in for a gubernatorial election in 2018 that might produce unexpected results. For the first time in Colorado political history, unaffiliated voters will be allowed to vote in either the Democratic primary or the Republican primary *without changing their registration to that party*.

Unaffiliated voters had previously been allowed to vote in party primaries, but they had to change their voter registration on primary day to the party whose primary they were voting in. Then, after the primary election, if these voters wanted to go back to being unaffiliated, they had to contact their county clerk and re-register unaffiliated.

Got all that? Having to change your registration to vote in a Democratic or Republican primary was a big hassle, so few unaffiliated voters bothered to do it.

But for the June 26, 2018, party primaries, unaffiliated voters will be mailed a ballot that includes both the Democratic and the Republican candidates for governor. They can vote in the primary of their choice, for the candidate they like best, then mail in the ballot – and that is it. They will still be registered unaffiliated.

We think making it easy for unaffiliated voters to participate in party primaries will measurably increase unaffiliated voter turnout in the primaries, thereby adding a factor to the voting that will be unfamiliar to the candidates and the news media.

Two scenarios are probable. In the first one, the unaffiliated voters reflect the even balance between the two political parties in Colorado and

half vote in the Democratic primary for governor and half vote in the Republican.

With this scenario, unaffiliated voters will have minimal or even no effect on the outcome. The party regulars who turn out election after election to vote in the primary will probably have the larger say in who gets nominated. Things will seem pretty much the same as they have in the past.

The second scenario could be the wild card. Large numbers of unaffiliated voters will all decide to vote for a particular governor candidate in a particular political party primary. Turnout for that particular gubernatorial primary will be consequential. Unaffiliated voters would overwhelm the party regulars in determining the primary election winner.

Let's call this phenomenon "Major Unaffiliated Concentrated Voting," or "MUC-V."

How do we know this may happen? The state of New Hampshire has allowed unaffiliated voters to choose which presidential primary to vote in – Democratic or Republican – for many decades. Every four years – at presidential primary time – New Hampshire presents the opportunity for MUC-V to happen, or not.

Take for instance the 2000 presidential primary in New Hampshire. Texas Governor George W. Bush was regarded as the establishment candidate who would easily win the Republican primary. His major opponent, Arizona U.S. Senator John McCain, was considered an outsider and a maverick and likely to lose to Bush.

Senator McCain, however, turned out to be an unusually charismatic candidate. He rented a bus, equipped it with comfortable easy chairs, and invited news reporters and local politicians to ride and talk with him as he went about the state from political rally to political rally.

McCain made a sincere effort to answer honestly any question put to him by reporters or local politicians. Emphasizing his honesty, he dubbed the bus the "Straight-Talk Express." On primary day, McCain scored a smashing victory over the favored candidate – George W. Bush.

How had McCain done it? The answer was unaffiliated voters. The vast majority elected to vote in the Republican presidential primary and cast their vote for McCain.

Exit polls confirmed that was exactly that happened. Registered Republicans voted for Bush over McCain by 42 percent to 37 percent, but unaffiliated voters in the Republican primary preferred McCain to Bush by an overwhelming 60 percent to 20 percent.

So, as Colorado embarks on letting unaffiliated voters effortlessly vote in party primaries for governor, one question will be in everyone's mind. Are the unaffiliated voters going to decisively vote in one particular party primary for one particular gubernatorial candidate?

Candidates for governor will try to devise strategies that will give them strong appeal to unaffiliated voters. But that strategy has to be tempered by a second thought.

What if all the unaffiliated voters go and vote in the other party's primary and only the party regulars are voting in yours. That thought dictates a strategy of adhering to the ideas and wants of your party base rather than trying to be a charismatic hero to unaffiliated voters.

One thing is clear. Colorado candidates and campaign managers have to consider and calculate whether to make a big play for the state's newly enfranchised unaffiliated voters in party gubernatorial primaries. This is a brand new and much changed electoral situation.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
11-2-2017

NOVELS ABOUT COLORADO

By Thomas E. Cronin

James Joyce helped us imagine Dublin and Dubliners. Victor Hugo did the same for Paris and the French. Leo Tolstoy portrayed Russia and Russians. William Faulkner told us about Mississippi. But who are the fiction writers who tell the story of Colorado and Coloradans?

Willa Cather set her novel *The Song of the Lark* in "Moonstone," Colorado. Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* famously described rogue escapades in Denver. In *Atlas Shrugged*, Ayn Rand located her hero's Libertarian bootcamp-for-the-Revolution in Galt Gulch, modeled on the town of Ouray, Colorado, where she occasionally vacationed.

Here is a list of novels that are set in Colorado:

1. James Michener, *Centennial: A Novel* (1974). Perhaps the best known Colorado novel, it creates the fictional town of "Centennial" (not to be confused with the more recent Denver suburb). It provides a sweeping multi-century history of the geology, anthropology and water and ranching politics of Colorado's Eastern Plains. Michener came here and lived in Greeley, interviewed hundreds of locals, and captured much of the pioneering spirit as well as prejudices of life along the South Platte River.

2. Sandra Dallas, *The Diary of Mattie Spenser* (1947). Denver resident Dallas tells of the fictional "Mingo, Colorado." Hardship and heartache characterize the lives of Mattie Spenser and her husband. They moved from fertile farmland in Iowa to homestead the forlorn and treeless dry country of Eastern Colorado. Life in early Colorado was a desperate struggle. Also

read her **Tallgrass: A Novel (2007),** as well—a fictionalized account of living down the road from Camp Amache, the Japanese internment camp slightly west of Holly, Colorado, in the early 1940's.

3. Dalton Trumbo, *Eclipse* (1935). Trumbo was born in Montrose, Colorado, and raised in Grand Junction. He then moved to Boulder to attend the University of Colorado. His first novel, **Eclipse (1935),** is a delightfully fictionalized memoir of growing up in "Shale City, Colorado," which bears a striking resemblance to Grand Junction. Trumbo mocked Shale City's boosters and philanthropists – and vividly captured the lives of downtown merchants, newspapermen, and local "brothelgoers."

4. Kent Haruf, *The Tie That* Binds (1984). Haruf left us a handful of plaintive novels about the average folk, who live in fictional "Holt, Colorado," a city
in northeastern Colorado. Haruf was born in Pueblo and grew up in Canon City and on the eastern plains of Colorado. His novel beautifully captures the quirkiness, restlessness and kindness that emerge when a community is put under the microscope.

5. Frank Waters, ***The Dust Within the Rock* (1940).** Waters was born in Colorado Springs, wrote for Hollywood, and produced some of the most memorable novels about the American southwest. He was of Native American descent and spent almost a year in his youth on a Navajo reservation. He also spent time at his grandfather's Cripple Creek gold mine. *The Dust Within the Rock* chronicled his growing up in Colorado Springs and going to Colorado College.

6. David Mason, *Ludlow: A Verse Novel* (2007) is a fictionalized history about the victims of one of the bloodiest and most cruel chapters in Colorado history—the Ludlow Coal Field Massacre of 1914. Mason had grown up hearing the Ludlow story. He tells of striking coal miners, and of the men,

women, and children who were killed when the mining camp was attacked by anti-strikers.

7. Gary Hart, *Durango* (2012). Former U.S. Senator Gary Hart makes his home in Kittredge, Colorado, and his *Durango* is in part a love letter to celebrate the people of Durango. The story is a fictionalized account of the long drawn out political negotiations and collaborations involved in the Animas-LaPlata water project.

8. Peter Heller, *The Painter* (2014). This novel is set in Paonia, Colorado, but includes various trips through the San Luis Valley. *Painter* is a psychological thriller whose complicated narrator, Jim Stegner, is a commercially successful artist, an avid fly fisherman, and, alas, a murderer.

9. John Dunning, *Denver* (1980). Dunning came to Denver in his twenties and was a police reporter for the *Denver Post* in the 1970's. Denverites should read *Denver,* his fictionalized expose of the city in the mid-1920's. This novel describes ruthless newspaper competition in a four-newspaper town. It also recalls the ugly politics and practices of the Ku Klux Klan, which had taken over the governor's office and city hall.

10. Russell Martin, *The Sorrow of Archaeology: A Novel* (2005). This is a story about a young doctor in Cortez, Colorado, Sarah MacLeish, who develops multiple sclerosis at age 40. Because of her disease, she sets aside her medical practice and joins her archeologist husband Henry in his digs in the Mesa Verde area. She uncovers a small crippled skeleton, belonging to a young Anasazi girl, and is motivated to compare herself with this small girl from the regions' past.

11. Stephen King, *The Shining* (1977). This may be the most read novel set in our state. Inspired by an overnight stay at the fabled Stanley Hotel in

Estes Park, *The Shining* has become a cult chiller/thriller, with a Stanley Kubrick film and a 1997 ABC mini-series that expanded its audience.

King gives us Jack Torrance, his wife and five-year-old son Danny, as Jack becomes the winter caretaker of the posh, atmospheric Overlook Hotel, located on the west side of Estes Park, at the foot of spectacular Rocky Mountain National Park. In King's gifted story-telling, the empty Overlook becomes a creepy cavernous and haunted place—replete with ghosts, dead bodies and more.

Tom Cronin is a professor of Political Science at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
11-12-2017

TIME TO GIVE CIVIC LEADER HIS DUE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

What makes for a healthy, vibrant neighborhood? Safety is typically the highest priority. Preserving home values and enhancing the attractiveness of the area come next. Traffic reduction and noise control are surely on the list. A quality neighborhood school is similarly important.

Add in parks, trees, and nearby places to bike or walk a dog. Also needed is a "Neighborhood Watch" organization where neighbors look after each other's homes and report suspicious activity. A neighborhood internet messaging system can warn about intruding bears, squatters, or drug dealers.

Our region's Council of Neighborhoods and Organizations, better known as CONO, devotes much time and creative energy to encourage neighborhood leaders to meet together, prepare neighborhood strategic plans, and take on the many challenges that neighborhoods face.

Challenges like putting a cement plant in the middle of a residential area, locating a high-density apartment building next to a low-density housing development, or converting a quiet residential street into a four-lane expressway.

Executive director Dave Munger has been the driving catalyst behind CONO's many successes over the past decade. He is retiring from the job, leaving behind an organization that is now a major player in what happens to neighborhoods in Colorado Springs.

Dave moved to Colorado Springs in the early 2000s after a successful career as a higher-education administrator at Indiana University and American University (in Washington, D.C.). He and his wife bought a home in the Old North End, and Dave was quickly caught up in the work of the

local volunteer homeowners' association – the Old North End Neighborhood.

Dave was elected president. His first job was to overhaul the financial structure, taking the annual operating budget from about $2,000 per year to nearly $40,000 per year. This provided the money for a long list of future projects, such as historic-looking street-name signs and historic-looking stone entryway signs. It also permitted hiring a private security service (aided by off-duty Colorado Springs police officers).

During Dave's presidency, historic-looking streetlights were installed on ten blocks of N. Tejon Street in the Old North End. He started a neighborhood tradition of holding an annual Garden Party. His biggest accomplishment, however, was ending N. Nevada Avenue's designation as a truck route, thereby diverting heavy trucks off N. Nevada and out of the Old North End on to I-25.

This track record led Munger to be conscripted to serve on a number of boards, ranging from the Citizens' Transportation Advisory Board (CTAB) to the Penrose Hospital Board of Directors.

The presidency of CONO was next. CONO is now an organization of 900 neighborhood and homeowners' associations in Colorado Springs, El Paso County, and Teller County.

Its major mission is to empower neighborhood volunteers to advocate effectively for their neighborhoods. CONO is a civics education training resource. It holds regular seminars encouraging neighborhood leaders to build their social capital, learn how to make their case effectively before city and county agencies and governing boards, and to develop Master Plans – that have the force of law – that help them achieve their neighborhood aspirations.

CONO receives and inspects every proposed zoning and land-use change that is proposed by Colorado Springs or El Paso County. It alerts neighborhoods to what is going on and helps them to respond appropriately.

Dave Munger is especially pleased that CONO has won the respect of city and county political leaders and has helped make a number of

government practices "more open and transparent." He is proud that the CONO staff has gone from one volunteer to a paid staff of five.

Under his leadership, the CONO budget has expanded from $4,000 annually to $350,000. Most of the money is donated by foundations and local corporations wanting to expand citizen participation in local government.

Munger said a city's strength and vitality come from its communities and how they can creatively resolve disputes. He noted: "Conversation, collaboration, and compromise take time, but they are essential for neighborhoods to flourish."

He concedes that more affluent neighborhoods such as the Old North End and Patty Jewett (west of Patty Jewett Golf Course) have an easier path in building community. He points to Ivywild as a middle-class community that has done a splendid job of strengthening its neighborhood, particularly by turning the old Ivywild School building into a community center.

CONO, Munger added, is working hard to assist southeastern Colorado Springs neighborhoods. These are lower income and low voter turnout areas where "neighborhood empowerment" is all the more important.

Kudos to Dave Munger for his civic leadership and his championing of the "small democracies" that are our neighborhoods in the Pike's Peak region. Neighborhoods now have a respected seat at the table at City Hall and with the county commissioners. Munger deserves a big thank you as he steps down from CONO leadership.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.