



**TOM CRONIN**  
**AND**  
**BOB LOEVY**  
**IN THE NEWSPAPERS**  
**2019**



## **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 2019. These are the stories as Cronin and Loevy wrote them. The dates on the stories are when the columns were written and not when they appeared in the newspaper. The headlines are the “working” headlines used by Cronin and Loevy and not the headlines used in the newspaper.

This book offers the opportunity to read the facts, ideas, and opinions of two scholars of Colorado politics all in one place for the calendar year 2019. The actual published versions of these articles can be found on the *Denver Post* or the *Colorado Springs Gazette* websites. Except for the headlines, most of the articles were published exactly the way that Cronin and Loevy wrote them.



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Voters Not Willing to Fund Better Schools, Roads	9
2. Time for Legislators to Legislate on Tax Measures	13
3. “Purple-Ish” or “Blue-Ish:” Which Way is Colorado Headed?	17
4. A First Look at the 2020 Presidential Election	22
5. Political Polarization in Colorado: It’s Happening Here and Is Growing	26
6. It’s Polis vs. JBC – or Maybe Not	32
7. Primary Runoffs Needed for 2020 Presidential Election	35
8. Nominees for Hollywood Political Films	38
9. Making Black History on Capitol Hill in the 1960s	44
10. Make Colorado College’s Robson Arena Architecturally Compatible	48
11. Oil and Gas Again Divide Us	51
12. Women’s History Month and Colorado College	55
13. Helen Hunt Jackson's “Ramona” Exposed Frontier's Racial Injustice	59

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

14. Two Governors, Two Missions: Hick, Polis Visit the Springs	63
15. More Registered Independent Voters Doesn't Translate Into Less Partisanship	67
16. Proposed Springs Law Challenges Traditional Single-Family Zoning	72
17. "Single-Shooting" a Hidden Reality In At-Large City Council Elections?	75
18. Springs Discrimination? HOAs Can Avoid Proposed Dwelling Law	79
19. Upscale White Democrats Like Socialist Programs, But Will They Pay for Them?	82
20. Divided Government – Divided Political Parties – Divided Americans	85
21. Proposed Law Will Permit Chain Hotel Units in Backyards	89
22. Colorado College Bids a Fond Farewell To Its "Mister Chips"	92
23. Is Area "Densification" Coming Soon?	96
24. Voters Registering in Record Numbers	99
25. Option B Eliminates Backyard Rental Units from ADU	103

26. Haphazard Presidential Nominating System Begins With Democratic Debate	106
27. The Pressure Is on to Stand Out in The Democratic June Debate	109
28. Democratic Party “Playoffs” Begin	112
29. Trump Gets a Pass on Collusion, But as for Obstruction ...	116
30. Council Hears Midyear Short-Term Rental Update	121
31. Short Term Rentals Could Come Under Private Contractor Control	124
32. U.S. Senator Bennet: Stay in the Race	127
33. Retired Gen. Mattis’ Memoir Tells of Personal Battles	131
34. All Four State and Local Ballot Measures Could Pass Next Month	138
35. Debate Survivors Face Off Again	142
36. Let’s Hear It for Historic Preservation	146
37. Four Centuries of Race Relations	150
38. Places We Miss – And Others We’re Glad Are Still Here	154





*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**1-6-2019**

**VOTERS NOT WILLING TO FUND  
BETTER SCHOOLS, ROADS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Longtime observers of Colorado politics know that major decisions in the state are often made by the electorate voting on ballot issues rather than by laws passed by the state Legislature and signed by the governor.

Over the years, such major reforms as rejecting the 1976 Winter Olympics for Colorado, approving a state lottery with proceeds going for parks and open space, requiring voter approval of all tax increases, and legalizing recreational marijuana have all been adopted at the ballot box. In some cases, the governor and/or the Legislature have opposed these choices by the voters.

We decided to look at two of the major issues Coloradans voted on at the recent midterm elections. We chose the constitutional amendment (Amendment 73) providing for a major increase in public school funding. We also studied the proposition (Proposition 110), amending state law, that called for repairing and expanding state roads and highways.

We selected those two because both required a significant tax increase — one raised taxes on the wealthy to pay for public schools, and the other called for a sales tax hike to pay for roads and highways.

As for the public schools ballot issue, it was defeated statewide by a vote of 46.4 percent “yes” to 53.6 percent “no.” As an initiated constitutional amendment, it required 55 percent approval to be adopted.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Two populous counties, however, gave increased public school financing very strong support with a more than 60 percent “yes” vote. One was Denver, which voted 61.8 percent “yes” to 38.2 percent “no.” The second was Boulder County, Denver’s close neighbor to the northwest, which was even more in favor of public education by 63.1 percent “yes” to 36.9 percent “no.”

The third-highest county for supporting public education was Pitkin County (Aspen). This high-class resort went 59.1 percent “yes” and 40.9 percent “no.”

Pitkin County pretty much set the pattern for two other Colorado counties that gave a 55 percent-plus vote to financially supporting public education. They both were in Rocky Mountain resort areas: Gunnison County (Crested Butte) at 57.2 percent “yes” and San Miguel County (Telluride) at 55.6 percent “yes.”

On Colorado’s populous Front Range, only two other counties came close to the 55 percent required for adoption: Broomfield County, a Denver suburb, at 50.5 percent “yes,” and Larimer County (Fort Collins), the home of Colorado State University, at 52.6 percent “yes.”

And that is it. Out of Colorado’s 64 counties, only 13 voted more than 50 percent plus in favor of paying more of their hard-earned money to improve Colorado’s public schools. The other 51 counties voted “no.”

On Colorado’s populous Front Range, only two other counties came close to the 55 percent required for adoption: Broomfield County, a Denver suburb, at 50.5 percent “yes,” and Larimer County (Fort Collins), the home of Colorado State University, at 52.6 percent “yes.”

It is clear to those who know Colorado politics that the “yes” vote for public-school funding mirrors the customary support Colorado voters give to the Democratic Party. That support comes most heavily from Denver,

Boulder and mountain resort counties. But there is this difference. Whereas the Democrats lately have been getting enough support to win elections to statewide office, the public school funding issue lagged far enough behind the Democrats to lose statewide.

And if the “yes” pattern on public school support reflects Democratic voting patterns, the “no” pattern looks very Republican as expected. Colorado’s three best counties at producing large numbers of Republican votes, El Paso (Colorado Springs), Douglas (Castle Rock), and Weld (Greeley), voted “no” to the tune of 66.9 percent, 63 percent, and 60.4 percent respectively.

Colorado’s agricultural counties, on both the Eastern Plains and the Western Slope, are famous for delivering high percentages of Republican votes. They produced “no” votes on school funding at the 60 and 70 percent level. Kiowa County (Eads) out on the plains had the highest “no” percentage in the state — 75.9 percent.

Most interesting were the three populous Denver suburban counties, Arapahoe (Littleton), Jefferson (Golden) and Adams (Brighton). They have been trending Democratic in recent officeholder elections, but they continue to vote “no” on public school funding, although not by high percentages — Arapahoe, 52.3 percent; Jefferson, 52.6 percent; and Adams, 53.3 percent. If tax increases for public schools are going to start passing in Colorado, it is these three Denver suburban counties that are going to have to switch from voting “no” to voting “yes.”

On the roads and highways ballot issue, with its sales tax increase, the voting pattern was almost the same — “yes” votes in Democratic counties and “no” votes in Republican counties. But the roads vote did not do as well as the public education vote. Only five counties — Denver, Boulder, Pitkin, San Miguel and Summit — voted to raise taxes to build roads. Colorado’s other 59 counties voted a resounding “no.” Since this was not a constitutional amendment, it would have required only a 50 percent plus vote to pass.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Here is the anomaly. Coloradans lately have shown a penchant for voting Democratic, a party that often promises enhanced government investments such as better public schools, all-day kindergarten, more preschools, improved roads and highways, etc. But when it comes to voting to pay for these desirable programs, most Coloradans continue to vote “no” and keep the necessary funds in their own pockets.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are retired political science professors who were longtime members of the faculty at Colorado College in Colorado Springs.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**1-13-2019**

**TIME FOR LEGISLATORS TO LEGISLATE  
ON TAX MEASURES**

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Colorado's state capitol in Denver is bursting with new energy and personnel. The Colorado State Assembly, more commonly known as the state legislature, opened about a week ago to begin its four-and-a-half month 2019 session.

This should be, for a number of compelling reasons, a session during which legislators will craft and send their own taxing proposals to the voters rather than leaving it to well-funded interest groups to initiate tax measures to be placed on our election ballots.

Our system, as a constitutional republic, calls for elected representatives to deliberate and formulate policies to promote the public interest. But too often our legislators have not lived up to our aspirational ideals, especially when it comes to fiscal policy.

State legislators, understandably worried about often being punished by the voters for raising taxes, rarely send tax increases to the voters. The result is that private interest groups, most often those that stand to benefit financially from the proposed new tax, petition the tax increase on to the next election ballot and then work to get it passed.

On most occasions, these "non-legislature" tax proposals are rejected by the voters. Two met that fate in the recent 2018 midterm elections in Colorado. But occasionally such "outsider" tax increases are adopted by the voters, and for years afterward the state is stuck with what interest groups wanted rather than tax policies written by state legislators elected by the people.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Look what happened in the last election. There was general agreement that Colorado needed to spend more money on roads and highways. Increasing traffic congestion, particularly on I-25 between Colorado Springs and Denver, could only be solved by adding toll lanes, mainly because there was no other major source of money.

The state legislature deliberated on the problem, yet in the end it made no tax increase proposal to be voted on in the November 2018 election. Interest groups associated with roads and highways moved into the vacuum and wrote an omnibus proposal, Proposition 110, to raise sales tax money not just for state roads but also for local (county and city) roads. This proposal also called for taxpayer financed improvements to public transit, possibly including rail passenger service.

This roads and highways initiative was defeated by state voters by 40.6 percent Yes to 59.4 percent No. It is possibly good that it was defeated. This initiated measure may have been trying to do too much by repaving local as well as state roads and also moving toward subsidizing public transit. The state legislature should have and could have done a better job of reading the public mind. They are, after all, elected representatives.

The legislature might have sent the voters a less ambitious tax increase, limited only to state roads and highways. That would have had a better chance of passing.

Just as there is much sentiment in Colorado to spend more tax money on roads and highways, there is widespread support for better financing of public schools (K-12). Inaction by the state legislature led to a major constitutional amendment being initiated on to the 2018 election ballot providing for an increase in state income taxes to pay for more state aid to public education.

This private interest group proposal also was nixed by the voters. As a constitutional amendment, it needed 55 percent of the vote to pass, but it only got 46.4 percent Yes and 53.6 percent No.

Here again we think the state legislature could have done a better job of proposing a public school aid bill that voters might adopt. The interest

group initiated proposal in 2018 put the main burden of paying the increased taxes on wealthy voters and corporations, a “tax the very rich” scheme that has not appealed to voters.

The state legislature would have been more likely to send voters a more broadly financed bill, progressively taxing all income groups, with a greater chance of adoption.

Bolstering our call for legislative initiative on tax matters is the Colorado state constitution. Similar to the U.S. Constitution, it places the responsibility to introduce revenue raising measures in the state House of Representatives. The state Senate can amend such bills but cannot introduce them.

Now would be a good time for the Colorado House of Representatives to begin the process of seeing to it that the state legislature makes fiscal policy in Colorado rather than relying on the present ad hoc method of having private interest groups initiate tax proposals for the voters.

In sum the state legislature should lose its current reluctance to send tax increases to the voters that finance solutions to state problems such as highways and schools. The two political parties – Democrats and Republicans – working together on these proposals would increase the chances of such bipartisan tax programs being adopted by the voters.

Take at least this part of TABOR in Colorado at its word. It calls for “A Vote on All Tax Increases.” The state legislature should send those tax increases to the voters and not leave the job to the private interest groups that are doing it now. If the legislature’s recommended tax increases fail to pass, wait and try again next election. The voters have been known to change their minds on such issues.

The state legislature’s Joint Budget Committee (JBC), with its expertise in the state budget and its competent fiscal staff, should take the lead in getting appropriate action started in the state House of Representatives and then sending it on to the state Senate.

Let’s have our state legislators organize and shape the state’s finances. Let’s reduce the present reality that private interest groups, some with

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

questionable motives, initiate and sometimes pass major taxing and spending policies in Colorado because the legislature has failed to present its own.

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



*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**1-20-2019**

**“PURPLE-ISH” OR “BLUE-ISH:”  
WHICH WAY IS COLORADO HEADED?**

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Is Colorado still a “purple” state that, in the future, will see voters split their votes between the Democratic and Republican parties? Or, in light of the strong performance by the Democrats in the 2018 general election, is Colorado becoming mainly Democratic – a “blue” state?

To answer these questions, we decided to first look backward over the past half century of Colorado voting statistics. We studied major statewide elections for U.S. president, U.S. senator, and Colorado governor. Using only Democratic and Republican election results (we excluded third parties), we divided the study into five separate decades – the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s.

For each decade we calculated a Statewide Partisan Average (SPA), an average number summing up how the two political parties did against each other over that decade of time.

The SPA metric is something we devised many years ago. Yes, it is a bit wonky, but anyone can do the math with data provided by the Colorado secretary of state’s office.

Thus, in the decade of the 1970s, Colorado had a SPA of 51.2 percent Republican. Compared to many other states in the United States, that is a close split. Many other states are strongly Democratic or strongly Republican.

In the 1970s, Richard Nixon won a big victory for the Republicans in Colorado in the 1972 presidential election, but the ensuing Watergate scandal forced Nixon to resign the presidency. The Democrats in Colorado

took advantage of this Republican scandal and elected Dick Lamm governor in 1974 and reelected him in 1978. Thus both parties had winning candidates in the 1970s, and the close SPA, 51.2 percent Republican, reflected that.

We go on to the 1980s. It was the most Republican decade in recent Colorado electoral history. The SPA hit 52.4 percent Republican, mainly thanks to Republican Ronald Reagan's twin victories in the 1980 and 1984 presidential elections in Colorado. Democrats continued to dominate gubernatorial elections, however. Lamm was easily reelected to a third term as governor in 1982 and Roy Romer, also a Democrat, succeeded Lamm in the governor's office in 1986. Republican presidential victories were mainly counterbalanced by Democratic gubernatorial wins, so the SPA stayed close at 52.4 percent for the GOP.

The 1990s were a comeback for the Democrats, and the decade ended with Colorado having an SPA of 50.6 percent Democratic. Bill Clinton won Colorado for the Democrats in the 1992 presidential election, but Republican Bob Dole narrowly defeated Clinton in the presidential sweepstakes in 1996. Democrat Roy Romer was reelected governor in 1990 and 1994, but Republican Bill Owens won the governor race in a squeaker in 1998. That super close SPA of 50.6 percent Democratic in the 1990s is what put the idea in people's heads that Colorado was indeed a "purple-ish" state.

But the SPA score became even closer in the decade of the 2000s and ended up at 50.4 percent Republican, the closest the two parties came to an even balance in the 50-year period studied. Republican President George W. Bush carried Colorado handily in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections, but President Barack Obama did even better for the Democrats in 2008. Republican Bill Owens was reelected governor by a big margin in 2002, but Bill Ritter took the governor's office back for the Democrats in 2006. Again there is this pattern of both parties winning major statewide offices throughout the decade, thereby explaining that 50.4 percent Republican SPA for the early 2000s.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

And now it is on to the present decade of 2010 to 2018. The SPA stands at 52.2 percent Democratic, the best the Democrats have done in any decade from 1970 to 2018. That is almost as good as the Republicans did in their best decade with 52.4 percent Republican in the 1980s. Barack Obama carried Colorado comfortably for the Democrats when he was reelected president in 2012, and Hillary Clinton won Colorado just as comfortably from Donald Trump in 2016. The only Republican win in a statewide election in Colorado in the 2010-2018 decade was Cory Gardner's election as U.S. senator in 2014. At an SPA of 52.2 percent Democratic, the 2010s have been the Republican Party's weakest decade in Colorado over the past half century.

**COLORADO STATEWIDE  
PARTISAN AVERAGES (SPA)  
BY DECADES**

1970-2018

1970-1978	51.2 R
1980-1988	52.4 R
1990-1998	50.6 D
2000-2008	50.4 R
2010-2018	52.2 D

---

R=Republican

D=Democratic

SPA=Percentage votes for U.S. President,  
U.S. senator, and Colorado governor  
averaged together by decade.

So what can be concluded from this 50-year decade-by-decade study. Over the long haul, it appears Coloradans consistently vote in a narrow range of 52.4 percent Republican to 52.2 percent Democratic. Thus there is no historical evidence Colorado voters ever want to go strongly Democratic or strongly Republican for an extended period of time. For fifty years the statewide vote has stayed close to the 50 percent mark that determines victory and defeat. The result is that Democrats and Republicans both get elected in the state most of the time.

Can the Republicans “come back” from the fact that the Democrats have been on a winning streak in the 2010s and currently enjoy a 52.2 percent Democratic advantage? Well, the Republicans had a slightly better figure of 52.4 percent Republican in the 1980s, and by the end of the 1990s that Republican lead was gone. The Democrats could lose their current advantage the way the Republicans lost theirs in the 1990s.

And then there is this point. The Democrats have won a large number of statewide offices in Colorado recently, but they have won most of them by narrow victory margins in the range of 50 to 52 percent. And in every case, Democratic candidates won only because they were better able to sway a majority of Colorado’s large and growing unaffiliated voters. With things this close in Colorado, and most unaffiliated voters regularly up for grabs, the Republicans will not have to reverse that many votes to start winning again.

The Democrats now control all but one of the major statewide offices that compose the SPA. It is well-known, however, that voters, in Colorado as well as elsewhere, have a tendency every eight years or so to vote for out-of-office party candidates. That could help the Republicans as well, especially when, or if, Republicans can better overcome their ideological divisions. This, going forward, may be a big “if.”

Most pundits are forecasting Colorado as a now a predictably “blue,” or Democratic, state. This may prove to be the case, and demographic changes help to make that case. Further, Governor Polis is off to a good start, and Republican U.S. Senator Cory Gardner is understandably losing

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

sleep over a likely contest against former-Governor John Hickenlooper in 2020. Still, as our close look at the last 50 years suggests, we would not yet “short” Republican chances over the next decade.

Warning: Just as in the stock market, past electoral performance never guarantees future gains. Except, we note, markets have an impressive way of coming back and going up after corrections, and even after recessions and depressions. So “blue-ness” will depend more on performance than on future expectations. That’s the way it has worked in Colorado over the past five decades.

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

**Not Used**  
**1-12-2020**

**A FIRST LOOK AT THE 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION**

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

One year from right now, the 2020 presidential primaries will be getting under way with the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary. Here is an early look at the 2020 presidential race from two longtime scholars of the presidency and presidential elections.

First off, do not be surprised if the eventual winner of the White House in 2020 is someone you have not heard of by now, or whom you know very little about. In both 2008 (Barack Obama) and 2016 (Donald Trump), lesser known candidates with minimal political experience won a major party nomination and the presidency.

So the old rules that leading candidates for a presidential nomination have to have lots of political experience, such as two terms as a state governor or at least one full term as a U.S. senator, no longer apply. For instance, in 2016 Jeb Bush, a two-term ex-governor of Florida, looked like a strong frontrunner for the Republican nomination at the start but was gone after only a few primaries and caucuses.

One reason so many people are running for a major party presidential nomination these days is that comparative outsiders lately have been gaining nominations and the presidency. “If anyone can win,” so the logic goes, “why shouldn’t I be a candidate. Electoral lightning just might strike me.”

Looking first at the Republican contest, we predict incumbent president Donald Trump will be seriously and strongly challenged by a highly qualified candidate for the GOP nomination. We are thinking of someone along the lines of former Ohio Governor John Kasich or newly elected Utah U.S. Senator Mitt Romney. Trump is unpopular enough in the

public opinion polls that one or more qualified Republicans should challenge him after just one term in office.

We are reminded of 1980, when incumbent Democratic President Jimmy Carter, after experiencing a slowing economy, rising inflation, and U.S. embassy personnel being taken hostage in Iran, was challenged by Massachusetts U.S. senator Ted Kennedy. Carter fended off Kennedy in the caucuses and primaries but then was badly beaten by Republican Ronald Reagan in the general election.

Trump having a serious challenger in the Republican primaries and caucuses will greatly affect the Democrats in 2020. The best scenario for the Democrats would then be for the Republican challenger to slam Trump on the issues and cost him money but not defeat him. That should make it easier for the Democrats to beat Trump in November.

The worst scenario for the Democrats would be for the Republican challenger to defeat Trump and be the Republican nominee. The GOP would have a fresh face for the general election and would be freed of most of the damaging baggage from the Trump presidency.

But what if more than one highly qualified Republican challenges Trump, and then those two split the anti-Trump vote and Trump is nominated in a three-way race? The possibilities here are numerous – and one of them is Trump being reelected in November 2020 after winning a tough primary.

Similar to other commentators, we expect many candidates to compete for the Democratic nomination in the winter and spring of 2020, something in the range of 10 to 20 women and men. U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts is the first highly qualified Democrat to enter the primary-caucuses race. There are a host of others said to be running, including former Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper.

A side note here on Elizabeth Warren. She is from Massachusetts, a state that is very close to New Hampshire. In fact, southern New Hampshire is a northern suburb of Boston. This should give Warren a real head start on

winning the New Hampshire primary, the second contest after the “First in the Nation” Iowa caucuses.

Back in 1992 Massachusetts U.S. Senator Paul Tsongas ran for president and, being a close neighbor, easily won the New Hampshire primary from former Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton. It took Clinton several wins in subsequent caucuses and primaries to finally knock Tsongas out of the race.

A big concern of ours is that large number of Democrats expected to run for the Democratic nomination for president in 2020. Newspaper cartoonists are already lampooning this, but we think it is no joke. With so many candidates running, the early winners in Iowa and New Hampshire and other early contests could be candidates with a low percentage of the vote in a crowded race.

That raises the danger that those early winners could be from the far left wing of the Democratic Party and not represent the mainstream of opinion in the Democratic Party. The Democrats could end up with a flawed candidate who will be a weak competitor in the general election against Donald Trump.

In fact, it is our view that Donald Trump’s best chance of being reelected is the selection of a fringe candidate in the Democratic caucuses and primaries, much like Trump’s selection from the fringe in the Republican caucuses and primaries in 2018.

We regard the current presidential nominating system in the United States as greatly flawed. It was not designed by the writers of the U.S. Constitution but evolved accidentally over the years. The caucuses and primaries are fun to watch in the news media, which labor to make them as exciting as possible. But the system can produce weak nominees from the party fringe that can distort the final results in the general election in November – with possible bad results for the nation.

Our advice: watch the 2020 nominating and election process with trepidation. There is more at stake this time than usual. Do not ask: “Who is



***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

winning?” Ask instead: “Is the system working to produce strong party candidates who will make good presidents of the United States?”

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. They have studied and written books about presidential elections since 1960.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**1-27-2019**

**POLITICAL POLARIZATION IN COLORADO:  
IT'S HAPPENING HERE AND IS GROWING**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

We have sometimes mused that the further you go from Denver's 16<sup>th</sup> Street Mall, the more you will find conservatives and Republicans. Well, this is not always the case. Colorado's ski counties defy this aphorism, as do a few historically Hispanic counties near the San Luis Valley region.

Still, in certain ways, there are two Colorados. Twenty out of 26 Colorado counties that are located along the state's outer borders are Republican in their voting patterns. That includes all four counties located in the four corners of Colorado – Moffat County (NW), Sedgwick County (NE), Baca County (SE), and Montezuma County (SW).

The Denver Metro Area and the rest of the state are increasingly different from each other, and much of this comes from political party and ideological preferences. We have several divides in Colorado, and one of them is party polarization.

It is often reported that American voters are polarizing along geographic lines, with Democrats mainly living in one part of a state and Republicans in another part. This is happening in Colorado. Which counties are polarized and which are not? And is political polarization growing in our state the way it supposedly is in the rest of the nation?

To answer these questions, we used the SPA (Statewide Partisan Average), our metric averaging votes for U.S. president, U.S. senator, and Colorado governor by the decade. The SPA is expressed as a percentage vote for either the Democratic or Republican parties for the county for the decade. Third parties are not included.

We consider a Colorado county polarized if it cast 60 percent or more of its two-party vote for one party or the other. We used El Paso County (county seat: Colorado Springs) as our model. The county mainly elects Republicans to county offices and to the state legislature, and it consistently has an SPA in the middle 60s percent Republican. We decided that any county that was more than 60 percent Democratic should be considered polarized as well.

So are Colorado counties polarized? The answer is “yes.” As of the present decade (2010 to 2019), 39 of Colorado’s 64 counties meet our definition of polarized, and 30 of them earn the Republican designation and 9 are aptly considered Democratic. Thus 60 percent of Colorado counties classify as polarized in one party or the other.

Keep in mind we are dealing with geographic locations in this study and not in terms of votes cast in elections. Thus the most polarized Republican county in Colorado is Washington County (Akron) out on the Eastern Plains at 84.1 percent Republican. It cast only about 2,300 votes for major party candidates in the 2018 gubernatorial election. Compare that to Denver, the most polarized Democratic area in Colorado at 76.9 percent Democratic. Denver’s total two-party vote in the 2018 gubernatorial race was almost 300,000.

But there are polarized Republican counties in Colorado that are heavily populated. Among them are El Paso County at 62.5 percent Republican, Douglas County (Castle Rock) at 61.6 percent Republican, Weld County (Greeley) at 60.8 percent Republican, and Mesa County (Grand Junction) at 66.8 percent Republican.

By and large, though, polarized Republican counties are in rural areas on the Eastern Plains and in non-resort oriented areas on the Western Slope. Examples of the latter would be Moffat County (Craig) at 80.1 percent Republican and Rio Blanco County (Meeker) at 83.3 percent Republican.

On the Democratic side of the polarization ledger, Denver is joined by Boulder County at 73.3 percent Democratic and a small number of the resort-oriented ski counties in the mountains of Colorado. They include

Gunnison County at 61.2 percent Democratic, Pitkin County (Aspen) at 72.8 percent Democratic, San Miguel County (Telluride) at 73.5 percent Democratic, and Summit County (Breckenridge) at 64.6 percent Democratic.

All the above figures are based on two-party voting in Colorado in the present decade of 2010 to 2018. To assess whether polarization had increased in Colorado in recent years, we compared the present decade with the decade of the 1980s, some 30 years ago. The results surprised us. For both the Democrats and Republicans, the number of polarized counties increased from the decade of the 1980s to that of the 2010s.

In the 1980s there were 23 polarized Republican counties in Colorado. That increased by 7 to 30 polarized Republican counties in the 2010s. The Democrats increased by 6 from 3 polarized counties in the 1980s to 9 polarized counties in this decade.

Non-polarized counties in our study were labeled “partisan” Republican or “partisan” Democrat and scored in the 53 percent to 59 percent range for their political party. Two of the Denver area’s most populous counties flipped from partisan Republican to partisan Democratic over the 30 years. Arapahoe County (Littleton) went from 58.6 percent Republican to 55.2 percent Democratic. Jefferson County (Golden) tracked 55.5 percent Republican to 53.1 percent Democratic.

These were among just a handful of county shifts from Republican to Democratic. Gunnison, Ouray, and Larimer (Fort Collins) counties were a few others. Only Las Animas County (Trinidad) flipped from Democratic to Republican.

And so, based on county election results from two decades 30 years apart, Colorado is polarized and the polarization is growing. As Denver and Boulder and the mountain resort counties become more Democratic, the rural areas all over the state become more Republican. Equally Republican (although not polarizing as fast as the rural areas) are populous El Paso (Colorado Springs), Douglas (Castle Rock), and Weld (Greeley) counties. This study suggests partisan differences in Colorado are becoming more intense along geographic lines.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

We assume these political differing Coloradans sit next to each other at Bronco games and ski, hunt and fish near one another in the great outdoors of Colorado. But the two polarizing parts of Colorado are sending representatives and state senators to the Colorado legislature at the state Capitol in Denver. It is little wonder the two parties struggle to get along at the state legislature. Coloradans need to be aware of how sharply we are dividing in terms of political polarization and work harder to emphasize common values and aspirations.

These divides are not going away. Politics requires we live together and try to craft policies that benefit everyone in the state. Politics is the process that brings people together, regardless of their party loyalties, to understand our common needs and find agreements. Shutting down the government is not an option. And giving up on politics is not an option.

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

**Colorado Statewide Partisan Average  
(SPA) By County – 1980s to 2010s**






**SPA = President +  
Governor + U.S. Senator**

County	SPA		SPA	
	1980-1988		2010-2018	
ADAMS	52.7	D	55.0	D
ALAMOSA	52.2	R	54.4	D
ARAPAHOE	58.6	R	55.2	D
ARCHULETA	64.1	R	59.6	R
BACA	64.3	R	77.5	R
BENT	50.9	R	61.0	R
BOULDER	55.0	D	73.3	D
BROOMFIELD	Non-existent		54.9	D
CHAFFEE	55.8	R	50.5	R
CHEYENNE	63.7	R	83.6	R
CLEAR CREEK	53.2	R	54.8	D
CONEJOS	52.7	D	51.4	D
COSTILLA	69.2	D	70.0	D
CROWLEY	58.7	R	68.3	R
CUSTER	67.7	R	68.6	R
DELTA	60.6	R	69.8	R
DENVER	61.3	D	76.9	D
DOLORES	62.8	R	72.0	R
DOUGLAS	67.3	R	61.6	R
EAGLE	52.9	R	59.7	D
EL PASO	65.1	R	62.5	R
ELBERT	63.1	R	76.4	R
FREMONT	58.2	R	68.5	R
GARFIELD	56.4	R	52.0	R
GILPIN	52.7	D	54.9	D
GRAND	59.6	R	54.5	R
GUNNISON	55.5	R	61.2	D
HINSDALE	68.4	R	59.8	R
HUERFANO	59.3	D	52.1	D
JACKSON	65.8	R	74.4	R
JEFFERSON	55.5	R	53.1	D

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

KIOWA	62.1	R	83.0	R
KIT CARSON	64.4	R	78.9	R
LA PLATA	59.2	R	55.0	D
LAKE	56.7	D	60.1	D
LARIMER	54.2	R	52.7	D
LAS ANIMAS	62.0	D	50.9	R
LINCOLN	62.8	R	78.3	R
LOGAN	56.7	R	73.3	R
MESA	60.4	R	66.8	R
MINERAL	59.7	R	54.1	R
MOFFAT	62.5	R	80.1	R
MONTEZUMA	64.2	R	63.1	R
MONTROSE	61.8	R	70.1	R
MORGAN	57.9	R	68.3	R
OTERO	54.5	R	58.2	R
OURAY	66.1	R	54.9	D
PARK	57.7	R	60.8	R
PHILLIPS	56.4	R	75.6	R
PITKIN	57.1	D	72.8	D
PROWERS	55.2	R	70.8	R
PUEBLO	58.4	D	53.5	D
RIO BLANCO	67.0	R	83.3	R
RIO GRANDE	61.2	R	57.7	R
ROUTT	53.0	R	59.4	D
SAGUACHE	50.8	D	60.6	D
SAN JUAN	54.2	R	57.9	D
SAN MIGUEL	54.2	D	73.5	D
SEDGWICK	59.3	R	70.7	R
SUMMIT	50.8	D	64.6	D
TELLER	65.3	R	69.3	R
WASHINGTON	64.1	R	84.1	R
WELD	55.5	R	60.8	R
YUMA	59.6	R	79.8	R
TOTAL	52.4	R	52.2	D

R = REPUBLICAN  
D = DEMOCRATIC

	equals 60 percent + Democratic
	equals 53-59.9 percent Democratic
	equals swing counties – 50-52.9 percent R or D
	equals 53-59.9 percent Republican
	equals 60 percent + Republican

*Colorado Springs Gazette*

**2-3-2019**

## **IT'S POLIS VS. JBC – OR MAYBE NOT**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Newly inaugurated Governor Jared Polis had an encounter with the state legislature's Joint Budget Committee (JBC) the other day. It won't be his last.

In the governor's first budget request, Polis asked for a total of \$253 million to provide full-day kindergarten in every public school district in Colorado. State Senator Dominick Moreno of Commerce City, the Democrat who chairs the legislature's Joint Budget Committee, commented: "I think he (Governor Polis) is well aware ... that the Joint Budget Committee has the final say on what's actually in the budget."

Moreno added that the JBC may find "transportation" rather than all-day kindergarten a higher priority.

Who and what is this Joint Budget Committee? Why does it have power over how state government money is spent in Colorado?

The JBC is noted for its small size. It consists of six members of the state legislature, three from the state House of Representatives and three from the state Senate. The majority party in each house of the legislature gets to name two of the three members and the minority party gets to name the third. Because the Democrats just won control of both houses in the 2018 elections, the Democrats have four members on this session's JBC and the Republicans have two.

With Governor Polis being a Democrat, and the Democrats having a four to two persons majority on the Joint Budget Committee, you might expect the governor to have no problems with the JBC. But it is not as simple as that. There is a historical tradition, in most years, of playing down



partisanship on the JBC. The six members spend so much time together they develop a high esprit de corps and sense of loyalty to the committee. Ideally all six members work together to enforce good budgeting principles rather than pursuing partisan agendas. We will find out in the next few months how that is going to work in this session.

The JBC was created by the state legislature in 1959 and thus has a more than half century of tradition behind it. It is the only committee of the legislature with a large full-time professional staff of its own. It occupies a suite of offices in the Legislative Services Building, just south of the Capitol building. The six committee members begin working on the budget in November and December, two months before the legislature begins its January to May regular session.

The JBC is supposed to begin its work by looking at the governor's proposed budget, but there are lots of stories, and jokes, about how little attention the committee pays to the governor's fiscal handiwork. One legend, never verified, holds that a JBC chairperson of yore, upon receiving the governor's budget, publicly and unceremoniously threw it in the waste basket. One observer noted that the governor's budget has as much status in the Capitol as "a child's letter to Santa Claus."

The JBC has been revered and feared. It is revered because, over the years, it has built a tradition of budget expertise that few other members of the legislature are willing to challenge. It is feared because it can shape department and lobbyist budget requests to its own liking, cutting them severely if it wishes.

Former state senator Mike Bird from Colorado Springs recalled there was a photograph, in one of the committee hearing rooms, of the Woodmen of the World with their lumber axes at the ready. The axes were considered appropriate because this was where budget requests got "chopped." One day the JBC discovered that someone had taken red ink and painted "blood" dripping from the axes in the photograph.

The JBC proceeds about its work in a highly ritualized fashion. It begins in December with the revenue estimates, being well aware that it can

only spend the money the state takes in through taxation. By February it is figure setting, writing into the budget the actual amounts of money to be spent on each item. The result is what is called “the long bill,” the massive budget bill that eventually goes to the state House and the state Senate for legislative approval.

Two developments have somewhat weakened the influence of the Joint Budget Committee in recent years. Term limits have caused higher turnover as experienced committee members are forced to leave the legislature after only eight years in office. This loss of expertise among the elected committee members has enhanced the power of both the governor’s and the JBC’s budget staff.

TABOR, the Taxpayer’s Bill of Rights, has also weakened the JBC. As money for state government services has become less available under TABOR, due to the difficulty of raising taxes, the JBC has mainly had to cut programs rather than expand them. That is not much fun. Here is how a state representative from Boulder put it several years ago: “I would love to be on the powerful JBC and hand out wads of cash to every constituency, but we don’t have wads of cash.”

No matter which political party is in control of the state legislature, the JBC has a fiscally conservative effect on the state legislature. It puts the emphasis on sound budget practices and spending only what the state gets in taxes. It likes to save money for future rainy days. As Governor Polis may or may not be about to learn, the JBC can deny or modify a governor’s pet spending requests when the JBC considers the requests unwise.

Polis has a good chance of winning substantial funding for his signature all-day kindergarten initiative – at least for the time being. This is part due to a state budget surplus from the past year. But he and the legislature will have to find new monies for transportation and more accessible health care. Polis and the JBC will meet again.

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

Colorado Springs Gazette  
2-10-2019

**PRIMARY RUNOFFS NEEDED FOR  
2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION**

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

It is a genuine worry for many Democrats. As the number of candidates running for the 2020 Democratic Party nomination for president goes steadily upward, the fear grows that a non-mainstream candidate from the party fringes will get the nomination and be a weak candidate in the November general election.

Presidential primaries and caucuses, such as the early caucuses in Iowa and the early primary in New Hampshire, are plurality elections. A large field of candidates can run in a plurality primary or caucus, split the vote, and the winner can score a victory with a low percentage of the total vote and little real support from a majority of those voting.

At last count, more than a dozen candidates have talked about running in the 2020 Democratic Party presidential primaries and caucuses. U.S. Senator Cory Booker, the former mayor of Newark, New Jersey, was one of the latest to announce. Even if just ten candidates get on the caucuses ballot in Iowa or the primary ballot in New Hampshire, the chances for winners with low percentages of the vote go way up.

There is a cure for this problem, and the cure is established and operating well in Colorado. The cure is, in each political party, to hold a nationwide runoff primary in all 50 states and D.C., one runoff for the Democrats and the other for the Republicans. This will produce political party nominees for president, one Democratic and the other Republican, who will have shown at the national ballot box they have broad voter support in their political party.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Such National Presidential Primary Runoff Elections would have to be created by law by the U.S. Congress and signed by the president. That way all 50 states would be required to participate in the nationwide runoff in both political parties. There would be no Electoral College as there is in the general election in November. The votes from all 50 states and D.C. would be added together and a majority vote would determine the Democratic nominee in one runoff primary and the Republican nominee in the other.

Congress will have to act now to institute this badly needed reform. Obviously, waiting until the caucuses, primaries, and state conventions begin in January of 2020 will be too late.

So it would go like this. The presidential caucuses, primaries, and state conventions would be held in all 50 states, just as they are currently, from about January to June of 2020. As done currently, state laws would govern when the caucuses/primaries/state conventions are held and what rules would apply. But in July, after all 50 states had held caucuses or primaries or state conventions, the top two candidates in each party with the highest number of delegate votes would enter each party's July nationwide runoff. The winner of the Democratic Party runoff and the winner of the Republican Party runoff would face each other in the general election in November.

One strength of this proposal is it would leave the current complex calendar of presidential primaries, caucuses, and state conventions unchanged. Iowa, New Hampshire, and other states would not have to give up their preferred positions in the existing system. The change would be instituted only after the familiar run of primaries, etc., had gone its full length course to the middle of June.

The problem of too many candidates running for major party presidential nominations is not going to go away. There is a reason so many people are running for president these days. Lately comparative outsiders have been gaining nominations and the presidency. Barack Obama in 2008 and Donald Trump in 2016 are examples of lesser known candidates who have gained a major party nomination and won the White House. "If anyone

can win,” so the logic goes, “why shouldn’t I be a candidate? Electoral lightning just might strike me.” As a result, relatively unknown politicians, such as former Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper and former San Antonio Mayor Julian Castro, are taking the presidential candidate plunge.

About 25 percent of Coloradans are familiar with this runoff election concept. Denver and Colorado Springs use it in their elections for mayor. Pre-elections are held in which many candidates can run. Several weeks later, there is a runoff between the top two finishers in the first round (the plurality round). Pueblo is currently installing such an electoral system for electing its mayor.

In Denver and Colorado Springs, if one candidate gets more than 50 percent of the vote for mayor in the first round, no runoff is required and the candidate with majority support is declared elected. The same would apply at the presidential level. If, after holding primaries and caucuses in all 50 states, one candidate had 50 percent or more of the delegate votes, that candidate would be declared the party nominee for president and no runoff would be held.

Although almost all of the attention on the “too many candidates for President” problem is currently focused on the Democratic Party, a runoff primary would be a good idea for the Republican Party as well. With his low approval ratings in public opinion polls, incumbent President Donald Trump may attract a number of competitors for the Republican nomination in 2020. A runoff following the usual round of primaries, caucuses, and state conventions would guarantee a “majority,” rather than a “plurality,” candidate for the GOP.

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

***Colorado Springs Gazette***  
**2-17-2019**

## **NOMINEES FOR HOLLYWOOD POLITICAL FILMS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

It's Academy Awards month, and this prompts we two film buffs to compile a list of Hollywood's more noteworthy movies about politics and politicians.

Hollywood films are invariably tough on elected officials. Hypocrisy, corruption, temptation, complicated motives and swollen egos are regular themes. There is an occasional "good guy," as with Senator Jefferson Smith in the Frank Capra classic, *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, or Dave in the pleasant yet sappy *Dave* – but they are accidental office holders rather than elected professional politicians.

Famed film critic Roger Ebert once said that "film is the wrong medium for facts." He could have also said Hollywood productions, especially in dealing with politics, specialize in mocking and disparaging ambitious political figures.

Two noted 2018 Hollywood films did just that. *The Front Runner* starring Hugh Jackman chronicles the impressive rise and humiliating fall of Colorado U.S. Senator Gary Hart. He was elected to the Senate in 1974 and ran unsuccessfully for U.S. president in 1988. By the spring of 1987 he was the frontrunner for the Democratic nomination.

But the ruggedly handsome and idealistic policy wonk stumbled ingloriously when confronted with charges of extra-marital relationships. The news media jumped all over him, and he withdrew his candidacy. This less than successful film rehashes this political prince's fall from grace. The film raises questions about what kind of president Hart might have become

yet pays even more attention to the proper role of the news media when it comes to the private lives of public figures.

*Vice*, starring the Oscar nominated Christian Bale, is a provocative and partisan depiction of our country's most prominent and controversial vice-president. Dick Cheney had a remarkable career in politics, beginning as a congressional intern and later becoming a White House aide, White House chief-of-staff, member of Congress from 1979 to 1989, secretary of defense and later vice-president from 2001 to 2009.

*Vice* portrays Cheney as heartless, lamely relating that to his heart ailments and heart operations. Cheney is seen as a believer in an overly powerful presidency, weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and torture. He is charged with being the manipulative power behind the throne of the George W. Bush presidency.

Liberals will find much to like in *Vice* with its conspiracy narratives. Conservatives may be impressed with Christian Bale's acting but will rate this film relentlessly overbearing and flawed.

So much for 2018 films – except to note that Spike Lee's *BlacKkKlansman*, based on a fascinating Colorado Springs police officer's story, has garnered six Academy Award nominations, including best director, best adapted screenplay, best film editing, and best original score.

Here, for fellow political junkies, are some of the important Hollywood takes on the American politician:

*Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* (1939). This is justifiably a fan favorite. Jimmy Stewart steals the show as an honest, if naïve, appointed U.S. senator from the Mid-west. He is everyone's ideal valiant public servant but, alas, finds himself confronting a home state political machine and an egregiously self-serving chamber of U.S. senators. It's good vs. evil. His so-called Senate mentor cautions Smith that "this is a man's world, Jeff, and you've got to check your ideals outside the door."

But our hero refuses "to play ball" with corrupt politicians and, inspired by Jefferson and Lincoln, fights to defend himself and American political ideals.

---

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

*Dave* (1993). Here again, an entirely apolitical accidental novice gets thrust into high political office, this time the presidency. Similar to Jefferson Smith, Dave becomes authentic, honest, idealistic, and heroic.

The fairytale plot here strains imagination. An ordinary guy, Dave Kovic (played by Kevin Kline), is a small town businessman who is asked by the Secret Service to act as a double for the real president. Dave gladly does so. He believes he is doing his civic duty.

Then the real president has a stroke and goes into a coma. The president's advisers dislike the vice-president so much that they "install" Dave as the new president. Dave succeeds brilliantly and wins everybody over with his kindness and noble deeds. *Dave* is a mindlessly simplistic yet entertaining film. Its larger theme is that the regular politicians are a corrupt and unsavory lot.

*The Candidate* (1972). Robert Redford plays an earnest and progressive young lawyer drafted into running for U.S. senator in California. Bill McKay agrees to run and initially campaigns as a principled liberal. Then his "handlers" take over and convince him to water down his issues and emphasize his style and image. The handlers reframe the election contest as a simple choice between youth and age as well as virility and impotence. McKay gets repackaged and essentially corrupted. Eventually the campaign swallows McKay.

This is a tale of an anti-politician becoming a "winning" politician with his victory purchased by vagueness on the issues and the triumph of personality over substance. The film is entertaining but depressing. After McKay is elected, he turns to his handlers and says a famous line: "What do we do now?" The obvious answer is to continue to take orders. Bill McKay has become Senator Sell-Out, a user of scams and cover-ups, even before he is sworn into office.

*The Seduction of Joe Tynan* (1979). This film provides a similar but more complicated message as in *The Candidate*. Joe Tynan, played by Alan Alda, develops presidential aspirations. His challenge is how to balance



family and friendships with the necessary consuming drive to acquire political power and success?

Tynan begins to flip-flop on the issues and becomes an absentee father and spouse. His wheezy slogan is, “Joe believes in putting the American people first.” Just as his wife is about to throw him out of their home due to neglect, Joe realizes he can only succeed in the election with the apparent loving support of his family.

Alan Alda is terrific, but the movie ends on a note of ambiguity. Still the message here is that politics is a tough, demanding occupation and the drive needed to excel is seductive in a variety of ways.

*Primary Colors* (1998). Actor John Travolta is an uncanny lookalike to former President Bill Clinton. He stars as Jack Stanton, a southern governor who loves people, projects amazing empathy, and is a person of varied and reckless appetites.

Stanton is committed to doing whatever it takes to become president of the United States because he believes “we can change the whole country” and “history is what we are all about.” Stanton is a likeable but sleazy rogue. His apology for his questionable behavior is that “this is the price you have to pay to lead.” Film goers are left asking: Cannot one be a leader and be a good person too?

*All the King's Men* (1949). Oscar winning actor Broderick Crawford stars as Governor Willie Stark, a self-made, up-from-the-hicks lawyer who becomes a populist governor of a southern state like Louisiana. It is a story based on former Louisiana Governor Huey Long. It emphasizes the hard-ball political creed: “I’d make a deal with the devil if it’ll help me carry out my program.”

Stark evolves into a shameless wheeler-dealer who sadly becomes intoxicated with his newfound political power and influence. Stark was well intentioned, and he brought about needed reforms. But the message here is that power can corrupt, and Stark becomes a power-obsessed, woman-chasing alcoholic who subverts moral as well as constitutional principles.

---

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

*The Manchurian Candidate* (1962). Angela Lansbury and Frank Sinatra star in this mocking portrait of political paranoia directed and coproduced by John Frankenheimer. Based on a novel by Richard Condon, the film satirizes communists, anti-communists, politicians, the media, and the shallow political culture of the 1950s.

This film has so many jolts and reversals that it is hard to tell who is telling the truth and what the truth is. It's timely for today because it succeeds in forcing viewers to question nearly everything that anyone in politics says – to be aware of brainwashing and collusion in the United States as well as from enemies abroad. The final message: Question anyone who becomes intoxicated with political power and especially those who try to diminish the free expression of alternative political opinions.

*Advise and Consent* (1962). This film was based on Allen Drury's bestselling 1959 novel of the same name. Both the novel and the film capture U.S. senators at work, sometimes collaborating and sometimes undermining one another. Although the film captures intrigue and skullduggery, it also suggests most of the senators are decent hardworking representatives of their home states.

The heart of the film is a heated confirmation hearing that results in the rejection of a presidential nominee for secretary of state. The film teaches that politics can be incredibly personal and that friendliness and civility can count for as much, if not more than, partisanship or ideology. The film gives us some good politicians yet it also reinforces negative stereotypes about politics. The nominee for secretary of state lies to Congress. The president and a Supreme Court justice engage in dirty tricks. One senator takes actions that are downright despicable.

*The Last Hurrah* (1958). John Ford directs Spencer Tracy in this nostalgic elegy to an over-the-hill mayor and his out-of-date political machine. The mayor is sympathetically depicted as helping his ethnic class and the underdogs of a city that looks like Boston. The film is a faithful portrait of urban and ethnic politics in the 1950s. It may be both

---

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

oversimplified and sentimental, yet it captures a style of politics that flourished in countless cities across America in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Spencer Tracy gives a great performance as he takes on electronic-age rivals who work to replace old-style ward politics with slick TV commercials.

*Bob Roberts* (1992). Actor Tim Robbins directed and played the lead in this mockumentary of a cynical mudslinging maverick evangelical conservative. In a campaign for a U.S. senate seat, the candidate exploits all the new technologies of modern-era politics. The candidate is ingratiating and celebrates family values and nationalism as he crusades around his state singing *This Land was Made for You and Me* and *Times are Changin' Back*.

The candidate is depicted as a self-made libertarian multimillionaire yet his sketchy background is littered with suspicious financial dealings. He is a crafty, sleazy and politically savvy politician who preaches meaningless rhetoric and propaganda. He cleverly accuses journalists of “abusing their responsibility” when they ask probing questions. This 1992 film sounds very familiar in 2018.

This film won great accolades from critics but was a box office dud. It is an irreverent entertaining yet not quite great movie.

Our longer list of great political films includes: *Dr. Strangelove*; *Wag the Dog*; *The Best Man*; *The American President*; *Gabriel Over the White House*; *The Farmer's Daughter*; and *The Ninth Wave*.

Hollywood films reflect our skepticism about politics and politicians, yet we believe films excessively disparage politics and too relentlessly present it as an evil craft, best avoided by decent people.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have each taught American Politics courses for more than 50 years. Between them, they have authored, coauthored, or edited more than 20 books.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
2-24-2019

**MAKING BLACK HISTORY  
ON CAPITOL HILL IN THE 1960s**

By Bob Loevy

February is Black History Month. Before the month ends, let's celebrate one of the great heroes of African-American history. He is Clarence Mitchell, Jr., the Washington lobbyist for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) during the 1960s.

That was the period when Congress enacted both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the two national laws that were the legislative fruit of the Civil Rights Movement. Martin Luther King, Jr., led the demonstrations and protests that got the Civil Rights Movement rolling, but it was Clarence Mitchell, Jr., who, as a skilled Washington lobbyist, turned all that Civil Rights momentum into workable and durable civil rights legislation.

Mitchell, a resident of nearby Baltimore, Md., was an old Washington hand. In the early 1940s he worked for labor union reform under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Middle-aged by the 1960s, he was a familiar figure on Capitol Hill lobbying strenuously for civil rights. He spent so much time with U.S. senators and representatives that he was nicknamed "the 101<sup>st</sup> senator."

In the summer of 1963, following the well-known civil rights demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama, a strong civil rights bill was sent to Congress by President John F. Kennedy. The bill was first considered in the House of Representatives, where pro-racial segregation and anti-civil rights Southern Democrats were working hard to weaken it with crippling amendments.

Clarence Mitchell sensed a problem. The Democratic Party whip system in the House was controlled by Southerners, who were not about to deliver Northern and Western Democrats to the floor to vote down amendments supporting racial segregation. In this situation, Mitchell realized, Southern inspired amendments weakening the bill were likely to be passed in the House and thereby harm the effectiveness of the resulting law.

To correct this situation, Mitchell developed a “gallery watchers-office visitors” system. Activist volunteers in the NAACP branches throughout the nation were called to Washington to help out. Half were assigned to be gallery watchers. They would sit in a seat in the House gallery and watch to make certain their assigned civil rights supporting representative was on the House floor and voting down any crippling amendments. The gallery watchers had to work by memory, because notetaking or any other form of writing was not allowed in the House gallery.

If a gallery watcher noticed that one of the representatives he or she was to watch was away from the House floor, a telephone call would be placed to one of Clarence Mitchell’s office visitors. An immediate visit would be made to the “truant” representative to urge her or him to get down to the House chamber and vote for civil rights when needed.

Suddenly the anti-civil rights Southerners began to notice that the galleries were full of people, many of them African-American, and that all the pro-civil rights representatives were on the House floor when needed. A Southern-Democratic house member from Florida later remarked that the civil rights bill would have never passed the House without all those “watchers” in the galleries.

President Kennedy had been assassinated while the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was before the House of Representatives. His successor, Lyndon Johnson, called on Congress to pass the 1964 act in Kennedy’s memory. Johnson was well aware of Mitchell’s efforts in behalf of the bill. The day it passed the House, President Johnson telephoned Mitchell from the White

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

House and told him, “We’ve got it through the House, and now we’ve got the big job of getting it through the Senate!”

A big job? President Johnson was referring to the filibuster, the process by which just a few U.S. senators, by talking endlessly about proposed legislation, could “talk it to death.” Most previous civil rights bills, after passing the House, had been killed in the Senate by a filibuster by the Southern Democrats.

The filibuster began in March of 1964. The Southerners droned and drawled until it was almost June of 1964. The only way to stop a filibuster was to get a cloture vote – a 2/3 vote of the 100 senators, or 67 votes. A large coalition of Republicans and Northern and Western Democrats would have to be assembled to gain such a large vote in the Senate and cloture the filibuster.

As chief lobbyist for the civil rights bill, Clarence Mitchell had to get those 67 votes but without making any deals that weakened the bill. He set to work to simultaneously get the votes but not give away any essential civil rights provisions of the bill. The following exchange between Mitchell and Hubert Humphrey, the Democratic floor leader for the bill in the Senate, illustrates Mitchell at his lobbying best;

MITCHELL: There has been an incredible reversal. Is our side caving in? It is unfair to cave in.

HUMPHREY: We are going to talk about cloture. We have to plan to pass the bill. We don’t have 67 votes for cloture.

MITCHELL: You are shooting your friends if you trade (provisions of the bill for cloture votes).

In the end, Mitchell prevailed. Without substantially weakening the bill, the needed votes were secured for cloture, the Senate debate ended, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was signed into law by Lyndon Johnson.

The new law ended racial segregation in all places of public access, such as restaurants, hotels, motels, swimming pools, and hospitals. It provided for the cut-off of public funds for those businesses or governments

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

that continued to discriminate, and it provided for equal employment opportunity without regard to race, religion or national origin.

One year later, in the spring and summer of 1965, Clarence Mitchell went through the same process with voting rights. Following demonstrations in Selma, Alabama, led by Martin Luther King, Jr., Mitchell guided to enactment the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which also had to be gotten past a Senate filibuster with a cloture vote.

Here's to Clarence Mitchell, Jr. His life personified Black History in the United States.

*Colorado College political scientist Bob Loevy was a Senate aide in 1964-65. He attended a number of meetings with Clarence Mitchell, Jr., to make civil rights strategy.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**3-3-2019**

**MAKE COLORADO COLLEGE’S ROBSON ARENA  
ARCHITECTURALLY COMPATIBLE**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado College has held public meetings inviting public comments on the proposed new Edward J. Robson Arena. This would be located at the northwest corner of N. Nevada Avenue and E. Dale Street.

The most recent meeting was supposed to focus on architectural design issues yet parking issues dominated public commentary. Parking matters deserve attention and answers. But so do architectural concerns – especially because some of the recent buildings added to the campus have disappointed many people.

The Robson Arena will house Colorado College’s “Tigers” men’s ice hockey program, and the team will play its home games there. Local ice hockey leagues and college intramural contests would also use this space. The U.S. Olympic Center would also schedule various competition and exhibition events in this 3,000 to 3,500 seat venue.

Colorado College has three main themes in its architectural history. The first theme is “Stone.” From the College’s founding in 1874 until the early 1930s, all of the major buildings were constructed of stone. Palmer Hall, a cherished classroom building constructed of pink peachblow sandstone, and Bemis Hall, a residence hall built of grey stone, are two good examples of this era, as are historical Cutler Hall (Admissions) and Shove Chapel.

Seven stone buildings remain on the campus, all showing the love of decoration and detail that characterized major buildings in the Victorian era.



---

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Building stopped at Colorado College in the 1930s due to the financial impact of the Great Depression followed by the mobilization of the campus to help win World War II. When construction of new campus buildings began in the 1950s, Colorado College entered its “Brick” period. New dormitories, such as South, Loomis, and Mathias halls, were done in routine and efficient red brick, as was a new science building, Olin Hall; the decidedly non-descript classroom building, Armstrong Hall; and a new athletic facility, El Pomar Center. The brick theme continued into the late 20<sup>th</sup> century with Worner Center, a dining hall and student union building.

The brick buildings were boxier and more “form follows function” than their highly decorated stone predecessors, but taken together were attractive if not distinctive. The newer brick buildings were scattered about the campus among the older stone buildings. The two different architectural styles, stone Victorian and red brick functionalism, looked reasonably good together.

The third architectural theme at Colorado College is “Victorian homes.” In the late 1930s and 1940s, when student enrollment at Colorado College began growing, the College began buying the large Victorian residences in the blocks immediately adjacent to the campus. Some of these attractive homes were torn down to make way for new buildings, but more than 50 have been kept by the College and restored or preserved. They have been repurposed as student residences, auxiliary offices, and theme houses.

We encourage the architects for the new Edward J. Robson Arena to keep this architectural history of Colorado College in mind when designing the new building. A 1993 survey of the campus concluded that 76 percent of the buildings at CC were “historically significant.” In a letter, History Colorado, the state historical society in Denver, called Colorado College “the poster child for institutional historic preservation in Colorado.”

We think the material for the exterior of the ice arena will be important. We would prefer stone or brick – or ideally a stone and brick combination, thus relating the building to the two main architectural themes in CC history. We hope the building walls do not resemble some of the

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

recent major buildings at the College, which are faced in part with cinderblocks and metal and other materials that have no relationship to the older buildings on campus.

And please pay attention to the inside of the new Robson Arena. Avoid large, joyless, cavernous, dark, and largely purposeless spaces.

We also think it is important that this new building will sit on the south side of the campus, immediately adjacent to what is known as the Near North End. This small neighborhood of Victorian homes and small businesses fills the two block long gap between the southern boundary of CC and the northern boundary of downtown.

Not only are the private homes in this area decidedly Victorian, but the public buildings have historic character as well. Among these historic public buildings to the south of the new arena are the Unitarian Church, the Congregational Church, and Grace Episcopal Church. The arena should be designed to fit well with its south side neighbors as well as the CC campus.

The Edward J. Robson ice arena will not be sitting by itself in the middle of big grassy lawn in a newly developing office park. It will be located on a college campus that has won awards for its efforts at historic preservation. It will sit next to a neighborhood of historic Victorian homes. Please provide it with appropriate historical architecture and design.

We thank Colorado College for asking for public input on the architecture and design of the new Robson Arena.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are retired political scientists (not architects) at Colorado College.*

**Colorado Springs Gazette**  
**3-10-2019**

## **OIL AND GAS AGAIN DIVIDE US**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado has always been a state where natural resources and energy issues are paramount – and this will always be the case. The energy industry is among the most consequential political forces in Colorado. But Coloradans are also conservationists, love the great outdoors and lean in an environmentalist direction.

These realities occasionally collide. They did last year when a controversial oil and gas drilling setback measure, Proposition 112, was defeated by the voters by a 55 to 45 percent vote.

The energy industry argued that a statewide regulation calling for a 2,500 foot setback from schools, homes and water sources would devastate Colorado's robust energy industry and cost tens of thousands of jobs.

Environmentalists and their allies pointed to drilling related explosions and deaths in Firestone, Colorado, as well as evacuations from local schools during drilling health emergencies. These critics claimed Colorado had a too loosely regulated extraction industry.

Leading Democrats, including then Governor John Hickenlooper and current Governor Jared Polis, opposed Proposition 112 as going too far in restricting energy development.

The energy industry and its friends spent a ton of money to defeat Proposition 112. Advocates for Proposition 112 had very limited funding.

Only 14 of Colorado's 64 counties voted to increase setbacks for oil and gas drilling. Eleven of those 14, however, were low population counties on the Western Slope that are destinations for skiing and other forms of mountain recreation. For instance, Eagle County (Vail ski area) voted 59.8

percent Yes, Pitkin County (Aspen ski areas) chalked up 71.9 percent Yes, and San Miguel County (Telluride ski area) had the highest Yes vote in the state at 74.5 percent.

Of the 11 counties on Colorado's heavily populated Front Range, only 3 voted for keeping oil and gas drilling sites further away from homes. Boulder County, home to some of the most hotly protested drilling sites, cast a 70.7 percent Yes vote. Nearby Broomfield County went Yes by 55.2 percent. The third Front Range county to support increasing drilling setbacks was Denver, at 59.0 percent Yes.

And that was it. Colorado's 50 other counties, including 8 on the Front Range, went against enlarging setbacks. These voting No counties included most of the Denver suburbs, the Pike's Peak region, and almost all of rural Colorado that is engaged in farming, ranching, and mining.

Much of the conflict between homes and oil and gas drilling sites is centered in the area north of Denver. Two of those north of Denver counties, Larimer County and Adams County, voted No – Larimer at 53.1 percent No and Adams at 58.9 percent No. With all of the drilling activity nearby, one might have expected those two counties would be more favorable to increased setbacks.

As in many Colorado elections in recent years, two populous counties in the Denver suburbs, Jefferson and Arapahoe counties, played major roles in the defeat of enlarged setbacks. Arapahoe County went 55.0 percent No, and Jefferson County hit 57.2 percent No. These two are among the more highly educated and upper income counties in Colorado, areas where one might expect to see more support for limiting energy industries to aid the environment.

Colorado Springs and Pueblo, located far away from most of the active drilling in Colorado, were solidly against increasing drilling setbacks. El Paso County was 59.6 percent No, Teller County was 62.8 percent No, and Pueblo County was 61.6 percent No.

The farming, ranching, and mining counties on both the Eastern Plains and the Western Slope, were solidly against favoring the environment over

energy. Many of these counties went more than 80 percent No. The 998 voters in Cheyenne County, way out on the Eastern Plains at the Kansas border, voted 90.3 percent No. You hardly ever see a Colorado county voting 90 percent against something, but this happened.

The defeat of Proposition 112 was a temporary victory for the energy industry. And now, just four months later, the same issue has resurfaced in the form of Senate Bill 181. This bill would do a variety of things, but it would most noticeably give to local city and county governments the right to regulate the location and safety standards of drilling sites.

Energy industry advocates are calling this legislation just as bad, if not worse, than the statewide initiative that was defeated last November. They criticize Democratic legislators for not listening to the verdict of the voters.

Coloradans like local government more than they do state government. But the energy industry much prefers the state Oil and Gas Commission's regulations to those they fear would be developed in places like Boulder and Broomfield counties.

Prominent Democrat Ken Salazar, former U.S. Secretary of the Interior, surprised some people when he said Senate Bill 181 goes too far and would hurt Colorado's economy and our national security. Salazar makes most of his money these days as an attorney for energy related companies – but he is still one of the most respected Democrats in this state.

Coloradans are split on energy issues just as Americans are on the Green New Deal. We want Colorado's economy to boom not bust, yet we want to preserve our environment and promote the safety and security of our neighborhoods.

This legislation will be among the most hotly debated in this year's legislative session. There will be pressure on Governor Polis to work out some sort of compromise on these issues, but he will face enormous pressure from strident advocates on both sides.

This is partly a Democratic vs. Republican issue. It is also partly a generational issue. It is much more divisive in a handful of state counties

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

where drilling is prevalent. It is a complicated issue, and Colorado will contend with it for years to come.

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

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
3-17-2019

**WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH  
AND COLORADO COLLEGE**

By Bob Loevy

March is Women's History Month. Let's take a look at the historical role of women at Colorado College, the national liberal arts college located in Colorado Springs.

Young Florence Haskell, age 14, was the first woman in the college story, and without her Colorado College would not exist. Florence suffered from tuberculosis. She and her father, Thomas N. Haskell, a Congregational minister, were searching for a college for her to attend located at a high elevation so the clear, dry air could help cure her illness. Alas, no such college or university existed, so they decided to found a new one in Colorado.

Sadly, Florence passed away from her lung ailment. Her father decided to found a college at high elevation anyway, in his daughter's "marvelous memory," and General William J. Palmer, the founder of Colorado Springs, convinced Haskell to locate it in this city.

Naturally a college in Florence's memory would have to admit women as well as men, so Colorado College was coeducational from the first minute of its founding. Haskell called for it to be open to "both sexes and all races."

Women were on the faculty from the very beginning. Miss Minna Knapp, of Germany, taught German and Music. Miss Mary S. MacKenzie and Miss Emma Bump also were teaching. Miss Eloise Wickard was the first woman to be awarded a professorship. It was in English Literature.

In the first 35 years of its existence, Colorado College built one men's residence hall and four residence halls for women. All four of the women's

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

residence halls were named for women who had helped to raise the money to pay for them. The women's residence halls included dining rooms, recreation and exercise rooms, and first-floor lounges where women could receive "gentlemen callers."

The men students lived in the one men's dormitory and in fraternity houses.

Colorado College graduated its first men students in 1882. Thirteen years later, in 1895, Nettie Carey and Elizabeth Powell became the first two women to graduate. Student enrollment at the college at that time was less than 200 students.

In the early 1890s, a women's advocacy group was founded in Colorado Springs to advance the particular interests of the women students at Colorado College. Faculty wives and prominent women in the social life of the city comprised the Women's Educational Society (WES). It raised money for scholarships for women students and supplied furniture and other utensils for the women's residence halls. The WES has existed for more than a century and is still going strong.

In the summer of 1893 Colorado College invited a woman professor of English at Wellesley College to come out west and teach summer session. Following a wagon ride to the top of Pike's Peak, Katharine Lee Bates wrote the words to the famous national song, "America the Beautiful."

The first non-teaching administrator appointed at Colorado College was a woman. Ruth Loomis came from Vassar College in New York state to serve as dean of women. She was famous for setting moral standards and stressing social etiquette that "maintained a college for women in a coeducational institution."

In 1906 the Student Government Association for Women Students was founded. This group was elected by the women students and enabled them to participate in the making of the rules under which they lived in the dormitories and conducted their social lives. It gave the young women the opportunity to run and serve in elected office without having to compete with men, which was considered an important value at that time.



---

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

The men students were forming literary and debating societies in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The women followed suit with their own such societies, which had names like Minerva, Hypatia, and Contemporary. The women's literary societies soon added social life to their calendars, hosting dances and picnics and putting on plays and musicals. In the 1930s the women's literary societies were transformed into sororities. Unlike with men's fraternities, women were not allowed to live in their sorority houses.

The Roaring '20s left their mark on Colorado College. Shorter skirts, bobbed hair, and long strings of pearls came into fashion for the women students, who revolted against outdated social rules such as the one that forbade men to visit women in the dormitories on Sundays. Jazz and dancing the Charleston were all part of the newly liberated, for the time, scene.

A treasured tradition at Colorado College was the Sunday serenade. On Sunday nights, just at the time the women students were required to be back in their residence halls, the men students would gather in the quadrangle formed by the four women's dormitories and sing and dance for the women. Bands played and firecrackers went off as various groups of men students worked hard to provide the best entertainment. The women students took it all in, cheering and clapping from the windows and porches of their residence halls.

The first woman with a Ph.D. degree to teach at Colorado College was Leila C. Spaulding, who taught Classics from 1911 to 1914. She received her Ph.D. from Columbia University and previously taught at Vassar and Bryn Mawr colleges.

The first woman to make a full career of teaching at Colorado College was Edith Bramhall, who received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Pennsylvania. She taught at Colorado College from 1920 to 1946. An adventuresome woman, she served in France during World War I as a nurse's assistant. She was the first woman ever elected to the Colorado Springs City Council, and she was an early and outspoken supporter of the United States getting into World War II to stop Adolph Hitler.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

During World War II, the women of Colorado College did their share for the war effort by planting a large Victory Garden (vegetable garden) in the quadrangle in front of Palmer Hall.

The late 1940s to the 1990s produced the Colorado College that we know today. Men and women students were allowed to dine together and live in co-educational dormitories. There were expanded sports opportunities for women and a Division I women's soccer team. There were increased numbers of women on the faculty and in the student body. In 1993 the first woman was inaugurated as president of Colorado College.

*Bob Loevy is the author of three books on the history of Colorado College.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**6-23-2019**

**HELEN HUNT JACKSON'S "RAMONA"  
EXPOSED FRONTIER'S RACIAL INJUSTICE**

By Thomas E. Cronin

Helen Fiske Hunt Jackson moved to Colorado in 1873. She came hoping the dry, high altitude would bring relief for her throat and bronchitis ailments — and she found the air and climate here helpful and delightful.

She had earned considerable acclaim for her poetry and journalism. She had lost her first husband, Edward Hunt. Hunt, a West Point-educated engineer, died in an accident during the Civil War.

She settled in downtown Colorado Springs, then a fledgling frontier village, continued to write, and married a local Republican entrepreneur, William S. Jackson. She had met and fallen in love with Jackson while they were boarding at the first hotel in Colorado Springs, aptly known as the Colorado Springs Hotel, on Cascade Avenue. She scorned politics and was happy when her second husband failed in his bid to become one of Colorado's first U.S. senators. He was a young business associate of Gen. William Palmer and became a leading banker and businessman here, as well as a four-decade trustee at Colorado College.

After they married in late 1875, the Jacksons lived for the next decade at 228 East Kiowa St. (on the corner with Weber) in one of the town's nicest three-story houses.

Helen Hunt Jackson soon found a political cause that led her to write both a scathing nonfiction policy tract and "Ramona," a bestselling politically

themed novel. Her cause was the plight of Native Americans and how they were mistreated by her fellow Caucasians.

Her nonfiction “A Century of Dishonor” (1881) held that “so long as there remains in our frontier one square mile of land occupied by a weak and helpless owner, there will be a strong and unscrupulous frontiersman ready to seize it, and a weak and unscrupulous politician, who can be hired for a vote, or for money to back him.” It was a strident call, aimed at educating Americans about broken promises, questionable confiscations of tribal lands and hypocrisy.

Jackson sent a copy of this work, at her own expense, to members of Congress and leading clergy. While her book was reviewed favorably, she was also dismissed as a preachy amateur historian.

She decided to follow the example of Harriet Beecher Stowe, and conceived and wrote a sentimental romance novel, to make her case anew and try to reach a wider audience.

Jackson’s novel, “Ramona,” is a prime example of an observation George Orwell once made about effective writers. Writing a book, he said, is a horrible, exhausting struggle, a lot like a long bout of some painful illness. “One would never undertake such a thing if one were not driven on by some demon whom one can neither resist nor understand.”

Helen Hunt Jackson said she “didn’t write ‘Ramona,’ it was written through me.”

Her demon was the prejudice and injustice she saw around the West.

She poured all her energy and “lifeblood” into this novel — and died the next year.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Coloradans who haven't read "Ramona," should. It was inspired by what Jackson saw as she traveled around Colorado and California. She visited the site of the Sand Creek Massacre in southwestern Colorado and had toured many of the mining towns in Colorado.

The novel is set in Southern California. Its endearing heroine, Ramona, is a beautiful young mixed-race orphan who falls in love with a manly, handsome young Indian named Alessandro Assis.

Jackson's stoic and heroic Alessandro is a stand-in for countless Native Americans who had been removed from their lands by the Manifest Destiny policies.

Alessandro, despite being in love with Ramona, knows that life with him and his fellow Indians will be one of poverty, struggle and frustration. He warns they could be treated as if they were animals, or beasts. "But I, too, am an Indian," Ramona protests, adding she would rather die than be left behind by her lover. "Oh, Alessandro, take me with you."

Their love is wondrously rich. Forced to elope, they forsake the hacienda haven where Ramona had been adopted. They try to forge their own path as Indians. And their life is miserable.

Jackson's novel beguiles us with a seductive love story, yet it is set in a larger context of heartless injustice and inhumane practices.

Jackson criticized her fellow citizens who assumed the superiority of their Anglo race.

Her contemporaries worshipped a white, primarily Anglo-Saxon Protestant god and thought of Native Americans as inferior, lazy, treacherous — "not like us."

Jackson became a fearless reformer and an undaunted contrarian.

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

Critics called her novel sentimental and faulted it for its one-sided idealizations. Her romantic duo is indeed so admirable, so physically and spiritually attractive, they might make even a Hollywood scriptwriter blush. Yet, there have been several film adaptations of her book, starring Mary Pickford and Loretta Young.

Colorado's Helen Hunt Jackson was a storyteller with a message, a novelist with a purpose and a writer who used her talents to celebrate inclusiveness, fairness, humanity and equal justice for all. (A splendid exhibit of Helen Hunt Jackson memorabilia and rooms from her house are well maintained on the third floor of the Colorado Springs Pioneer Museum — and a collection of her papers and writings are also open to the public at Tutt Library's Special Collections at Colorado College.)

“Ramona” stands with “Uncle Tom’s Cabin,” “The Jungle,” “The Grapes of Wrath,” and “Beloved” as a reminder of the kind of republic most Americans yearn it still might become.

*Tom Cronin is president emeritus of Whitman College and professor emeritus at Colorado College.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**3-30-2019**

**TWO GOVERNORS, TWO MISSIONS:  
HICK, POLIS VISIT THE SPRINGS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado Springs hosted both Colorado’s 42<sup>nd</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> governors at separate events a week or so ago.

Former Governor John Hickenlooper, a current U.S. presidential candidate, came to raise money for his slow-to-catch-fire bid for the Democratic Party’s 2020 presidential nomination. He gave a pleasing talk and answered questions at a modestly attended house party here.

He touted his strengths as a doer and pragmatist and cited how he helped boost the economic vitality of Denver when he was mayor – and Colorado’s economy while he was governor. His economic successes in Colorado give him a lot to brag about.

He also talked of his efforts to expand Medicaid (health care for lower income people) and in greatly lessening the rate of teenage pregnancies. Hickenlooper also claims credit for getting environmentalists and oil and gas industry folks together to find common ground, and for bringing suburban mayors to work collaboratively with Denver to strengthen the region’s economic and cultural assets.

Hickenlooper has a harder time talking about U.S. foreign policy. That he presided over the state’s National Guard and that he has been to a few international conferences does not allow him to speak with much authority on national security or foreign policy matters.

Meanwhile, on national television, Hickenlooper stumbled over some questions put to him by Joe Scarborough of MSNBC’s *Morning Joe* cable TV show. He was asked whether he considered himself a “capitalist” not

once but three times. Each time he ducked a direct answer and allowed he didn't like labels. Commentators were quick to conclude he did not want to alienate the loud, if small, socialist faction in the Democratic Party.

He made a mistake ducking and hedging on the capitalist question. Hickenlooper was a successful entrepreneurial capitalist who helped to create nearly 20 companies and a thousand jobs. He has every right to be both a Democrat and a capitalist. He needn't have been shy about that – and his entrepreneurial capabilities contributed very positively to his successes as mayor and governor.

Hickenlooper's biggest national exposure came on March 20 when he was the solo guest on an hour-long CNN *Town Hall* broadcast. He emphasized his various successes as governor – especially in job creation and low unemployment. His personable style came across well. Yet Hickenlooper fumbled interviewer Dana Bash's question on whether he would put a woman on his presidential ticket. He got around to saying "of course" he would, yet he seemed to whine when he charged that commentators never seemed to ask women candidates whether they would put a man on their ticket. Hickenlooper may have been asking a fair question, but it was neither appropriate nor politically correct. The *Town Hall* audience groaned.

Back in Colorado Springs, Governor Jared Polis gave an updated, upbeat version of his State of the State address to the local Chamber of Commerce.

Polis is less folksy but a more polished public speaker than Hickenlooper. He skillfully avoided divisive partisan issues such as oil and gas regulations pending in the legislature, gun regulations, the just adopted alternative to the Electoral College, or the Green New Deal being heralded by D.C. liberals. He spoke instead of his leadership in lowering health care costs and in providing more state money for full-day kindergarten. He boasted about the charter schools he has founded. He lauded his collaborative leadership efforts to strengthen the role of cybersecurity in the



Colorado Springs economy and to get the U.S Space Command permanently located in the Springs.

Polis during his 2018 gubernatorial campaign had “Independent” Bernie Sanders campaign for him in Boulder and Fort Collins. They drew large, admiring crowds. In Colorado Springs, however, Polis portrayed himself as a businessman and entrepreneur who cares about government efficiency and lowering taxes for individuals and small businesspeople. He supported issues business people care about, such as tackling the opioid crisis, upgrading I-25, and making Colorado inclusive for everyone. He spoke earnestly and directly, not in the dreamy and preachy Sanders style.

Our new governor adroitly celebrated Colorado Springs as “the City for Champions”. He introduced to the crowd by name all the local state legislators. He joked with the packed hall about Colorado Springs socialized public utilities (electric, gas, water and sewer). He then told of his efforts to work with the state’s private enterprise utilities to get cleaner air and bring about a sensible transition from coal-generated power to alternative energy sources.

Polis was surprisingly effective in sharing his policy vision for a bolder Colorado. He won a standing ovation from this large crowd at the Antlers Hotel. He even got an accolade from a well-known veteran El Paso County Republican who told us that “I’m not worried about Jared – it’s those liberals up there in the state legislature.”

Former Governor John Hickenlooper’s three weeks or so on national news and late night shows has helped to build his name recognition. He won some additional news this week for calling aspects of the Green New Deal too costly or unrealistic—thus reinforcing his centrist image as a “Chamber of Commerce Democrat.” But his inability to propose exciting new policies or project a charismatic narrative have left him in the shadows of the campaigns of such colorful youthful competitors as Beto O’Rourke, Kamala Harris and South Bend Mayor Pete Buttigieg.

Although an effective governor over the past eight years, Hickenlooper is having a tough time converting his state success to the

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

national stage. But he reminds supporters he was not given much of a chance when he first announced he was running for mayor of Denver. Keep in mind too that in Iowa and New Hampshire he will be competing with as many as fourteen other candidates—most of whom are to his left. Since these are plurality contests, he has a chance of coming in among the top three.

Polis is in his honeymoon period. He yearns to be a bipartisan governor for this decidedly purple state. Former Governor Roy Romer – both a Democrat and a businessman, could be his model. But Polis will be under heavy pressure from liberal Democrats at the state or national level that don't have his business and entrepreneurial experience and may not share his occasional libertarian sympathies.

Meanwhile, spotlights will be on both our recent and current governors over the next several months.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists and have written several books on state and national politics.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
4-6-2019

**MORE REGISTERED INDEPENDENT VOTERS  
DOESN'T TRANSLATE INTO LESS PARTISANSHIP**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado is one of many states that have more adults registered unaffiliated, or independent, than are registered in either of the two traditional parties – Democratic and Republican.

Alaska leads in this category with over 50 percent independents. Massachusetts and Rhode Island have close to exactly 50 percent. New Hampshire and New Jersey have about 42 percent registered independents. Colorado is next with about 38 percent (as of last year). Connecticut, Iowa and Maine come in close behind Colorado.

For the record, as of April 1, 2019, Colorado had 39.3 percent active registered unaffiliated voters, 31.1 percent active registered Democrats, and 29.6 percent active registered Republicans. In only about half of the 50 states are people asked to register their party affiliation. In the other half, independent voters are identified by polling.

Along with a number of other states, Colorado has gradually but steadily shifted toward independent affiliation over the past two generations. At the same time, Americans have developed more negative views of the two political parties, especially for what they believe is, for them, the opposition party. The general pattern in Colorado in recent years has been for the percentage of unaffiliated registered voters to go up, the percentage of Democratic registration to hold steady, and the percentage of Republican registration to go down.

Just who are these unaffiliated (independent) voters? Throughout the nation, about 40 percent now described themselves as independents while 31

percent say they are Democrats and 27 percent call themselves Republicans. Note these figures are right in line with the ones we just gave you for Colorado on April 1, 2019.

Scholars and analysts agree that about 75 percent of the so-called “independents” should more accurately be called “leaners.” When prodded, independents admit to regularly voting for one of the two major parties. How do we define a Democratic or Republican “leaner?” This is a voter who might deliberately register independent or unaffiliated and, in addition, might proudly call themselves an independent, yet they are more likely than not to vote for the same party election after election. This could be, for example, in three out of four presidential elections. Or they could vote for three quarters of the party’s ballot nominees over the course of a few state elections.

Some researchers find that maybe 10 percent of those calling themselves independent are so decidedly independent that they hopscotch between the two parties and have no loyalty to either.

Those who view themselves as independents include a diverse group. Surveys by the Pew Research Center and other show they are younger, less interested in politics, somewhat less informed, more moderate on ideological issues and more likely to listen to the appeals of third party candidates.

There also are studies that show unaffiliated voters are less likely to vote regularly. When they do vote, they make up their minds much closer to Election Day than do Democrats and Republicans. Independents also are turned off by the bickering and stalemates between the two major parties that prevent progress on issues such as building roads and highways and immigration reform.

Some of those who have shifted to unaffiliated in recent years have been turned off by media coverage of the two major parties that has party leaders coming across as strident, racist or socialist.

New independents include some former Democrats like Starbuck’s recently retired president Howard Schultz, who laments that “too many voices in the Democratic Party are going too far to the left.” He sees the

greatest threat as the soaring national debt. He said it is a threat more important than climate change or inequality. Then there are a few former Republicans who are embarrassed by President Donald Trump's softness toward Russia and other dictators and his low support for minority programs.

All of us know conservatives who no longer call themselves Republicans and social liberals who worry that the Democratic Party is promising far more in social welfare programs than it can pay for and deliver. The question is: Where can these unaffiliated people go politically? The answer is hard to provide.

The pollster Peter Hart says some of the appeal of describing oneself as independent is because we all like to believe we are our own free agent and that, like a good umpire, we call them as we see them – and are not prejudiced by special interests or political party ideology.

Are unaffiliated voters predominantly moderate in their politics? They are more likely to describe themselves as moderate but not in a marked way. There are plenty of moderates who consider themselves conservative or liberal. The key point is that being an unaffiliated and a moderate are not the same thing.

Here are a few of the realities about independents that need to be kept in mind as the 2020 presidential election approaches:

1. Those who call themselves independents do not have enough in common to develop a viable third party. Thus it will be very hard for Starbucks's former chief executive to unite those who call themselves independents and win the White House.
2. Most independents are only slightly disguised partisans. They may switch between parties more than other voters, yet they actually favor one party or the other with regularity.
3. Few independents win elections. Alaska had an independent governor recently and Maine has an independent U.S. senator and a handful of independent state legislators. Alaska, Vermont, and

New Hampshire have also been among the states electing independent state legislators.

4. Donald Trump's job approval ratings during his first two years were more polarized along party lines than any president in recent times. He has won consistently high approval from regular Republicans – at the 85 percent rate or higher. But his job ratings among independents are at 34 percent, according to Pew, and are lower than his two recent predecessors in the White House.
5. Independents are more aligned with Democrats on two social issues – same-sex marriage and the legalization of marijuana. Democrats favored gay marriage by 73 percent, as did 70 percent of independents. In contrast, just 40 percent of Republicans say they support same-sex marriage. Similarly, on marijuana, Democrats and independent voters support legalization by an identical 68 percent, while 51 percent of Republicans oppose it.
6. Moderates comprise the largest share of unaffiliated voters who do not lean to a particular party. But, as expected, independents who lean Republican have grown more conservative in recent years, and those who lean Democratic have grown more liberal.
7. Overall, there is a growing distance between the political parties. Democrats are more disapproving of Republicans than they used to be and vice versa. Back in 1994, for example, about a third of Americans had a favorable attitude toward both parties. That is down to a measly 12 percent.
8. Finally, there are few signs that our party divisiveness is likely to subside in the next few years. More and more people view political issues and government challenges through a partisan lens. We may be seeing an increase in registered unaffiliated voters and described independents, yet this should not be interpreted as a rise in moderates or a move toward some common ground in terms of political ideology.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

At least for the immediate future, we will have to live with the existing party system and some increased nastiness in partisan sniping. Those of us who are older will feel great nostalgia for Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and the recently deceased John McCain. These greats of the past seemed to bridge the partisan divide better than most of our current leaders.

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

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**4-14-2019**

**PROPOSED SPRINGS LAW CHALLENGES  
TRADITIONAL SINGLE-FAMILY ZONING**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

R-1 Single-Family Zoning has long been the gold standard for residential areas in Colorado Springs, both old and new. It is credited with creating strong neighborhoods, both close to downtown as well as in more distant housing developments. The ideal of one family living on one lot is believed to create, maintain and preserve great neighborhoods in which to live and raise children.

If you live in R1 Single-Family Zoning, and like it, you may not have it for long. The City Planning Commission approved unanimously and sent to the City Council for future citywide adoption a new law that, in effect, turns every R-1 Single-Family Zone into a de facto Two-Family zone.

It is called the Accessory Dwelling Unit, or ADU, law. It will permit every homeowner living in an R-1 Single Family Zone to build or install a second separate dwelling unit on their property. This dwelling unit can then be rented to strangers, thus potentially doubling the number of people living in what was previously a one-family area.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) come in two forms – detached units and integrated units. On R1 Single-Family lots with adequate space, detached ADUs can be built as separate residences in the back or side yard. According to drawings distributed by City Planning, these detached houses can be two stories high and also have room for a two-car garage. They look perfectly adequate to house a family of four.

Integrated ADUs are for homes with inadequate yard space for a second residence. In this instance, homeowners are allowed to add a second



story to the home or knock out a side or back wall and thereby create a separate dwelling unit that can be rented to others.

The proposed law requires that one of the two units created by adding an ADU to your property be owner-occupied. However, the law also says an ADU can be subdivided and sold as a separate residence to a new owner.

Of course moving large numbers of new people into the neighborhood means more automobiles. The ADU proposal calls for one off-street parking space to be provided by the homeowner for each new ADU. City Planning notes that these parking spaces can be provided in the front yards of houses in R-1 Single Family zones and specifies how much of the front lawn can be paved for such parking spaces.

If the Accessory Dwelling Unit law is enacted by City Council, there will be little neighborhood change at first. In the course of ten to 20 years, however, when many people in the neighborhood have constructed ADUs, the number of housing units in the neighborhood would almost double, the numbers of people living in the neighborhood would almost double, and the number of automobiles in the neighborhood would almost double. At full buildout there will be double density of both people and cars.

City Planning has arguments for encouraging every R-1 Single Family zone homeowner to add an ADU. It could be a place for parents to age in place. It could provide housing for dependent and disabled adult children. It could provide additional housing in both economically challenged neighborhoods and wealthy neighborhoods. It could house unemployed “boomerang children” who return home after college and graduate school. And it could give a “wealth building opportunity” to R-1 Single Family homeowners who would like the extra income from an in-house or backyard rental.

The proposed law also provides that you can build an ADU in your backyard, or add one to your present home, and take it commercial and rent it out as a Short Term Rental (AirBNB, etc.)

We support the goal of encouraging more affordable housing in Colorado Springs, yet we question some aspects of the proposed citywide

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

ADU program. People who paid extra to buy and live in R-1 Single Family zones may not be pleased to have an adjoining property suddenly have two residences rather than one. Others may feel the character of their neighborhood is being degraded as it slowly fills up with more and more backyard homes and paved front-yard parking spaces. Good zoning like R-1 Single Family zoning is thought to give permanence and value to a neighborhood and should not be casually done away with in a drive to enforce higher density living.

We also dislike the “one size fits all” approach of making every R-1 Single Family neighborhood in the city accept ADUs, both detached and integrated. Individual neighborhoods should be given a chance to take a vote to decide if they want ADU generated increases in population and automobile densities.

If you like your R-1 Single Family zoned neighborhood the way it is, and you want it to stay that way, you should let City Council know about it. On the other hand, if you want more affordable housing for all income groups – and do not mind making the trade-offs of higher population density and more automobiles in your neighborhood – you should let City Council know those views.

*Retired Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy both live in R-1 Single Family zones. Bob Loevy served on the City Planning Commission from 1972 to 1975.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
4-21-2019

**“SINGLE-SHOOTING” A HIDDEN REALITY  
IN AT-LARGE CITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS?**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

The 2019 Colorado Springs city elections are now in the record books. On April 2, John Suthers was easily reelected mayor and Tom Strang (reelected), Bill Murray (reelected), and Wayne Williams (elected) were chosen as the three at-large city councilpersons. It was an orderly election with a 37 percent turnout of eligible voters. The results were pretty much as many of us had expected.

So now is the time to ask an intriguing political process question. Were you asked by a candidate, or a candidate’s friend, to cast a “single-shot” for one of the at-large city council candidates? Or did you, all on your own, decide to cast just one vote for just one of the many at-large candidates and let the other two votes go uncast.

In other words, did you cast one vote for a candidate you really liked and wanted to see win, and then you let the other two votes go uncast?

We are only talking about the at-large city council election. The mayor’s race was a straight-up every voter has one vote and votes for one candidate type of election. There could have been a run-off if Mayor Suthers had received less than 50 percent of the vote. Then he would have had to run-off against the next highest finisher. But the popular Suthers got 73 percent of the vote, so there was no run-off.

At-large city council elections are another matter. Every voter in this race had three votes and could vote for three of the 11 candidates running. Most voters do the obvious thing – cast all three votes – but voters with

more “defined” political objectives are likely to single-shoot on just one preferred candidate.

Why single-shoot? The logic is simple. If you want your candidate to win, do not give your other two votes to candidates who, in the final tabulation, use those votes to beat your preferred candidate. You lose those two votes, true, but you gain giving your number one choice a better chance to win and get on City Council.

Single-shooting has little or no significance on an individual basis, but if practiced by large numbers of people it can have an impact on the election outcome. If entire church congregations, or civic clubs, or well-organized interest groups can be motivated to single-shoot on one candidate, it can make a real difference in who wins and who loses, particularly if the election is close.

All of this takes place out of public view. Requests to single-shoot for a certain candidate are usually passed around by word-of-mouth. But if 10 to 20 supporters of a candidate start talking up single-shooting within an organization, the word can get around fast. Because it is a mostly whispered person-to-person technique, it is difficult for political analysts to prove single-shooting is occurring.

A woman city councilperson several years ago made no attempt to hide her use of single-shots to get elected and reelected. She said her campaign technique was to speak mainly to women’s groups and have her close friends and supporters pass among the female audience asking for single shots for her. She claimed that, without single shots from women, she would have never been elected, let alone reelected.

Did single-shooting occur in this most recent at-large city council election? The best sign is 96,227 people voted in the mayor’s race. Every one if those voters had three votes to cast in the at-large city council race. Three times 96,227 is 288,681. Yet only a total of 255,944 votes were cast in the at-large council race, a difference of 32,737 less.

Some of those missing 32,737 votes were people who voted for mayor and did not bother to vote for at-large city council. We speculate, however,

that many of the lost votes were the result of intentional single-shooting. Some of it was done by individuals. On the other hand, we think most of the uncast votes were in response to single-shooting electoral campaigns.

We speculate that Wayne Williams, former Colorado secretary of state and former El Paso County clerk and recorder (among other things), came in a decisive first place (winning by over 16,000 votes) in part because he was the best known of everyone running for councilperson-at-large. But we also think friendly Republicans, along with his other fans, cast a single-shot for him. We cannot prove this yet believe it likely.

Most Colorado Springs voters accept the recent election results as valid and probably have no complaints about the election process. But there is one alternative process that could eliminate the single-shooter tendency and may encourage more direct policy debates between candidates. It is called “slotting.”

Instead of all the candidates for three seats running against each other in an unwieldy single election, there would be three separate elections for three “slotted” council seats. They would be slotted seat A, seat B, and seat C.

Candidates would pick just one of the three seats to run for, and then in turn would run only against the other candidates who picked that one race. Voters would still have three votes, but they would vote each one in a separate race. Since the three races would be different from one another, there would be no point in single-shooting and throwing your other two votes away.

This alternative system would not have changed the outcome of this year’s at-large city council elections. In addition to ending single-shooting, the case for considering the three-lane, or “slotting,” alternative is that it would have enriched the level of policy deliberations between candidates. Council candidates this year did differ on issues and certainly emphasized their different experiences and backgrounds. But they seldom confronted one another on policy matters – in part because every voter has three votes,

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

and you do not want to attack a candidate a voter is thinking of voting for along with you.

A final point. With slotted A, B, and C at-large city council races, there could be a run-off election in each of the three elections if no one candidate got 50 percent of the vote, exactly as is currently done in the mayoral election.

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

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
4-28-2019

**SPRINGS DISCRIMINATION?  
HOAS CAN AVOID PROPOSED DWELLING LAW**

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Outlying neighborhoods that are organized as state-registered HOAs (Home Owners Associations) will be able to stay R1-single-family if City Council adopts an ADU law for Colorado Springs, but older neighborhoods closer to downtown will be forced to change to de facto R2-two-family zoning whether they want to or not.

This will in effect create two unequal classes of neighborhoods in Colorado Springs. On the one hand, neighborhoods registered with the county clerk as legal HOAs will be able to amend their covenants to ban the construction of ADUs (second homes on single family lots). Older neighborhoods without HOAs, however, will have their single-family zoning automatically turned into two-family zoning the day the proposed ADU law takes effect.

ADU stands for Accessory Dwelling Unit. A proposed law for Colorado Springs provides that owners of single-family homes can build a second home in their back yard and either rent it out or subdivide it and sell it to strangers. The second home can be about one-half the size of the original home, but it can be two stories high and include a one-car garage. The second home will be adequate for a new family of four persons.

In those cases where there is inadequate room in the yard for a second house, the main home can be enlarged for a second family by putting on a second story, knocking out a side or back wall, or creating or enlarging the basement. Parking for the new residents can be provided in the front yard of the home and paved.

The ADU law was approved unanimously by the City Planning Commission on March 21 and referred to City Council for final passage. Council is scheduled to have a work session on the controversial proposal on May 13 and hold an initial public hearing and vote on May 28.

The Colorado Springs ADU law is the local version of a movement sweeping the nation called “densification.” The idea is to increase population densities in city neighborhoods so as to increase the number of housing units available for sale in the community. At the same time densification increases the population in a neighborhood, it simultaneously increases the number of automobiles and results in more traffic and congestion.

We think it is unfair to force a long-term doubling of population and automobiles in one set of neighborhoods and let an arbitrary group of other neighborhoods – those with legal HOAs – escape these requirements if they choose to do so. Single-family zoning, with its strict limits on the number of households and motor vehicles in a neighborhood, thereby is made available to one special group of homeowners yet not to others.

It has long been an axiom of sensible urban planning that single-family zoning, with lowered densities and lighter traffic, preserves city neighborhoods and makes them much less subject to urban blight.

Homeowners groups come in two forms. Most neighborhoods are organized on a volunteer basis and have no official legal status. Neighborhoods with such volunteer associations include the Old North End, Broadmoor, Skyway, the Mesa and Ivywild, to name just a few. It is in these neighborhoods that the proposed ADU law will go into full effect and will likely increase the numbers of people and automobiles.

But there is another kind of homeowners association, generally referred to as an HOA. These are created by state law and used by housing developers to provide services for new housing. HOAs have governing boards, and these boards are empowered under the new law to vote ADUs, both backyard and in-house, in or out of the neighborhood.



As the ADU portion of the densification movement has spread across the nation, it has generated supporters and opponents. Supporters hope the creation of all this new housing on existing single-family lots will relieve upward pressure on housing prices. They also claim that more citizens will ride mass transit if neighborhoods are forced to become more crowded.

Critics claim that ADUs will just make existing neighborhoods less pleasant to live in and thus will increase the movement of well-to-do citizens to the suburbs and start the process of neighborhood decay. Historic preservation supporters across America are particularly fearful that all those newly constructed and modified dwellings units in older neighborhoods will destroy their historic character.

One of the charms of Colorado Springs is its low population density and the large number of neighborhoods close to downtown that have, thanks to single-family zoning, remained highly desirable places to live. We think legalizing ADUs, with the increases in the density of people and automobiles, is a mistake. When neighborhoods close to downtown are a big success already, why change them.

Isn't it unfair to let one set of neighborhoods – legal HOAs – vote themselves out of the new densification law but leave all other neighborhoods subject to its onerous provisions? We believe every neighborhood in Colorado Springs should have the privilege, just as legal HOAs have, of deciding whether or not it wants to have Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) within its boundaries. City Council should craft a mechanism by which neighborhoods can organize, establish their boundaries, and outlaw ADUs within those boundaries.

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

**Not Used**  
**4-29-2019**

**UPSCALE WHITE DEMOCRATS  
LIKE SOCIALIST PROGRAMS,  
BUT WILL THEY PAY FOR THEM?**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Are the well-educated and well-to-do voters that now comprise a big part of the Democratic Party political coalition ready to pay for the big-spending ideas of the Democratic Party 2020 candidates for president of the United States?

It's an important question? It used to be, when most rich people were Republicans and most working class people were Democrats, an easy task for Democrats to propose super-expensive government programs like Medicare-for-all, college tuition-for-all, and forgive all college and university student loans. Democrats could argue wealthy Republicans would have to cough up the higher taxes to pay for such expansive – and expensive – giveaway programs.

It's not that way anymore. Over the past 50-years, a major component of well-educated and well-to-do voters have switched from Republican to Democratic, particularly if they are younger and live in large metropolitan areas on the East and West coasts. Along with minorities, principally African-Americans and Hispanics, they are a significant portion of the national Democratic Party electoral coalition.

We have nicknamed them the Democratic “wells,” as in well-educated and well-to-do.

With the Republicans now mainly a white working class party centered in the Midwest and the South, and no longer famous for having all the rich voters, it is these “wells” Democrats who are going to have to pay the higher income and property taxes to turn the 2020 Democratic

presidential candidate's lavish promises about Medicare, college tuition, and college loans into fiscal reality.

When it comes to income taxes, it is the wells that have higher incomes and will pay more under the U.S. progressive income tax rates (the rate is higher the richer you get). As for property taxes, the wells pay more as their expensive homes on expensive land close to big cities go up in assessed value, with increased property taxes automatically levied.

We know the wells like the Medicare-for-all, free college tuition, and forgive-all-college-loans reforms as ideas to vote for in a highly charged Democratic presidential primary. What we are wondering is whether they will like these programs once they see a realistic price tag (in the hundreds of billions of dollars) and realize they are the high earning and expensively housed taxpayers who will mainly have to pay for them at both the state and the national level.

We first observed the readiness of upscale white voters to join with minorities in voting Democratic during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. What was an early trend then is the reality of the Democratic Party electoral coalition now. It may seem strange that financially well-off whites share political goals with middle-income and lower-income minorities, but it is one of the truths of current American politics.

One can really see it in Colorado voting. Two of the wealthiest counties in the state, Boulder County (main campus of the University of Colorado) and Pitkin County (Aspen ski areas) are two of the most solidly Democratic counties. On the other hand, Denver, with the highest numbers of minority voters in the state, is also solidly Democratic. And Colorado's new Democratic governor, Jared Polis, is one of the wealthiest men in the state.

It is as though the Democrats have united both ends of our political society – the wells and the minorities – against the middle (Republicans).

Do not get the idea that we fault the large number of 2020 Democratic candidates for president who are running hard on Medicare-for-all, free college tuition-for-all, and forgive-all-student-loans. In a nominating system

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

where candidates compete in individual state primaries and caucuses, and there are more than 20 candidates, it makes perfect sense to direct your campaign to winning the active left-wing socialist-leaning voters who are most likely to vote in Democratic Party presidential primaries and caucuses.

With as many as 20 plus candidates in the race, it is mathematically possible to win a particular state's primary/caucus with only six to seven percent of the vote and thereby taking a giant step toward the 2020 Democratic Party presidential nomination.

The Republican equivalent of this is that, in Republican presidential primaries/caucuses, those who wish to win run as hard as possible to the far-right conservative point of view.

By its broadest definition, the word "woke" now means to be aware of economic, social, and racial injustice in the United States. The large number of well-educated and well-to-do white voters in the Democratic Party coalition are "woke" to the need for Medicare-for-all, free college tuition, and forgiveness of all college loans. The three reforms have become a group chant among almost all the 2020 Democratic candidates for president.

We want to know if the wells are ready to pay, as they must, the so far unrevealed high costs of being woke?

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

**Not Used**  
**4-30-2019**

**DIVIDED GOVERNMENT –  
DIVIDED POLITICAL PARTIES –  
DIVIDED AMERICANS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

“What do they do all day?” That is what a woman interviewed recently on TV asked. She was referring to the people in the U.S. Congress.

Most members of Congress spend a lot of time with their staffs doing constituent services. They also have multiple committee assignments and are expected to develop special expertise on at least certain policies, especially on issue of concern to their states and districts.

But, as everyone knows, most members of Congress now devote the equivalent of several hours a day raising money for their next election.

Even so-called “safe seat” members like Doug Lamborn in Colorado Springs and Diana DeGette from Denver face serious challenges in their own political party. President Trump’s disapproval rating hovers in the 52-53 percent range, but at least 60-70 percent disapprove of the performance of the U.S. Congress.

Politics in contemporary America is hard to explain. The U.S. economy has rarely been as strong. The stock market is soaring. Unemployment is wonderfully low. Colleges and universities are packed with students. Millions of people from elsewhere in the world want to come to the United States to study, work, and seek their version of the American Dream.

So why are so many Americans upset with their Congress, their president, and the direction the country is going? Put another way, why are so many Americans unhappy with what most of us grew up believing was a

pretty darn good if not ideal political system and a pretty good lightly regulated free-market economic system?

We cannot point to simple answers. Yes, there is unacceptable economic inequality. Yes, there is less economic mobility than most people would like. Yes, there are environmental challenges that are being inadequately addressed. Yes, there are fears about health care costs and drug epidemics. And, sadly, America has experienced senseless and tragic hate crimes in every region of the country and an alarming murder rate in many of our large cities. Meanwhile our national government is divided, and both of our political parties have noticeable splits and strains defining them.

President Donald Trump has a coalition of supporters that news media commentators mistakenly refer to as his “base” as if it is homogeneous. It is not. Money managers on Wall Street approve of his performance just as much as National Rifle Association (NRA) and anti-abortion folks do. Trump still wins approval, even if some of it is grudging, from 80-85 percent of the Republican base that favored Ronald Reagan and the two Bush presidents. Trump’s base crosses economic class lines and is a national base, even if it is more solid in the South and working class Middle West.

Still, Trump’s GOP is divided all kinds of ways. He may be its “bully” pulpit, but there are an increasing number of prominent Republicans who are displeased with his positions and his character. They include Maryland Republican Governor Larry Hogan, former Massachusetts GOP Governor Bill Weld, Maine Republican U.S. Senator Susan Collins, Alaska Republican U.S. Senator Lisa Murkowski, former Ohio Republican Governor John Kasich, and, on occasion, Utah Republican U.S. Senator Mitt Romney.

What are these dissident Republicans concerned about? They want tough sanctions on Russia. They want greater protection against other nations interfering in U.S. elections. They want more moral leadership on issues of equality and tolerance, and they want greater leadership on public policies such as infrastructure investment, lowering health costs, and higher education affordability. Most also want a strong affirmation of our

allegiance with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other allied countries. And, as constitutional conservatives, they want less reliance on expansionist executive privilege and dictums and more collaboration and negotiation with Congress.

The Democratic Party has a long history of being divided. The Civil War divided it. The Vietnam War divided it. It may not be as divided as it was during those two epochal periods, yet there are some clear strains that will make it difficult for the Democrats to unite for the 2020 presidential election.

Here are some of the Democrats' current divisions. Impeach Now vs. careful investigations of obstructions of justice by President Trump. Medicare for All vs. protecting the Affordable Care Act (Obama Care). Reparations for racial injustice vs. investing in promising economic development projects. Free college tuition vs. more scholarship aide to make a college education affordable to everyone.

The Democratic Party is a loose coalition of the well-educated professional class and minorities and environmental activists. But they are not rallying around a single candidate for president. In fact, there are two candidates each from Texas, California, Massachusetts, and Colorado among the twenty or so declared or semi-declared Democratic nomination aspirants.

The reality is that both parties are fragile coalitions. Leaders in both political parties lack a mandate for many of the policies they are pushing. Thus there is no mandate to build President Trump's wall along the Mexican border just as there is no mandate to impeach him at this time. And while there is a national yearning for lower health care costs, most of those with company health plans or private insurance are not keen on ending those relationships.

Democratic U.S. senators Bernie Sanders, Barbara Warren, and Cory Booker all seem to be championing redistributive income equity programs, while incremental types such as former Vice-President Joe Biden, U.S. Senator Amy Klobuchar, South Bend Mayor Pete Buttigieg, and former

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper are mostly not in on a socialist-sounding agenda.

We have divided political parties because Americans are divided on a host of issues. We are united on some issues such as a strong defense and clean air and water. We all favor peace and prosperity and a progressive taxation system. Most of us favor a strong Bill of Rights and a vibrant three-branch system of government (President, Congress, and Supreme Court).

But when it comes to policy details, we differ. And there are notable differences within as well as between our national political parties.

If you are the kind of person who would like tidy, clear-cut and unified political parties, you are going to be thoroughly disappointed for the near future.

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



*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**5-12-2019**

**PROPOSED LAW WILL PERMIT  
CHAIN HOTEL UNITS IN BACKYARDS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

It is a zoning problem that will soon happen to selected families living in some of Colorado Springs' many R-1 Single Family zoned neighborhoods. Mom, dad, and the kids will wake up to find a mini-Marriott, mini-Hilton, or mini-Hyatt hotel under construction in their next-door neighbor's backyard.

If the family is really unlucky, there might be a similar small mini-hotel project on the other side of their home and one or two across the street as well. Under a new law under consideration by City Council, there will be no limits on the number of small chain hotels that can be built in almost any R1-Single Family zoned neighborhood in Colorado Springs.

This grim future became reality for R1-Single Family homeowners when Marriott International announced recently that it is entering the new home-sharing and home-rental business to compete with AirBNB and similar internet companies. Colorado Springs City Council passed a law several months ago that legalized such Short Term Rentals (STRs) in R1-Single Family zones throughout the city. Council placed no limits on the number of these commercial small hotels/motels that can be opened and operated in what were previously exclusively residential areas.

With about 1.3 million hotel rooms available each night around the world, Marriott is the globe's largest hotel company. It will create a home-rental platform on its website and list rooms available in cities throughout the world. Guest staying in such Marriott facilities in Colorado Springs R1-Single Family zones will be able to redeem loyalty points and win free hotel

stays and other valuable gifts. The points would be good at Sheraton and Ritz-Carlton hotels as well.

This means for Colorado Springs homeowners that the Short Term Rental unit next door will not be controlled by a supposedly friendly neighbor but by a powerful and well-funded hotel chain with vast resources for promoting and filling the rooms each night with traveling strangers.

The Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) proposal currently under consideration by City Council will mandate the conversion of R1-Single Family zones into R2-Two Family zones. If the backyard of a home is large enough, it can be the site of a completely new house that can be rented or subdivided and sold to a separate family or person. The new home will have to be somewhat smaller than the original home on the property.

In those cases where there is insufficient land for a separate house on the lot, the original home can be expanded by adding a second story or knocking out a wall and creating a second dwelling unit that way. The city has stated firmly that all newly constructed ADUs can be rented or sold as Short Term Rentals and thus would be available to Marriott, Hilton, Hyatt, or any other powerful international hotel chain for their use.

The proposed ADU law sets no rules for the design or painting of these new housing units in R1-Single Family zones. The way we read the new law, the new units could be built to function like mini-hotels rather than private residences and be painted garish colors for advertising purposes.

The theory behind the proposed ADU law is called “densification.” It seeks at final build-out to double the population density in R1-Single Family neighborhoods by building new homes in backyards or in an expanded main dwelling unit. With the sharp increase in population will come an equally large increase in the number of automobiles, which ADU supporters hope will force more people to use mass transit rather than drive their own cars. The mini-hotels will bring additional automobiles into the neighborhood every night.

We think the combination of the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) law with the existing Short Term Rental (STR) law will make it

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

impossible to keep our Single Family neighborhoods free of commercial uses (mini-hotels) and apartment buildings. We worry that speculators will begin buying Single Family homes in Colorado Springs, expanding them into apartments under the ADU law, and then merchandising them as mini-hotels under the STR law.

R-1 Single Family zoning was designed to keep traditional families – parents with children – living near the downtown areas of cities. We believe it is the neighborhoods close to downtown that will attract the most ADU and STR activity, thus driving traditional families to relocate in the more distant parts of the city. We see Broadmoor, Ivywild, the Mesa, the Old North End, Patty Jewett, and Skyway as particularly vulnerable to the development of ADUs and STRs and thus most likely to lose traditional families to the suburbs.

There is only one form of relief. Families that live in legal HOAs can have their board of directors ban both Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Short Term Rentals (STRs). Most legal HOAs are in the outskirts of Colorado Springs far from downtown.

City Council has cancelled a “work session” on the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) law originally scheduled for tomorrow (Monday, May 13). There will be a public hearing on the proposed ADU law at an unspecified date in late May. Council is now scheduled to vote on the proposed ADU law in June.

If you want to maintain single-family zoning in your neighborhood and keep ADUs out, you should send an e-mail to the council members to tell them that.

*Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy both live in R1-Single Family zones.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*

**5-19-2019**

**COLORADO COLLEGE BIDS A FOND FAREWELL  
TO ITS “MISTER CHIPS”**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado College and Colorado Springs paid a fond farewell in a packed Shove Chapel to Professor William Russell Hochman (1921-2019). It was a beautiful spring day, Saturday, May 11, as nearly one thousand family, friends, fellow professors, former students and townspeople celebrated the life of one of the most effective, influential and popular teachers in the history of liberal education.

Bill Hochman died at age 97. He had been associated with Colorado College for 64 years – giving great lectures at the college and for local community groups right up to the end of his life. His service as an award-winning American History professor won him widespread acclaim.

He wanted his students to understand constitutional values and the importance of the rule of law. He called upon a few Socratic maxims, such as “laws are precious – they make civilized life possible,” and “an unexamined life is not worth living.”

“Above all,” Hochman would say, “I wanted to leave my students with a sense of humane values that would sustain them in their coming lives.”

He had come out of his U.S. Navy service during World War II with an abiding reverence for life. While he was a hard critic of many of our political leaders and a champion of peace, he emphasized he was not a pacifist and that there were grounds for hope. Giving up on politics, he held, was never an option. He explained:

“It seemed to me that what the students wanted to know, what they really needed to know, was how people actually lived in the past, how they

---

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

confronted crises, how they preserved decency and culture under sometimes dreadful circumstances, and how they experienced birth, joy, suffering and death.”

Most schools, colleges and universities have an iconic “Mr. Chips” character or two over the long haul. Bill Hochman loomed at Colorado College as a larger than life effervescent Mr. Chips character. The original Mr. Chips came in the form of the fictionalized Arthur Chipping in James Hilton’s inventive *Goodbye, Mr. Chips*, which was both a book and a celebrated movie.

Chipping was a warm-hearted classics professor at imaginary Brookfield School outside of London in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. He was a decent but not great teacher, a spectator not a military man, and was neither a family man nor a citizen activist. His longevity at Brookfield was a mere 63 years.

In contrast, Colorado College’s Bill Hochman fought for his country in North Africa, Sicily, Salerno, and in the Normandy invasion (D-Day). He was a great teacher, educator, and mentor and was a lifelong champion of both liberal arts learning and public schools. He also had a great love of life and an excellent sense of humor.

During the Reagan and Bush One presidencies, Democrat Bill Hochman and Republican Bob Loevy would publicly debate the major issues between their respective political parties. Hochman used to joke: “I always won the debates for the Democrats, but Bob Loevy’s Republicans kept winning all the presidential elections.”

Bill had a loving extended family of six children, eleven grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. Arthur Chipping had some modest headmaster responsibilities but Bill Hochman was always in the visible middle of whatever was going on at Colorado College. He was chair of the History Department for 17 years.

He was faculty marshal, presiding at graduations, for over a generation. He probably attended and spoke at more faculty meeting than any other professor in the history of the college. He was dean of the Summer

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Session and founding coach-manager and all-star pitcher for “Mind and Body,” the faculty-staff softball team. He was the number one requested Alumni Homecoming speaker for several decades.

Bill Hochman gave back to the community of Colorado Springs in dozens of ways. He accepted many invitations to speak at civic, military veteran, and bar association gatherings. He was always ready to debate issues such as arms control, and he joyfully defended Democratic candidates for office at election time.

He was a loyal member of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). He attended a number of Democratic National Conventions, and he worked for unsuccessful Democratic presidential candidates Eugene McCarthy in 1968 and George McGovern in 1972. In 1960 he met and shook hands with presidential candidate John F. Kennedy while wearing a Stevenson for President button.

For several years when 90-plus years old, he was a volunteer history and civics instructor at the Zebulon Pike Youth Detention Center. He was pleased to explain to his troubled, wayward, “captive” students such things as the importance of the Bill of Rights, due process of law, and the importance of the rule of law. He taught his Pike students about Clarence Gideon and the breakthrough Supreme Court decision granting defendants the right to counsel. He taught them about Miranda rights. Most important, he taught them about hope and the possibilities of turning their lives around.

He once wrote that the U.S. Bill of Rights was simultaneously a remarkable yet exceedingly fragile document. “It is never going to be fully defined,” he would note, “nor are most of its protections absolute.” He added that the people who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights “were the founders and dreamers of our free society, yet we must be nurturing guardians of what they accomplished, and our work will never be done.”

All of us who knew Bill Hochman understood he had his own definite opinions. As a New Yorker in his youth, he let us know that Franklin D. Roosevelt was his governor, then his president, and then his commander-in-

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

chief during World War II. In his view, Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt were the best presidents the U.S. has ever had. He said:

“At the end of my *Recent U.S. History* course, I would tell the students I did not care whether they became Democrats or Republicans, but I did hope they would be active participants in public life, with a sense of empathy and compassion for people less fortunate than they were. People who, but for the accident of birth and the Grace of God, might be themselves.”

“I see the faces of my students,” he wrote a few years ago. “There are thousands of them by now. I have had a lifelong love affair with all of them. Faculty who teach at a liberal arts college taste the Fountain of Youth that Ponce de Leon once sought in the Florida wilderness.”

Goodbye, Professor Bill Hochman. Thank you to naval officer Hochman, teacher Hochman, citizen Hochman.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy were colleagues of Bill Hochman for decades at Colorado College.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*

**5-26-2019**

**IS AREA “DENSIFICATION” COMING SOON?**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

“What is densification?” “What are these Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) all about?” “Why will they end Single-Family zoning in Colorado Springs?”

These questions come up regularly, mainly because Colorado Springs city officials have done a lame job of explaining the new ADU high-density housing program City Council is scheduled to consider and adopt on June 25.

Densification is a housing theory currently being legislated in California, mainly in the crowded San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas. Buildable open land is about exhausted in these two giant cities, thus there is a housing shortage. The California state legislature has responded by considering a law, Senate Bill 50, that allows the construction of apartment buildings in the backyards of homes zoned for Single-Family residency. This state law would override city and county zoning laws that require there be no apartment buildings or other commercial businesses built in Single-Family zones.

At full build out, when every Single-Family home has at least one apartment house behind it, the population of a neighborhood will be doubled, thus the name densification. In effect, every Single-Family zoned housing area in California could become a Two-Family zoned area. Along with the doubling of residents in a neighborhood could come an increase in the number of automobiles, thereby adding to neighborhood traffic congestion.

It is a policy trade-off. By crowding more people and automobiles into Single-Family zoned neighborhoods, the California government gains more



housing in the form of all those backyard apartments. The city and state collect more property tax. The traffic jams in the neighborhood are considered a plus because they will inspire people to ride commuter rail, a form of mass transit found in both San Francisco and Los Angeles.

According to the *New York Times*, backyard apartments in single-family zones are just the beginning of densification. California's proposed Senate Bill 50 "would allow four-unit apartment buildings – known as 'fourplexes' – throughout the state," including Single-Family areas.

"Holy cow! California may get rid of Single-Family zoning," was the way a recent *Los Angeles Times* headlined the story.

The Colorado Springs version of all this, which was referred by the Planning Commission to City Council, is called the ADU law. ADU stands for Accessory Dwelling Unit, although we think it might better be called Apartment Development Universal. We coined that phrase because the proposed law allows homeowners in almost all Single-Family zones to embark on the commercial venture of building a small apartment house in their back or side yard and renting it to another person or family.

Or they can build it as a small hotel/motel and list it with Airbnb or, in a while, Marriott.

And so this national debate over the purposeful densification of existing Single-Family zoned neighborhoods has come to Colorado Springs. Will the backyard apartment buildings allowed by the proposed ADU law be appropriate for our medium-sized city?

It's debatable, yet we think it is ill-advised. Unlike San Francisco and Los Angeles, there is still plenty of buildable land for housing in Colorado Springs. The city has, wisely in our opinion, annexed considerable land at the city periphery – particularly on the east side – and has it readily available for homes, apartments, mixed use, or any other form of housing the market calls for. Public money could be used to build affordable housing on these empty lands.

We also note that the automobile jams caused by densification are supposed to stimulate the use of commuter rail. San Fran and L.A. have

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

plenty of commuter rail, but Colorado Springs has none and no plans to build any. Have you, like us noticed the increased traffic on Academy Boulevard, I-25, and elsewhere? The densification created by the Colorado Springs ADU law would create traffic jams from which there would be little relief.

We worry about the individual homeowner who has bought a home in a Single-Family zoned neighborhood but, once City Council adopts this new ADU law, will be living in a Two-Family zone with apartment houses and mini-motels likely to go up soon. We regard Single-Family zoning as a pledge by city government to the homebuyer that the Single-Family zoning you have when you buy the home will be forever maintained. The ADU law breaks that pledge and forces the homebuyer turned homeowner into living in a de facto Two-Family zone filled with apartments and mini-motels.

This is a major issue for Colorado Springs. There are two different visions of the future of our city. One preserves our strong downtown-area neighborhoods – Broadmoor, Ivywild, the Mesa, Old North End, Patty Jewett, Skyway, etc. – as the strong Single-Family zoned neighborhoods they are now. The ADU law, on the other hand, will crowd them with more people and jam them with more automobiles. That is what densification does.

The ADU law is currently scheduled to come up for approval by City Council on June 25. It should be a heated discussion, because the stakes for Single-Family homeowners anywhere in the city are so high. If you do not want your Single-Family zoning compromised by the ADU law, then write, telephone, or e-mail City Council and tell them densification may be good for California but not for us.

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**6-2-2019**

## **VOTERS REGISTERING IN RECORD NUMBERS**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado is a state of immigration. Most Coloradans, likely, came from other states – usually the Midwest or East. But once they settle in for a while, Coloradans want to vote.

Exciting things are happening with voter registration in Colorado. The voter rolls are growing at a much faster rate than the population as a whole, probably as a result of increased efforts by the political parties and election officials to register new voters. In some of the more populous counties in Colorado along the Front Range, voter registration growth rates over the past nine years have exceeded 50 percent.

Start with El Paso County, which contains Colorado Springs. According to the most recent U.S. Census data on the internet, El Paso County's population grew by 14.7 percent from 2010 to 2018, but the rate of growth for active registered voters was 46.9 percent. Over 120,000 new voters joined the electorate in El Paso County during the period studied.

The voter increase in Denver was even greater. The population from 2010 to 2018 went up 19 percent, but the number of active registered voters increased 59.1 percent. That came out to more than 150,000 more active voters over a little less than a decade in the Mile High City.

The Secretary of State's office keeps track of both active and inactive voters in Colorado. Inactive voters are those who have missed voting in a number of elections. We prefer to base our calculations on active voter rolls, which are routinely scrubbed of the names of people who are not voting regularly.

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

For the state of Colorado, the population growth rate from April 1, 2010, to July 1, 2018, was 13.2 percent. The number of active voters statewide, however, during roughly the same period grew by 41.7 percent. That is a percentage point difference of 28.5 points. Colorado added more than 1 million new active voters in slightly more than eight years.

This increase in active voter registration was not spread evenly throughout the state. Most of the large increases in registration activity were concentrated in the heavily populated Front Range along I-25. Only seven counties grew active voters at a faster rate than the state rate of 41.7 percent. They were Adams (53.3%), Broomfield (54.0%), Denver (59.1), Douglas (47.1%), El Paso (46.9%), Larimer (42.6%), and Weld (56.7%).

Colorado's other 57 counties had active voter expansion rates that were less than the statewide rate of 41.7 percent. But scoring reasonably close behind the state average were three of the state's other populous counties – Arapahoe (37.8%), Boulder (33.3%), Jefferson (33.5%), and Pueblo (33.9%).

Note that, from 2010 to 2019, all counties in Colorado added new active voters, even those losing population.

We have two theories to explain these sizable increases in active registered voter when compared to the growth of the state's population.

One theory is avid recruitment of new voters by presidential candidates, mainly Democrats, at the time of presidential elections. Presidential campaign are hiring workers to pursue the so-called “ground game,” identifying potential voters, befriending them, and seeing that they register and vote. President Barack Obama's reelection campaign in 2012 was said to be particularly successful with this kind of voter recruitment.

A second explanation for all the new voters is Colorado's major expansion in the electoral participation opportunities of unaffiliated voters. Electoral reforms supported by both political parties have made it easier to register and have encouraged more people, including unaffiliated voters, to participate in all elections. Unaffiliateds now can vote in Democratic and

Republican Party primary elections as well as in Colorado's new presidential primary.

There have been constant improvements in voting and voter registration. Mail-in elections have improved voter turnout as well as the desire of newcomers to register to vote. Also for many years Colorado has had motor-voter – asking voters if they want to register to vote when they get a driver's license.

Note too the changes in political party registration from 2010 to 2019. In 2010 the Republican and Democratic parties and unaffiliated voters were almost evenly balanced – Republicans 35.3 percent, Democrats 33.7 percent, and unaffiliateds 31 percent. By 2019, however, both the Republicans and the Democrats had gone down and unaffiliateds had gone up. The 2019 percentages were unaffiliateds 39.3 percent, Democrats 31.1 percent, and Republicans 29.6 percent.

Unaffiliated voters increased 8.3 points while the Democrats decreased 2.6 points and the Republicans dropped 5.7 points. Both political parties in Colorado are losing their appeal to newly registering voters, the Republicans slightly more than Democrats.

The two major political parties in Colorado should take a warning from this situation. Apparently the strident partisanship and polarization of the two major parties are starting to drive newcomers to the voter rolls to be unaffiliated.

The long term impact of these new trends is hard to predict. It is still Democrats and Republicans who get elected to political office. Unaffiliated voters may be moderates, but it is party politicians who populate the state legislature, serve as governor, are elected to Congress, and occupy almost all county offices.

It is our guess that many of the younger newcomers to Denver and the Denver suburbs are inclined to register as unaffiliateds. Many are well-educated and have good jobs yet are not pleased by the “ideologues” in the two traditional political parties.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

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

**Colorado Springs Gazette**  
**6-10-2019**

**OPTION B ELIMINATES RENTAL UNITS FROM ADU**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

The Colorado Springs City Planning Department is circulating a revised proposal, called Option B, concerning ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units).

As we read this new legal language, Option B eliminates the proposed backyard rental houses in single-family zones that stirred so much earlier controversy. The revised city legislation, however, retains ADUs that are “integrated” into existing houses in single-family neighborhoods.

Meanwhile, City Planning still has available an Option A for City Council’s consideration that provides for both the backyard rental units and the integrated units in single-family zoning. City Council was originally scheduled to consider the proposed ADU law on June 25, but the city’s ADU website recently reported the date is to be determined.

Accessory Dwelling Units are part of a process called densification. Additional rental housing is hoped to be created by motivating home owners to turn part of their main dwelling into housing for a second family not related to them. The home owner is required to remain a resident in the main part of the home for at least six months of the year.

Such an integrated ADU must be connected to the main home by at least one doorway, but the door may be left locked most of the time.

If adopted by City Council, the revised Option B ADU law will still in effect turn all single-family zoning in Colorado Springs into two-family zoning, one family living in the main house and the second family occupying the integrated unit. The new Option B proposal eliminates,

however, an earlier plan to allow homeowners to build a separate structure in their backyard, called a “detached” ADU, to house a second family.

Critics of ADUs, both “integrated” and “detached,” are worried about the future increases in population density and automobile density that will occur with the widespread construction of ADUs in single-family zones. There is also the problem that families that bought single-family houses in single-family zones will have their zoning arbitrarily changed to two-family zoning.

The Planning Department is hoping the Option B proposal, by eliminating backyard rental units designed to look like the main home, will reduce the likelihood of major increases in population and automobile density. Doing away with the backyard rental units will also eliminate the possibility of these small apartment buildings being turned into mini-motels under the city’s recently adopted Short Term Rental (Airbnb) law.

Option B does not do away with the highly criticized provision of the original ADU law that permits legal HOAs (Homeowners’ Associations) in the outlying areas of the city to exempt themselves from the provisions of the revised law that call for integrated ADUs. It seems unfair to critics that legal HOAs can avoid the ADU law but older neighborhoods closer to downtown, such as Broadmoor, East Platte Avenue, Ivywild, the Mesa, the Old North End, Skyway, and the Westside, among others, are forced to allow integrated units in single-family areas.

The fear is that allowing ADUs in single-family zones will drive families out of the central city area and into the legal HOAs concentrated at the outer edges of the city, where ADUs can be banned.

In addition to eliminating backyard ADUs, Option B requires that building additions to houses to create integrated units should not change the exterior appearance of the home from the “front.” This provision of the revised law might better read “front and both sides” to keep new construction confined to the back of the home and completely invisible to the street.



***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

We believe that Option B, which bans backyard ADUs but allows integrated ADUs, is highly preferable to Option A, which allows both backyard and integrated ADUs. We still believe, however, that it is a bad idea to experiment with ADUs as a source of new rental housing in single-family Zoning, given that single-family zoning has created and preserved this city's strong residential neighborhoods, particularly those in the downtown region.

The mileposts on the road to urban blight are well documented. Single-family homes are broken up into apartments, thereby changing the neighborhood from single-family to multi-family. Shortly thereafter commercial development comes in, and the single-family character of the neighborhood is lost completely.

Do we really want to artificially start the process of neighborhood deterioration by intentionally introducing two-family occupancy into our strong single-family neighborhoods?

We compliment City Planning for offering Option B that removes the backyard rental units and keeps only the in-house apartments. It is surely better than Option A, which allows all forms of ADUs in our single-family zones. But, in the long run, we recommend that City Council keep all of our single-family zoning just that – all single-family.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy both live in single-family zones in the downtown region.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
6-15-2019

## HAPHAZARD PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING SYSTEM BEGINS WITH DEMOCRATIC DEBATE

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

In a week and a half, on June 26 and 27, the 2020 presidential election will begin in earnest. The Democratic Party will hold its first official two-night television debate between the party's more than 20 candidates.

Why is the campaign beginning so early – more than one year and four months prior to presidential Election Day in November 2020? And just who is in charge of making the rules for this process? Now, as the process begins, is a good time to step back and review our presidential nominating system.

This is an unusual democratic institution. In no other country is nomination for a major national office determined by a series of *regional primary elections* (state caucuses and primaries) conducted in no particular order and under no form of centralized control. With four exceptions, individual states are given a general time period, set by the political parties, in which to schedule a presidential primary, presidential caucuses, or hold a state convention to select delegates to the party national convention.

The four exceptions are Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Nevada. Back in 2008 they were assigned the hugely influential first four dates for presidential caucuses and primaries. The national Democratic Party decided to do it that way, and the national Republican Party, less concerned with such matters, went along with it.

The point is this. State law governs certain aspects of presidential primaries and caucuses in the United States, but other aspects are controlled by rules passed by the two principal political parties in the United States,

although the Democrats make most of the rules changes. In addition, rules for raising and spending money by presidential candidates, as they run in primaries and caucuses, have been passed into law by the United States Congress.

No one person or group is in charge of this process. In addition, the calendar of presidential primary elections in the United States undergoes changes every four years. Periodically, these changes have a major effect on how the nominating system operates and which particular candidates receive a major political party nomination for president. These changes often are undertaken haphazardly, sometimes by individual states and sometimes by one or both national political parties, with no single body coordinating the overall effect of one particular change upon another. The presidential nominating process is thus a totally random process with multiple centers of control.

Before our very eyes, we can witness this evolutionary process as the Democratic Party struggles to bring some kind of order out of the upcoming presidential nominating debates. These uncommonly early nationalized debates are a relatively new wrinkle in the nominating process, caused by the tremendous expansion of American television in the 1950s. Now that there is cable TV as well as streaming TV news on the internet, there is plenty of screen time for these early debates. Back when there were only three national television networks, there would have been no TV time for such a minor political event.

This tells us something else about the presidential nominating process in the United States. The news media are active players along with the states and the political parties. It is the news media that took what are really minor political events, the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary, and turned them into major national news events. The news media get at least 50 percent of the credit for making a minor candidate debate such as the one 10 days from now into a must-see political event.

And so we witness the Democratic Party trying to make up sensible rules as to which of their two-dozen candidates can be included in the two-

night debate. So far the party has adopted two standards: 1. How are the various candidates scoring in early public opinion polls? 2. The number of small-dollar contributors each candidate has gathered so far. If these new rules for limiting debate participants work for the Democratic Party, they will likely become a new permanent part of the U.S. presidential nominating process.

That brings up another issue – the outsize role of polls and pollsters. Until the first real votes are cast in the Iowa caucuses and New Hampshire primary early in 2020, the polling industry will provide a constant supply of rankings of the competing candidates, one against another. These pollsters are totally unregulated. No one oversees the skill or accuracy of their work, yet they will be one of the principal sources of information about who is leading, and who is not, prior to the actual voting in Iowa and New Hampshire. Within days after these June 2019 presidential candidate debates are over, the polling industry will be giving us a first solid reading on who the most competitive candidates are.

Because of the controversial governing style of incumbent Republican President Donald Trump, there should be a keen interest on the part of the American people in the 2020 caucuses and primaries, beginning with the Democratic Party debates slightly more than a week away.

Take time to pay attention to the process as well as the daily events of the 2020 major political party presidential nominations. Is this really the best way for the world's model constitutional republic to nominate candidates for its highest and most powerful elected office? Probably not. We will explain why as the process continues.

*Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have, between them, written more than ten books on the presidency and U.S. presidential elections.*

**Not Used**  
**6-22-2019**

**THE PRESSURE IS ON TO STAND OUT  
IN THE DEMOCRATIC JUNE DEBATE**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

No one noticed very much when, in the 1992 race for the Democratic presidential nomination, Jerry Brown of California began raising money with a 1-800 telephone number. It is notable now as one of the first steps in presidential campaigning being financed by large numbers of small contributors rather than a small number of very large gifts from wealthy persons and organizations.

Jerry Brown raised much money with his 1-800 telephone number but failed to win either the Democratic nomination or the White House in 1992. Former Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton won both. But the pattern was established of outsider candidates bypassing the traditional “big money” financing of presidential election campaigns and relying more on small individual contributors.

Today, thanks to the internet, almost anyone can decide to run for president and begin raising money from hopefully large numbers of contributors on line. That’s one of the main reasons, we think, that 20 Democrats running for the party nomination will be participating in a marathon 2-night debate on television this coming Wednesday and Thursday evenings on NBC-TV. So many people are running because small-contributor financing is so much easier to arrange in the contemporary digital world.

The Democratic National Committee in Washington, D.C., is struggling to bring this astoundingly large number of presidential nomination candidates under control. One of the standards it has set for

getting to participate in the upcoming “Official Democratic Party Debate” is the ability to raise money from a large number of small contributors.

We think the “mob” of 20 debaters over two evenings is going to have a major effect on this Wednesday’s and Thursday’s debates. Each candidate will only have a very short period of time to debate, and that will put the pressure on to do something notable in just the few minutes allowed – something that will make the candidate stand out from the crowd. The weaker a candidate is in the polls or fund-raising numbers, the greater the pressure to do something really startling. Sometimes these startling gambits work for candidates, and sometimes they fail miserably.

For instance, in a 2,000 presidential election television debate, Democrat Al Gore walked away from his speaker’s stand and stood almost face-to-face with Republican George W. Bush, as if facing him down. Sadly for Gore, the ploy did not work, and he was criticized for invading Bush’s space to no purpose.

Appearance will be important. Some candidates will dress for business (men in coats-and-ties and women in pants suits or skirts), but others will dress more informally in hopes, perhaps, of attracting younger more casual voters. Facial make-up will be important also. Some candidates will be made-up normally, but others might mimic John F. Kennedy who won his 1960 debate with pasty-faced Richard Nixon by looking suntanned and active and fit.

Due to the many candidates, there will be a great temptation to launch strong quotable “zingers” against a leading opponent – a zinger that is both short and memorable. A good zinger will make an opponent look bad and will be easily remembered by the TV audience. In 1984, when Republican president Ronald Reagan was running for reelection, he was being criticized as perhaps being too old for the White House. Reagan zinged his opponent, Democrat Walter Mondale, by noting that Mondale was “too young and inexperienced to be president.”

To stand out among 20 competitors, the Democratic debaters will be tempted to take a dramatic stand on a particular issue. Look for issues such

as “a free basic livable income guaranteed for all” to be bandied about, or “having the U.S. Government pay off all student loan debt, ever at private colleges and universities.” Bernie Sanders seems to have most of the far-left positions already taken (i.e., Free Medicaid for All, etc.). It will be exciting to see if any of the other candidates try to get to the left of Bernie in order to make their mark.

Above all, candidates will not want to stand out by committing a gaffe – doing or saying something disastrous to their candidacy. Republican President Gerald Ford committed the ultimate gaffe in 1976 when he argued Eastern Europe was not dominated by the Soviet Union. At that time everyone knew that Eastern Europe was ruled in totalitarian fashion by the Soviets. Ford lost the White House to his Democratic competitor, Jimmy Carter.

So we are expecting an exciting debate this Tuesday/Wednesday. Will some of the candidates make the startling moves we are anticipating, or will most of them play it safe? You will want to watch to find out.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have personally observed more than ten major U.S. presidential caucuses and primaries in both political parties.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**6-22-2019**

## **DEMOCRATIC PARTY “PLAYOFFS” BEGIN**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

The NBA and NHL playoffs just ended, and they seemed to go on for weeks and weeks. But the Democratic Party presidential nomination “playoffs” begin next Wednesday and Thursday and, brace yourself, will last for nearly a year.

The Democratic National Committee is preparing to stage at least six presidential candidate debates this year and another six in the first several months of 2020.

Coloradans this spring had professional basketball and ice hockey teams that made it into the second round of their playoffs – add that was fun while it lasted. Colorado also has two entries, former Governor John Hickenlooper and U.S. Senator Michael Bennet, in next week’s debates, although like the Nuggets and the Avalanche, they are unlikely to make it past their party’s second round.

NBC, MSNBC, and Telemundo will host the debates from 7 to 9 P.M. (MDT) from a performing arts center in Miami. Wednesday night’s draw features, among others, Senators Cory Booker, Amu Klobuchar, and Elizabeth Warren as well as former Texas U.S. Representative “Beto” O’Rourke.

Thursday night’s debates promise to be more exciting for Coloradans. Included are U.S. Senators Kamala Harris and Bernie Sanders, former Vice President Joe Biden, and South Bend, Indiana, Mayor Pete Battigieg. Also included are Colorado U.S. Senator Bennet and former Governor Hickenlooper.



The national Democratic Party decided that to qualify for these debates a candidate had to meet a minimum threshold in a few credible national polls and/or record 65,000 campaign donations, including 200 in each of twenty states.

Senator Bennet was the last to qualify, and he and Hickenlooper barely met the polling requirements.

Early polling suggests Biden, Sanders, Warren, Buttigieg and Harris might be considered among the frontrunners, yet everyone knows it is much too early to rank candidates at this stage. Just ask Jeb Bush, who led in the early polling in 2016 but lost the Republican nomination to Donald Trump.

Of note, however, is that several probable frontrunners clash on the second evening of this doubleheader. That is the night our two Coloradans – self-proclaimed good friends with strikingly similar public policy views – get thrown into the performance playoff arena.

The stakes are high for every candidate. A gaffe or two at this early stage could be fatal.

Viewers, especially Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents, will judge candidates on electability (can they win in November of 2020?), their competence and expertise (how they handle complicated policy questions), their fresh proposals for solving problems (such as trade, the environment, immigration, climate), and likeability (do they have the charm and touch of a John F. Kennedy, or a Ronald Reagan, or a Barack Obama?).

Candidates, especially in the time-limited format, have to avoid over attacking one another. In 2016 New Jersey Governor Chris Christie hurt both himself and Texas U.S. Senator Marco Rubio when he went after Rubio for making too many canned comments.

Candidates can hurt themselves by inadvertent gestures. Al Gore seemed condescending in 2000 when he sighed loudly during George W. Bush's answers and when he crowded Bush's physical space. President George H. W. Bush lost points in 1992 when he looked at his wristwatch, making him seem bored and anxiously waiting for the debate to end.

---

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

President Gerald Ford was famously criticized and had to awkwardly walk back ill-advised claims that certain parts of Eastern Europe were not under the domination of the then Soviet Union.

Many viewers will be watching to see how far left these candidates will turn. Sanders and Warren are already crowding the left lane. Leftish politics may appeal to activist presidential caucuses and primaries participants, but candidates in either major political party who veer too far from the American center generally do not fare well.

The memory of Barry Goldwater in 1964 and George McGovern in 1972 is illustrative. Both took extreme stands and lost bigtime.

Thus the challenge will be great for Democrats who can define themselves as progressive pragmatists and as candidates who can unify their party (if this is still possible) and attract solid support from independents. Most of the candidates, if not Sanders and Warren, understand that being defined as the “socialist” candidate is an invitation to defeat in November.

Viewers will be asking a number of important questions. Is the candidate too old? Too young? Too strident? Too combative? Too complacent? Too bland? Is the candidate unlikely to be able to work with both parties in Congress? Or is he or she too inexperienced in foreign policy?

Expect Warren to try to win away Sanders supporters. Expect Booker and Harris to try to attract liberals and African-American voters away from Joe Biden. Expect O’Rourke to try to attract some of the younger voters that Buttigieg has won over.

It is hard to know what Bennet and Hickenlooper have to do. They are centrists and pragmatists with good performance records in elected office. But each of them needs a distinctive issue or personal narrative to make them catch fire. For both of them this is a “do-or-die” moment. But the “do” is probably as unclear to them as it is to us.

Presidential nomination debates are a relatively new experience for this nation. Debating skills or performance or stagecraft may be important in the course of presidential leadership, but we should also value other qualities

as equally important – qualities such as character, integrity, listening, conversational ability, and judgment.

This question-answer debate format may or may not be the best way for voters to learn who is the most qualified person for the job. Cable news “town halls,” where a single candidate is grilled for a longer period of time, have proved a valuable new format.

The upcoming Democratic debates could well turn out to be a disappointing circus of attempted zingers and awkward plays at “one-up-man-ship.” Or they could prove to be a reasonable way to help winnow the crowded field of aspirants for this nation’s most important leadership position.

We are not certain we are ready for a year’s worth of political playoffs. But, ready or not, Hickenlooper and Bennet and a gaggle of 18 others will get things going Wednesday and Thursday with a brief national audition from Miami.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have observed and analyzed the fifteen presidential elections from 1960 to 2016.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
7-7-2019

**TRUMP GETS A PASS ON COLLUSION,  
BUT AS FOR OBSTRUCTION ...**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

We have read and discussed the Mueller Report, one of the most talked about and least read government reports in our nation's history.

It is much talked about because President Donald Trump relentlessly attacked it before it was issued. He relentlessly questioned its legitimacy, repeatedly called it a "witch hunt," and tried in vain to terminate it at every stage of its early existence.

Once the report came out this spring, Trump prematurely gloated that it had vindicated him. "No collusion, no obstruction" he said. He called it "great," "a beautiful report," and told everyone it had been a huge waste of taxpayers' money.

The report's findings, however, were devastating in their portrayal of Trump's character and of Russian government meddling in the 2016 presidential election. After a while Trump realized the negative image the Mueller Report created of him. He then began calling the report a "total hit job" and full of crazy and fabricated descriptions of actions he and his associates had engaged in.

It is a little read report for several reasons. It runs 448 pages long with almost 300 additional pages of appendices. Eleven percent of it is redacted (blacked out). There are over 900 redacted sentences or paragraphs, including a few pages that are entirely blacked out. It is discomfoting to read a report about a U.S. president with so much material withheld from the public for security reasons. Plus there are some 1,100 footnotes, considerable dense legal language, and countless instances of repetition.

The clumsy writing is no threat to the delightful storytelling found in political novels. But two of Trump’s associates – Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort and Trump business ally Michael Cohen – would make exciting characters in a lively political novel.

Then there is Special Counsel Robert Mueller himself. He is at one and the same time heroic but mysterious. His conclusions about Trump are understated and confusing.

The Mueller Report details how Russian government associates meddled in the 2016 U.S. presidential election with the intent of helping to elect Donald Trump. It describes the strangely coincidental one hundred or so contacts between Russians and Trump advisers.

Paul Manafort appears to have been in the pocket of Russian oligarchs. Michael Cohen, despite lies to the contrary, was busily working throughout the campaign on negotiating the building of a huge Trump Hotel complex in Moscow. Other Trump associates seemed to be working to reassure Russians that Trump would be much more pro-Russian than his opponent Hillary Clinton – and Russian leader Vladimir Putin acted as if that was the case.

The report documents that Russian military intelligence conducted computer hacking and strategically shared stolen documents from the Hillary Clinton presidential campaign and the Democratic National Committee. Another Russian agent conducted a social media campaign with the intent of promoting political and social discord in the United States. Some of the descriptions of these pro-Trump/anti-Hillary Clinton advertisements would disgust even the most ardent Trump supporters. They were not something to joke about.

Was this “collusion?” The Mueller team did not address that accusation. They found that “collusion” had no legal definition. They instead investigated whether there was a criminal conspiracy.

Mueller and his team concluded that, despite all kinds of links between Trump campaign associates and the Russian government, “the evidence was not sufficient to support criminal charges.” This despite the

fact that Putin and his folks wanted Trump to win is clear, and that Trump and his team welcomed Russian support is also clear.

Mueller raises major concerns about these threats to U.S. national security and sovereignty. That the United States has sometimes engaged in other countries' elections is not addressed. But, bottom line, the Mueller Report gives President Trump a "pass" on the so-called "collusion" charge.

Mueller's Report is considerably tougher on the matter of whether or not President Trump obstructed justice trying to "cover up" his election campaign's many contacts with the Russians. Many readers of the report have concluded that it is "an indictment in all but name." Mueller more than hints at this verdict, but he was constrained by a U.S. Department of Justice precedent against indicting a sitting president. Mueller also signaled to his readers that there was an adequate constitutional process (presumably impeachment and conviction by Congress) that was appropriate in cases such as this.

On May 29, 2019, the date Mueller officially retired from the U.S. Justice Department, he said: "The report is my testimony." He then intoned in classic Muellereese: "If we had confidence that the President clearly did not commit a crime, we would have said so. We did not, however, make a determination as to whether the president did commit a crime." Got that?

That same month over a thousand former U.S. government prosecutors and Department of Justice officials, who had worked for both Republican and Democratic administrations, signed a statement saying: "Each of us believes the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller's Report would, in the case of any other person not covered by the Office of Legal Counsel policy against indicting a sitting president, result in the filing of multiple charges for obstruction of justice."

These hundreds of retired prosecutors pointed to three of the ten examples of obstruction justice outlined in the Mueller Report. They were:

1. The President's efforts to fire Mueller and to falsify evidence about that effort.

2. The President's efforts to limit the scope of the Mueller investigation so as to exclude the president's conduct.
3. The President's efforts to prevent witnesses from cooperating with investigators probing him and his presidential election campaign.

These three points, the prosecutors insist, satisfy all of the elements for an obstruction charge. It was “conduct that obstructed or attempted to obstruct the truth-finding process, as to which the evidence of corrupt intent and connection to pending proceedings is overwhelming.”

President Trump intimidated FBI Director James Comey and Attorney General Jeff Sessions. Then he fired them. Press Secretary Sarah Sanders said from the White House at the time that they had countless reports from FBI members about how much they disliked Comey. She recently admitted she had completely made that up. In effect, she was engaged in “fake news” dissemination from the White House press briefing room.

The Mueller Report should be read and should be widely debated. It was not mentioned during the recent four hours of television debate by candidates for the 2020 Democratic presidential nomination.

Trump's defenders such as Attorney General William Barr insist that indictment charges against a sitting president have to have convincing evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. But no Americans believe that any president – Nixon, Bill Clinton, or Trump included – is or should be above the law.

Congress, Mueller suggested, has constitutional authority to speak to the obstruction of justice charges against Trump. But they have not done much so far. And few of us, including your co-authors, think impeachment is likely in this case.

So what is next? On Wednesday, July 17, Mueller is scheduled to testify before the House Judiciary and Intelligence committees in Congress. Mueller did not volunteer to do this. He was compelled by an unwelcome subpoena. His appearance is likely to be the most scrutinized congressional event of the summer, but the understated and private Mueller will probably not reveal much.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

We predict Mueller will mostly say that he has done his job and now it is time for the people's elected representatives and the voters to render their verdicts.



*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
7-13-2019

**COUNCIL HEARS MIDYEAR  
SHORT-TERM RENTAL UPDATE**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Short Term Rentals, those mini-motels that the City Council authorized to operate in residential areas and other parts of Colorado Springs, are concentrating in four sections of town – the Broadmoor, Old Colorado City plus the West Side, Downtown, and the Old North End.

The vast majority of the Short Term Rentals (STRs), many of them operating in residential areas, do not have the owner living on the property and are being operated fulltime as stand-alone businesses.

In addition, almost one third of STRs are being managed by professional real estate companies rather than a live-in property owner. Adjacent residents with complaints about noise, trash and garbage, and parking problems find themselves complaining to unconcerned property professionals rather than a live-in next door neighbor.

In 70 percent of Short Term Rentals in Colorado Springs, the entire house is available for rental and often stands empty between rentals, even though in a residential area. Only 30 percent of STR rentals are in rooms or a converted garage or a cottage in or adjacent to an occupied home.

Worst case scenario for people who live in a home in a residential area in Colorado Springs. You awaken one morning to find the house next door to you is a whole-house rental, it stands empty between rentals, the property is managed by a rental management company, and the owner could very well be a person or a corporation located outside of this city or even outside the United States.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

These facts about Short Term Rentals were presented to City Council in early June during a Work Session, which allowed no public participation or response. Morgan Hester of City Planning presented a “Mid-Year Update” on how the city’s new STR ordinance is working.

STRs are better known by the internet sites that arrange the rentals – Airbnb, HomeAway (part of Expedia), FlipKey (part of TripAdvisor), and Booking. Marriott has announced plans to offer STRs on its hotel room booking site, thereby bringing a major international hotel company into the industry. Other major hotel chains, such as Hilton, are expected to follow Marriott’s example.

One of the major problems with STRs is that they tend to concentrate in those parts of a city most attractive to travelers, such as downtowns, national historic districts, and major tourist attractions. A study of STR locations in Colorado Springs by postal zip codes found 161 in zone 80904 (Old Colorado City plus West Side), 72 in zone 80906 (Broadmoor and Cheyenne Road), 106 in 80903 (Downtown and Colorado College), and 66 in 80907 (Old North End).

These four zip codes are just 20 percent of the 19 zip codes in Colorado Springs, but they contained 60 percent of the Short Term Rentals.

From January through April of this year, the city required operators of STRs to get a permit and pay a fee. City Planning prepared a “heat map” based on the location of the various permits. The highest concentrations of SRTs showed red on the heat map and the second highest showed yellow. Old Colorado City plus West Side and Downtown showed red on the map, and the Broadmoor area and the Old North End came in yellow.

The majority of STR permits are located in residential zones, even though STRs are clearly a commercial activity. A total of 204 were in Single Family residential zones (R, R1-6, and R1-9) and 235 were in Two-Family zones (R-2).

Of the 679 total permits for STRs issued in the four months from January to April, 413 of the owners (61 percent) acknowledged they did not live on the property. A total of 240 owners (35 percent) said the SRT was

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

their primary residence, while 26 (4 percent) said they lived in the home but rented it out while traveling.

The Planning Department also kept track of whether an entire house or just rooms within a house were being made available as Short Term Rentals. Entire houses were being rented in 70 percent of the cases and only 30 percent were rentals of rooms or separate cottages on the property.

When it came to professional management of STRs, 471 (70 percent) were managed by the STR owner and 208 (30 percent) were in the hands of a professional management company.

The Planning Department's mid-year update on STRs noted there were some problems getting STR owners and operators to get the required permits. In 28 instances, complaints from neighbors led to STRs being permitted. In 142 cases the existence of STRs was discovered by city government officials with permits being issued as a result of code enforcement.

City Council listened to the Mid-Year Update but did not spend much time discussing all the statistics. There was a brief talk about there likely being many unpermitted STRs in the city, and the fact that there is much money, all pure profit, to be saved in permit fees by those who skip getting a permit.

We question whether Short Term Rentals are appropriate uses in Single Family and Two Family residential zones. This is particularly true in light of STRs mainly being an entire house being rented as a "party" or "entertainment" house with no owner occupant living on the property who is readily available to take complaints.

*Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy both live in zip codes loaded with Short Term Rentals.*

**Not Used**  
**7-31-2019**

**SHORT TERM RENTALS COULD COME UNDER  
PRIVATE CONTRACTOR CONTROL**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

If you want to know what the problems are with Short Term Rentals (STRs) in residential neighborhoods, you should take a look at proposals made to the city government in Colorado Springs to have private firms bring STRs under strict regulation and control.

The list of problems caused by Short Term Rentals, according to private enterprise would-be regulators, include noise, garbage and trash, traffic and parking, 24-hours-a-day party houses, unsafe amateur building expansion projects, inadequate city response to neighbors' complaints, bringing large numbers of strangers into local neighborhoods, and changing neighborhood character from residential to commercial.

That is quite a laundry list of problems, and it does not include the biggest problem. That is the large number of Short Term Rentals that go underground and attempt to fly under-the-radar by not getting the required city permit and not paying city lodging tax and city sales tax. These mini-hotels are actually "ghostels" that attempt to remain unseen by local taxing authorities. In some cases, some STR operators engage in "Vampire" listing, only putting the availability of their mini-hotel on the internet after 6 P.M. because they know local tax officials have gone home from work for the day.

Short Term Rentals (STRs) are better known by internet site names such as AirBnb, VRBO, and Flipkey. This market has grown 800 percent since 2011 and is causing increasing friction between STR entrepreneurs and the residential neighborhoods in which so many of them operate.

A number of private firms have made proposals to the city of Colorado Springs to, for a fee, bring the STR situation under control. According to one of them, Host Compliance, 1,691 short term rental units were identified in Colorado Springs at a time when only about 600 were officially permitted by the city. Host compliance also presented figures showing that 80 percent of short term rentals in Colorado Springs were single-family homes being rented as entire homes with no private owner in residence.

A big problem with STRs, Host Compliance noted, is they displace both long-term homeowners and long-term renters, thereby altering the residential character of the neighborhood. They also reduce the housing supply for local residents.

Host compliance argues that, in many cities, less than 10 percent of STR operators voluntarily register with the city and pay their taxes. The listings are spread over numerous web sites and are frequently changed. Furthermore, the vacation rental platforms refuse to provide cities with the detailed data needed to know where STRs are located and how much they should be taxed.

Services offered by companies such as Home Compliance include seeing to the registration of unpermitted STRs, identifying addresses of not-yet permitted STRs, discovering the amount of rental activity to be taxed, and operating a dedicated hot line to receive complaints from neighbors adjacent to STRs that are creating noise, trash, parking, and other problems.

The city can purchase these services for \$66 per year per STR, or for a total of about \$200,000 per year for the estimated number of STRs in the entire city. The expectation would be that increased collection of tax and permit fees would more than pay these enforcement costs.

It is our opinion that, when an industry has a list of flaws as long as those of the STR industry, a more reasonable solution is to ban STRs in residential zones (Single-Family and Two-Family) altogether. Private homeowners simply should not have to put up with the many defects of

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

STRs outlined above. Why pay private contractors to “straighten out” an industry that brings so many problems into almost all our residential areas?

The city published both the Home Compliance proposal and a bid from a firm named Hamari on the City Council website. Both proposals have expired but may soon be renewed with proposals more specifically tailored to the needs of Colorado Springs. In the meantime, the number of Short Term Rentals in the city is thought to be increasing rapidly.

If you think outright commercial uses such as Short Term Rentals should not be allowed in Single-Family and Two-Family residential zones in Colorado Springs, e-mail City Council. All nine council members can be e-mailed at once at [allcouncil@springsgov.com](mailto:allcouncil@springsgov.com).

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. Bob Loevy served on the city Planning Commission from 1972 to 1975.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**9-1-2019**

**U.S. SENATOR BENNET: STAY IN THE RACE**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Advice to U.S. Senator Michael Bennet. Do not let the Democratic Party force you out of running for president. Leave the 2020 race for the White House only when you want to do so.

So what if you fail to score more than 2 percent in the public opinion polls and do not raise a requisite amount of campaign cash. That only knocks you out of an upcoming round of Democratic sponsored television debates in September. You can still qualify for the October debates. And it will not force you out of the Iowa caucuses, the New Hampshire primary, or any of the other state presidential primaries and caucuses that determine the party nominee.

Iowa and New Hampshire election laws determine who gets on the presidential caucuses and primaries election ballot in those states. It is the same in all 50 states. Every American has the right to run for president. Usually you prove you are a qualified citizen and pay a registration fee – and you are on the primary ballot in every state you file in.

We understand that the Democratic Party wants to limit the number of candidates running for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2020. They have been fearful that an oversupply of qualified candidates will split the vote widely and perhaps permit an underqualified or extremist candidate to get the nomination, thus putting victory in the November general election in doubt.

But we dislike giving up the notion that anyone can run for president in the United States, and that they can only be eliminated from the race by election results. The voters in early caucuses and primaries should end the

Bennet campaign for the Oval Office, not the party bureaucrats at the Democratic National Committee.

Be assured we would be just as critical of the Republicans if they were trying to eliminate candidates for the GOP nomination by setting arbitrary polling and fund-raising standards for getting in Republican sponsored presidential candidate television debates.

Senator Bennet – we agree with your criticism of the Democratic Party for setting debate entrance standards – polling and fund-raising standards – that favor old established members of the Democratic Party who have previously run for president and been around Washington, D.C., for a long time. It is a system that shuts out party newcomers with fresh and moderating ideas that might really prove appealing to general election voters in November.

“The DNC process is stifling debate,” you said, “at a time when we need it most.” You’re right – and this process has come too early for an election that is 14 months away.

It will take courage to stay in the race if and when the Democratic Party forces you out of these early Democratic Party presidential television debates. The pressure will be on to “be a good guy” and tacitly accept the party’s stratagem for eliminating multiple candidacies. But there are many other ways to make news on television, and the door will be open in both Iowa and New Hampshire – and beyond – for you to use personal campaigning in kitchens, local restaurants, and neighborhood barbecues to win those crucial early votes.

We see the Democratic Party trying to eliminate one of the great traditions of U.S. presidential politics. This is where a lesser-known governor or U.S. Senator starts campaigning early in Iowa and New Hampshire and, on caucuses or primary day, scores a surprise victory and becomes automatically a major contender for president.

Jimmy Carter, a governor from Georgia, did that in 1976. Unnoticed by the national press and party leaders, he built determined personal



campaigning into a surprise Iowa caucuses victory. He built on that lead and confounded all the experts by being elected president that year.

It has happened in the Republican Party as well. Patrick Buchanan, an outspoken conservative, stunned the experts in 1996 by winning the New Hampshire primary over front-runner Robert Dole. For the next month it looked as though Buchanan would wrest the nomination from Dole, although Dole won the nomination in the end and then lost the general election to Bill Clinton.

We see a disconnect between the Democratic Party requirements for staying in the party television debates and the reality of the caucuses/primaries nominating system. The Democratic standards are set by national polling and national fund raising, but the only early votes that count are in Iowa, New Hampshire, and so forth. National performance standards should not be used to force presidential candidates out of what is essentially a state-based nominating system.

The party rules have effectively forced out at least twelve of the 25 or so declared candidates. Many analysts believe that the Democratic nomination race has evolved to a three or four person race in which the frontrunner, Joe Biden, is vulnerable if venerable, with two-leftish New England runners-up, Sanders and Warren.

So we call on Colorado's U.S. Senator Michael Bennet, now the only Coloradan in the Democratic Party presidential nomination sweepstakes, to stay in the race, graciously not participate in those Democratic national television debates, and concentrate his electoral fire where it really counts – in Iowa, New Hampshire, and so on.

Bennet is not the only moderate, aside from Biden, still in the race. Pete Buttigieg, the learned mayor of South Bend; Amy Klobuchar from Minnesota; and Beto O'Rourke of Texas (who is doing a good job of impersonating Robert Kennedy) are still in contention. Montana Governor Steve Bullock should also be considered.

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

Bennet will have to run a perfect campaign from now on, and he will have to announce more appealing plans on how he would be a better president than Donald Trump,

Still, we believe he is as attractive as any of the other moderates in the contest. Stay Michael, stay.

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

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**9-23-2019**

**RETIRED GEN. MATTIS' MEMOIR  
TELLS OF PERSONAL BATTLES**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Marine Four-Star General Jim Mattis served in the U.S. Marine Corps for four decades and as Secretary of Defense, in the Donald Trump cabinet, for nearly two years.

He loved serving in the Marines and especially as a field commander in Afghanistan and Iraq. He twice was a top executive assistant in the Pentagon. He was Trump's Defense Secretary from 2017 to 2019.

Yet he says Washington was not his cup of tea. "I wasn't cut out for Washington duty," he writes. "I didn't get my energy from behind a desk." Moreover, from where he sat at the Pentagon, "the process was necessarily messy and required ugly compromises."

Mattis is entitled to his view of Potomac politics, yet his preferred battlefields also had their share of messy consequences, many of which he acknowledges – such as unnecessary civilian casualties, sexual harassment, and cruel Abu Ghraib-style prisons.

Jim Mattis has a lot to be proud of. He and his troops helped to topple the Taliban in Afghanistan. He and his troops, under President George H. W. Bush's direction, joined in forcing the Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait in 1991. Later, under George W. Bush, Mattis and his troops were part of toppling Saddam Hussein and making Iraq a semi-safe and stable nation.

Mattis just published an auto-biography, with Bing West, entitled *Call Sign Chaos: Learning to Lead* (Random House, 2019). It tells how a restless young man and self-described mediocre student grew up near the banks of

the Columbia River in central Washington state and became a disciplined and devoted student of military strategy and leadership.

Mattis was raised by parents who served in World War II. He grew up in a military town (Richland, Washington) that was one of the key outposts of the development of the atomic bomb (Manhattan Project). He graduated from Columbia High School, where the sports nickname was “The Bombers” and there was an A-bomb mushroom cloud for the logo. It has since been renamed Richland High School.

He was a History major and ROTC cadet at Central Washington State College and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marines even before he graduated. His first of many “graduate schools” was seven months at Basic School at Quantico, Virginia. After that he was stationed at Okinawa and served all around the world, including a year at the National War College when he was 43 years old.

Mattis learned to love the Marines and their values. He learned about leadership and military strategy. He became a voracious reader. The never-married Mattis earned the nickname “Warrior Monk” for his dedication to scholarship. He also was called “Mad Dog Mattis,” a reference he dislikes, referring to his earthy, blunt, and sometimes obscenity-laced frankness.

The Marines teach, Mattis explains, how to adapt, improve, and overcome. They insist everyone does their homework, learn from mistakes, and build teams of trust. The primary job of a leader is train and nurture – not followers – but leaders who can take the initiative to adapt to changing challenges. Mattis writes:

“I don’t care how operationally brilliant you are; if you can’t create harmony – vicious harmony – on the battlefield, based on trust across different military services, foreign allied militaries, and diplomatic lines, you need to go home.”

He believes in sophisticated command and feedback communication processes. He prides himself on becoming an expert listener and on decentralizing decision making authority whenever possible. Mattis says:

“I love being with the troops, gaining energy from their infectious, often sardonic enthusiasm. We were all volunteers, and patriotism was found more in our DNA than in our words.”

Mattis adopted as his own mantra a saying attributed to the Roman General Lucius Cornelius Sulla: “No better friend, no worse enemy.” Mattis wants the Marines to be the agents of liberation, friendship, and peacemaking, yet he wants his terrorist foes to fear his troops as their worst possible foe. “Our liberal democracy must be protected by a bodyguard of lethal warriors, organized, trained, and equipped to dominate in battle.”

General Mattis emphasizes two major beliefs from his four plus decades of public service:

First, that every military and top political leader should read and understand history, which “lights the often dark path ahead, and even if it is a dim light it is better than none.”

Mattis chides people who believe they are “too busy to read.” He gives the names of dozens of his favorite books that helped educate him about history in general and military battles in particular. He gives a list of those books that instruct for the military future in an appendix.

Here is his typically blunt exhortation: “We have been fighting on this planet for ten thousand years; it would be idiotic and unethical to not take advantage of such accumulated experiences. If you haven’t read hundreds of books, you are functionally illiterate, and you will be incompetent because your personal experiences alone aren’t broad enough to sustain you.”

He credits his extensive reading for preparing him for all kinds of contingencies and surprises, and for heightening his understanding about adapting and improving.

Mattis’s second major belief is the importance of having as many allies as possible. “Nations with strong allies thrive, then without them die.” Mattis, among his many other jobs, was the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) commander. In sharp contrast to many isolationists in public life today, he is a NATO champion. He has a rich appreciation for what NATO and other allies have done to support the United States in the Desert

Storm campaign, after the 9-11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and in the Middle East generally.

Maddis is fond of a Marine adage: “When you’re going to a gunfight, bring all your friends with guns. Having fought many times in coalitions, I believe that we need every ally we can bring to the field.”

He applauds all the help he got from the British, Jordanians, and the United Arab Emirates, among others. “I have never been on a crowded battlefield, and there is always room for those who want to be there along side.”

When he resigned from the Trump cabinet, Mattis reiterated this conviction to President Trump: “One core belief I have always held is that our strength as a nation is inextricably linked to the strength of our unique and comprehensive system of alliances and partnerships... While the U.S. remains the indispensable nation in the free world, we cannot protect our interests or serve that role effectively without maintaining strong alliances and showing respect to those allies.”

Mattis’s basic point is that unilateralism and going-it-alone make no sense and will not serve the nation well. No wonder Mattis felt obliged to resign as Trump’s Secretary of Defense.

Mattis earned a reputation as an aggressive risk-taking fighter. Yet, in this brilliant memoir, he allows that the U.S. has fought some wars that we should have avoided. He did not, for example, think the U.S. needed to wage war on Iraq in 2003. He may have thought the same thing about our efforts in Libya, but he does not make this clear. He faults both the George W. Bush and the Barack Obama leadership teams for “half-heartedly engaging in wars that needed to be won.”

The only president Mattis praises is George H. W. Bush. Bush gave clear directions, and he avoided “mission creep.” Mattis marvels at how the internationalist senior Bush pulled together a remarkable coalition of Western and Arab nations with compelling U.N. support. Mattis pointedly praises Bush for avoiding “sophomoric decisions” like imposing a ceiling on the number of troops sent to a battle zone or setting a date for troop

departures. This is a thinly disguised indictment of George W. Bush, Obama and Trump, all of whom made those mistakes.

Mattis was frustrated that his military superiors didn't accept a plan he devised to capture Osama bin Laden in the hills of Tora Bora in 2001. He believed he could have captured and killed bin Laden, but neither the White House nor his commanding officers were convinced. Mattis learned from this episode that he needed to be louder and even more forceful in making his recommendations.

He was again frustrated with the White House on its lack of coherent direction in conducting the second Iraq War.

Mattis believed that the 2003 White House decision to disband the defeated Iraqi Army and prevent most members of the Baath Party from any government positions was a major mistake – and it was made without consulting Mattis and his military colleagues in the field.

Later Mattis would again be deeply frustrated with President George W. Bush and his advisors. Bush II had idealistic goals yet was tragically misguided, especially when it came to fighting in and governing the dangerous city of Fallujah in Iraq.

Mattis recalls pleasant visits with the thoughtful and reserved Barack Obama and the amiable Joe Biden. But he is quick to fault Obama on several issues. Obama's willingness to send more troops to Afghanistan is applauded, yet Obama undercut the military by telling everyone that the troops would pull out at a specified date. This was just foolish, according to Mattis.

Similarly, Obama's withdrawal of troops in Iraq in 2012 was "catastrophic." Mattis's views were regularly rejected, and the Obama White House eventually eased him out of command in Iraq. Mattis also found fault with both Obama and Trump for not doing enough in dealing with Syria and Iran. His years in the Marines and his several tours of duty at the Pentagon shaped Mattis as an internationalist, a multi-lateralist, and a willing if not eager interventionist.

“Strategic acumen must incorporate a fundamental respect for other nations that have stood with us when trouble looms.” This was a not too subtle reference to Trump.

“Unless you want to lose, you don’t tell an enemy when you are done fighting, and you don’t set an exit date unrelated to the situation on the ground.” That was a message to President Obama.

Mattis sees Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea as all dangerous and untrustworthy countries. Our current and future administrations have to be vigilant with these outliers.

The U.S. has often, Mattis says, tried to do too much with too little. He points to the case of South Korea, where the United States had the will and the resources and the staying power to do the job well. “We have kept tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers there. Our large troop presence and steady diplomacy safeguarded the transformation of that war torn country from dictatorship into a vibrant democracy. But it took forty years.”

Our country has been engaged with Afghanistan and Iraq for longer than most Americans want, and many think there is little to show for it. Is Mattis recommending the South Korean strategy for those places? He doesn’t quite say that, but he does say the South Korean example “is instructive.”

Mattis leaves his readers with multiple messages. No nation standing alone can sustain its security. Human rights are incredibly important but should not be the sole criterion guiding our foreign policy. Civilian control of the military is crucial, yet the assessments of the intelligence community, diplomats, and military leaders should never be excluded or ignored by arrogant White House decision makers.

Mattis argues that America has to be better prepared to fight irregular warfare opponents as well as cyber enemies. “The history of counterinsurgency teaches us that an enemy who can roll in and out like waves on a beach is devilishly hard to fight.”

Former Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis kept a handwritten card on his desk that helped remind him of his responsibility – and ours. “Will this



***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

commitment contribute sufficiently to the well-being of the American people to justify putting our troops in a position to die?”

That’s wise advice from a reflective warrior.

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
**10-27-2019**

**ALL FOUR STATE AND LOCAL BALLOT MEASURES  
COULD PASS NEXT MONTH**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Next week's state and local elections are decidedly off-year compared to presidential and mid-term elections. Major political parties are mostly sitting this one out.

Voters do get to choose among non-partisan school board candidates. But two state statutory propositions and two Colorado Springs infrastructure-spending measures are, by default, the center of attention.

Both of us are voting "yes" on all four of these measures. We believe that two or three and possibly all four will be approved by voters in what will likely be a low-turnout election. We examine each of them here.

Proposition CC is referred from the state legislature to the voters. It is cleverly worded to say it provides more state funds for schools, higher education, and roads and bridges – without raising any taxes. Yet it would mean that, in years when revenues are especially good (which will be the case for at least the next two years), the state would retain moneys that would (according to the provisions of the Taxpayer Bill of Rights, 1992) otherwise have be refunded to Colorado taxpayers.

Voters have to read their 2019 State Ballot Information Booklet to understand the rather complicated details of this proposition.

Supporters who favor Prop CC see it as an opportunity for a state with a booming economy to invest more money in underfunded needs like the Colorado public higher education system and state roads and bridges. Democrats, joined by groups such as the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce and the Colorado Contractors Association, are for this measure.

Libertarians and conservative anti-tax groups are strongly opposing this Proposition. Colorado is a relatively low tax state, yet a majority of registered voters don't believe it to be the case.

Coloradans generally vote against tax increases on their state ballots. But Prop CC confuses the issue as to whether taxes are being increased. It emphasizes instead that budget surplus funds will be directed to high priority state need.

Opponents claim this Proposition calls for taxpayers to sacrifice their tax refunds for programs that should be funded through the existing state budget. And that these refunds will be permanently eliminated.

Supporters point out that these refunds would only come in high tax-revenue years. Moreover, this is a statutory change, not a constitutional change, and therefore can be revisited and amended by future state legislatures.

Hence there are classic pro- and anti-government sentiments involved here. We support Prop CC and believe it will narrowly win.

Proposition DD, on the state ballot, is presented with some opaque legalese that is, at least in part, required by the state's TABOR Amendment. But there is little opposition to DD.

It essentially recognizes that, because of a 2018 U.S. Supreme Court ruling, betting on sports may be legalized at the state level. So Proposition DD asks that limited sports betting be legalized in Colorado (presumably at our casinos), and that the state should have the right to tax a small portion of casino profits derived from this sports betting. Most of this tax-revenue will be targeted for much needed state water conservation projects.

Proposition DD will easily pass and we support it. There will always be some voters who will oppose this type of measure because they oppose anything that encourages gambling of any kind.

The City of Colorado Springs Ballot Issue 2B is a relatively non-controversial request to spend tax surplus funds to upgrade city parks, ballfields and trails. This takes advantage of growing revenues and a strong

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

local economy. The city estimates that, on average, retaining these surplus funds will amount to only about \$31 per household.

Opponents criticize this measure saying it would deny taxpayers \$7 million in tax refunds. They say it violates the spirit of the city's TABOR laws, and that the city already has adequate funds to provide for parks and trails.

This measure does abide by TABOR law, however, by explicitly asking voters' approval for an occasional TABOR override.

We support this one-time special measure and predict it will win approval.

City of Colorado Springs Ballot Issue 2C – a measure strongly supported by Colorado Springs Mayor John Suthers and the Colorado Springs City Council – asks for a renewed sales-tax increase, yet at a slightly lower rate than two years ago, to repair roads and for street improvements.

A similar measure was overwhelmingly passed here by voters back in November of 2015.

Roads, street curbing and potholes have been improved in Colorado Springs. The Mayor says we've made excellent progress, but we are only halfway to our goals.

Opponents argue this is a tax increase as well as a sales tax. They claim it will cost taxpayers \$55 million yearly and that it disproportionately hurts the vulnerable.

Mayor Suthers responds that Colorado Springs needs to provide for better streets and infrastructure to respond to the growth in the city's population and business investments. Moreover, the city's improvements in these areas, he says, are being greatly repaid by the businesses that have moved here or are expanding their operations here.

Colorado Springs Measure 2C, in part a referendum on Mayor Suthers, will win approval by the voters. We both support it.

We urge everyone to read the information booklets sent to every household by the state and the city. These ballot issues are seldom easy to

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

understand. Talk with your friends and neighbors about them. Go on line to read internet arguments about them.

Your two authors usually have some differences at election time. On this occasion, however, we both encourage a yes vote on all four ballot measures – and believe most of them will be approved.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists and co-authors of “Colorado Politics and Policy: Governing a Purple State.”*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
11-17-2019

## DEBATE SURVIVORS FACE OFF AGAIN

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Coming up on November 20 is yet another Democratic Party Presidential Nomination Debate.

These debates and the inevitable pre-Iowa Money Chase have effectively winnowed down the race to just a handful. Worthy as well as unworthy candidates are gone, and another group will bail after they fail to pick up traction in Iowa.

These debates were instructive. We now know much more about the character and policies of the contenders. We also understand their political liabilities.

Andrew Yang wins the award for new ideas and trying to look at problems in a fresh light. Elizabeth Warren gets the blue ribbon for having both the most and the biggest attention gaining plans. Mayor Pete Buttigieg ran away with the “Rookie of the Debates” trophy. He tied with Warren for being the best competitive debater.

It is an amazingly level playing field when Buttigieg, the young mayor of South Bend, Indiana, can take on and best the seasoned Mayor of New York City – Bill de Blasio. Buttigieg also outscored Joseph Biden, a two-term former vice president of the United States.

Bernie Sanders, hands down and “hands way up,” wins both the most authentic and the most consistent honors. He is an unapologetic and unwavering Democratic Socialist, and we all know where he stands. Most of us could probably recite his stump speech, which has varied little from his 2016 presidential campaign narrative.

Joseph Biden earns “The Last Hurrah” award, which is given to an older candidate making a last run for office. These debates were not Joe’s friend. As the early frontrunner, he was targeted and picked on by his Democratic opponents as well as hammered by Republican President Donald Trump. Biden has been forced on the defensive. It also hurts that he has trouble coming up with topic sentences and then completing sentences he does begin.

As Biden is fading, Elizabeth Warren has become Target-in-Chief. Her economic and health plans are under attack daily. Buttigieg is surging in Iowa where he must do well. Amy Klobuchar, from nearby Minnesota, also has to catch on in Iowa, which may not be happening.

The Democratic Party’s rules for participating in these debates, which include scoring high in public opinion polls and raising big money from many donors, are under attack. Michael Bennet of Colorado, Steve Bullock of Montana, and Tulsi Gabbard have all complained, to no avail, about those strict DNC rules.

Some form of these debates is likely to survive and carry over into future presidential election years.

People may not realize it, yet we have been watching presidential primary-and-caucuses history in the making here. In previous years, there were occasional early television debates between would-be presidential nominees, but they tended to be isolated and on less-watched cable channels and only involve previously well-known candidates. But this year, with the Democratic Party doing the hosting, holding one-a-month, and trying to begin the process of limiting the field, these TV debates have generated a lot of public interest much earlier in the primary-caucuses nomination process.

We know more about the candidates at this point than we did in previous presidential elections. We also have “leaders” emerging in the early public opinion polls, something that in previous cycles usually did not occur until late November or early December prior to the primaries and caucuses that will start early in 2020.

It is important to remember that, unlike so much of the rest of United States government, the presidential primary-caucuses selection process is not in the U.S. Constitution or even major U.S. laws. It is mainly found in state laws and national party rules. As a result, the presidential party nomination process is changing all the time. For instance:

The New Hampshire “First in the Nation” presidential primary was created in 1948 by a New Hampshire Republican governor who wanted to pave the way to the White House for World War II general Dwight Eisenhower.

The Iowa presidential caucuses were created in the early 1970s by Iowa legislators who thought Iowa should be “First in the Nation.” They accomplished that by calling their electoral method “caucuses” rather than a “primary.” An unknown Georgia Governor, Jimmy Carter, rode the 1976 Iowa caucuses right into the presidency.

“Super Tuesday” was created in 1988 by a couple of Southerners, Al Gore of Tennessee and Bill Clinton of Arkansas, who tried to boost southern chances by having all the southern states hold primaries and caucuses on the same day. “Super Tuesday” did not work in 1988, but it helped propel Bill Clinton of Arkansas to the Democratic nomination and into the Oval Office in 1992.

The message is that changes in the presidential nominating process do not come from Congress or the Executive Branch but occur on an ad hoc basis at state and party levels. But if such changes seem to work, they are quickly accepted by voters and the news media and are repeated presidential cycle after presidential cycle. After all, New Hampshire, Iowa, and a modified Super Tuesday (it is less southern now) are still with us.

And we think that is what may happen with this year’s one-a-month Democratic Party presidential candidate debates on major television venues. The news media have loved them, although the number of television viewers declined after the first debates. What is said at the debates, however, is being quoted over and over on television political talk shows and in newspaper columns.



***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

But there is one concern for the Democrats. These early one-a-month debates have been educational, yet it is at this point unclear that they will produce for the party an ideal candidate who can rally Democrats, recruit independents and new voters, and triumph over Donald Trump on November 3, 2020.

*Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have personally observed many a presidential primary and caucuses over the years.*

**Colorado Springs Gazette**  
**11-24-2019**

**LET'S HEAR IT FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Colorado Springs is growing fast. As new homes, offices, stores, and public buildings are constructed, older and outdated buildings are torn down and removed. To prevent that from happening to historically significant buildings and places, Colorado Springs has a historic preservation plan.

Historic preservation can add to a community's understanding of its roots and sense of place, and can enhance pride in its history. Properly done it can bring economic benefits as well.

The city government is currently reassessing its historic preservation plan, which was last reviewed in 1993. A detailed draft has been written by Stan Clausen and Associates, a professional preservationist consultancy. Named HistoricCOS, the new plan has already been advanced by the City Planning Commission and is slated for final approval by City Council on December 10.

HistoricCOS embraces a bold proposal to strengthen neighborhood associations in the city, guide many of those neighborhoods to become National Register Historic Districts, and then create Neighborhood Master Plans that will use zoning and improved city services to preserve the unique historic character of those neighborhoods.

To accomplish the above, HistoricCOS recommends that the present city Historic Preservation *Board* be turned into a Historic Preservation *Commission* and directly charged with creating and overseeing the creation of more Historic Districts in the Springs.

HistoricCOS is an update on the status of historic preservation in Colorado Springs as well as a bold plan for the future. It describes how, up

to now, historic preservation of homes and businesses here has mainly been a “do-it-yourself” exercise rather than a local government program. Individual homeowners and local organizations, such as colleges and business firms, have voluntarily placed their historic homes and buildings on the National Register or the Colorado State Register of Historic Places. No city involvement was required.

Thus HistoricCOS lists 36 homes and buildings on the National Register, 9 more on the Colorado State Register, and an itemized list of 20 buildings at or near Colorado College.

Many of these 65 historic places in Colorado Springs are well known. They include the Trianon mansion at the Colorado Springs School in Broadmoor, the U.S. Post Office building downtown, St. Mary’s Cathedral, and city founder General Palmer’s home at Glen Eyrie. But others are relatively unknown, such as the Second Midland School on the west side, the Maytag Aircraft Building on S. Cascade Avenue, and the Herschell Ideal Two-Abreast Carousel at the Cheyenne Mountain Zoo.

HistoricCOS encourages Colorado Springs city government to work harder at identifying and celebrating its 65 historic places. A systematic program of placing plaques on historic structures would be in order, along with a map of the city that shows the historic places and how to find them. An easy to find and use internet site is needed.

The proposed historic preservation plan calls for stronger neighborhood associations because they would be the best advocates for preserving neighborhoods through the strict application of zoning laws. “Neighborhood leaders are increasingly concerned about insensitive changes taking place locally,” the consultant’s report noted. “Rezoning often impacts the long-standing character or pedestrian scale of a neighborhood... These neighborhood leaders are seeking help to protect the aesthetic and overall value of their neighborhoods.”

The HistoricCOS report celebrates places in Colorado Springs where there are active and functioning historic districts. Best known is Old Colorado City National Historic District, the endearing commercial area on

***THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY***

---

the west side which has preserved several blocks of an 1890s style commercial area. Also easily identified is the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind State Historic District. A major residential preserve is the Weber-Wahsatch National Historic District that runs along those two streets from Palmer High School to the east side of Colorado College.

The consultants who wrote HistoricCOS cited the Old North End National Historic District, the area between Colorado College and Penrose Main Hospital, as the model for future residential neighborhood historic preservation in Colorado Springs.

National or state historic district designation brings no protections. The Old North End has taken advantage of a city law that provides for a historic preservation “zoning.” Historic design standards have been adopted by City Council for the Old North End. The city’s Historic Preservation Board sees that these standards are applied whenever there is new construction or major remodeling in the Old North End.

A newly strengthened Historic Preservation Commission will need modest staff assistance for its efforts to create more neighborhood Historic Districts with historic preservation zoning in Colorado Springs. HistoricCOS concludes by encouraging “increased levels of city staffing devoted to historic preservation.” Right now there is very little.

We applaud the city planners, local historic preservationists, and consultants who are working on the HistoricCOS blueprint. We believe an increased number of local organizations will need to participate if we are to have an effective historic preservation program that keeps pace with all the rapid developments in Colorado Springs. Public-private partnerships, local foundations, family trusts, volunteer groups, and leading business interests are needed to preserve our city’s remarkable historic neighborhoods, landscapes, and landmark buildings.

One helpful national guide sums it up this way: “A community that respects its history respects itself. The preservation of that history through the preservation of sites important to it can help a community realize its strengths and use them to improve the lives of all its residents.”

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

*Retired Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are longtime residents of Colorado Springs. Tom lives on the Mesa; Bob resides in the Old North End.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*

**12-9-2019**

## **FOUR CENTURIES OF RACE RELATIONS**

By Bob Loevy

Four hundred years ago, in 1619, the first African slaves were brought into what is now the United States at Jamestown, Virginia. Scholars and news organizations are marking this four centuries anniversary by retelling the American story in light of the historical effects of African-American slavery and its successor, racial segregation, on American life.

Because African slavery began in 1619 in Virginia, it predated the founding of the other colonies, the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the Revolutionary War, and the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In other words, slavery and segregation have been an integral part of American political history from the nation's earliest beginnings.

Geography played a role. Slavery was an economic success in the southern half of the country. In the north, an economy based on free white labor thrived. The result was a southern economy and politics committed to slave labor and a northern economy and politics based on free white labor.

This divide led to the rise of what is called Sectionalism, the analysis of American politics in terms of geographic sections, mainly a slave-holding South, a free labor North, and a Middle West (and later a Far West) that landed somewhere, often undecidedly, between the two.

There were race relations issues at the time of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. When it came to representation in the proposed House of Representatives, the South wanted to count all the slaves (but not allow them to vote). The North wanted to count none of them. The result was the three-fifths compromise. It allowed the South to count three of every five African slaves.

The Constitutional Convention also dealt with the issue of the slave trade, the continued importation of African slaves into the United States. The slave trade was allowed to continue for 20 years and then was abolished.

By the 1850s, the continued existence of slavery divided the country. The two major political parties, the Democrats and the Whigs, were both split apart by the slavery issue. The result was the spontaneous formation of a new political party – the Republicans. They were dedicated to the idea that human slavery could continue to exist in its present boundaries in the South, but it must not be allowed to spread into new territories, in the Midwest and West, being added to the United States.

When the Republicans elected Abraham Lincoln to the presidency in 1860, the Southern states sought to preserve slavery by seceding from the Union and forming a new nation called the Confederacy. This caused the Civil War, which was fought primarily over the status of African-Americans in the nation. When the North defeated the South, slavery was abolished as a legally authorized institution in the United States.

But legal freedom for the former slaves hardly guaranteed equal status. As a result of a close election for U.S. president in 1876, the Republicans found the necessary electoral votes to win the White House by agreeing to remove all Union troops from the South. As the troops left, so did hope for the equal treatment of African-Americans in the South.

Southern state governments turned to legalized racial segregation as the best way to deny equality to their African-American citizens. These “Jim Crow” laws denied Southern Blacks access to whites-only public schools, restaurants, snack bars, hotels, motels, movie theaters, and swimming pools. The U.S. Supreme Court legalized such practices in the *Plessey v. Ferguson* decision in 1896. The court decided government and business services could be “separate” as long as they were “equal.”

Following the Civil War, the Democratic Party became the preferred party of racial segregation in the South. On the other hand, African-Americans in the South became loyal Republicans. This situation lasted until the 1930s, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal economic

policies began wooing African-American voters away from the Republican Party and into the Democratic Party. Roosevelt also recruited large numbers of working class Northerners, many of them labor union members, into the Democratic Party.

This situation changed in the early 1960s, when African-Americans under the leadership of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., began publicly demonstrating for more equal treatment from government, particularly in the South. Responding to King's appeals, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which ended racial segregation throughout the entire nation in places of public accommodation (restaurants, hotels, movie theaters, swimming pools, etc.). Next came the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It guaranteed African-Americans the right to vote in all elections – national, state, and local.

By ending racial segregation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 broke the glue that had tied the Democratic Party in the South to racial segregation. In the ensuing years, white Southerners were attracted by conservative economic and social policies into the Republican Party. The Democratic “South” evolved into the Republican South. White voters in the South remain mostly Republican to this day.

Meanwhile, African-American voters became strongly Democratic. The impetus was the campaign of Republican Barry Goldwater for president in 1964. Goldwater built his campaign around strongly opposing the Civil Rights Act of 1964. African-Americans have been voting 90 percent or more for Democrats for president ever since.

Today, 400 years after the introduction of slavery, the United States has a Republican president who is strongly anti-immigrant and appeals to white working-class voters, particularly in the South and Midwest. The Democratic Party is made up of minorities – principally African-Americans and Hispanics – as well as highly educated white voters. Race relations remain a front page issue in U.S. politics, just as they have continuously since the earliest beginnings of Colonial America.



**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

*Retired Colorado College political scientist Bob Loevy worked as a legislative aide to Senator Thomas H. Kuchel (Rep., Calif.), the Republican floor leader in the U.S. Senate for the Civil Rights Act of 1964.*

*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
12-22-2019

**PLACES WE MISS – AND OTHERS  
WE’RE GLAD ARE STILL HERE**

By Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy

Longtime Colorado Springs residents have nostalgia for a number of landmark places — cozy restaurants, friendly hangouts and fun entertainment centers — that have gone out of business and are no longer here.

We especially think about them at this holiday time when out-of-town family and friends return to the Springs, yet can no longer visit these places with so many treasured memories.

Here are some of these landmarks we really miss:

**Chinook Bookshop** is near the top of the list. Dick and Judy Noyes seemed to know everyone and ran an outstanding downtown bookstore with a wide variety of excellent titles.

**Michelle's Chocolatiers & Ice Cream** was a favorite for everyone out on a downtown excursion — regardless of age.

**The Cotton Club** was near the corner of Colorado and Cascade avenues and flourished from the late 1940s into the 1970s as a downtown dining and entertainment hub. Owned and managed by African-Americans, the club welcomed everyone.

**Railroad steam locomotive Engine 168** was a legacy from city founder General William J. Palmer’s narrow-gauge rail lines. It used to grace the

public park behind the Antlers Hotel. It has been relocated to Antonito, where it is restored as a fully operating steam locomotive.

**Giuseppe's Old Depot** was a welcoming family restaurant located in a former railroad station adjacent to a busy mainline railroad. "A table at trackside" allowed diners to watch passing freight trains. The food was ample if not memorable. Rumors have it new food shops may reopen at the depot building in 2020.

**Furr's Cafeteria** in the Uintah Gardens Shopping Center closed some years back. It provided comfort food rather than a gourmet experience.

**Flying W Ranch** with its chuckwagon barbecue and beans also offered country music by the Wranglers. There were a small number of amusement rides for children. It closed abruptly because of severe damage from the Waldo Canyon fire but is scheduled to reopen in 2020 or 2021.

**Ski Broadmoor** on the side of Cheyenne Mountain was Colorado Springs' own little ski area where children and adults could learn to ski and then take their newly learned skills up to the big ski resorts. The hotel closed it for financial reasons. Equally lovable was the original **Broadmoor World Arena**, a skating rink across the lake from The Broadmoor hotel. The symphony orchestra would stage a Christmas Pops music and skating show in which Charles Ansbacher, the symphony conductor, would take to the ice dressed as Santa Claus. The Broadmoor West now occupies the site.

The original **Manitou Incline** was an incline railway (counterbalanced cable cars) that carried tourists and townspeople to the top of Mount Manitou. The view of Colorado Springs and Manitou Springs was spectacular. The site has been recycled as the popular Manitou Incline climbing trail.

There are also the lost architectural gems, such as the second **Antlers Hotel** with its twin high towers framing the view of Pikes Peak, the **Burns**

**Theater** on Pikes Peak Avenue downtown and the old **El Paso County Jail Building**.

We could make a much longer list of “gone but not forgotten” eateries, such as **The Hungry Farmer** on Garden of the Gods Road, **Zeb’s** on Eighth Street, the **Craftwood Inn** and the **Tajine Alami** Moroccan restaurant in Manitou Springs.

Please email us your most cherished places that have disappeared in recent decades: [tcronin@coloradocollege.edu](mailto:tcronin@coloradocollege.edu) or [bloevy@coloradocollege.edu](mailto:bloevy@coloradocollege.edu).

• • •

Here are some landmarks that we’re glad are still here:

**Arcade Amusements** in the heart of Manitou Springs is at the top of our list of “still going strong” nostalgic locales. Parents and grandparents take the children there, and even folks in their 80s find excuses to sojourn in the Arcade for a few more pinball machine challenges.

**Navajo Hogan**, a distinctive roadhouse serving food, liquor and entertainment, has been on North Nevada Avenue since 1935. It is distinguished by its neon sign featuring the head of a Native American.

**Luigi’s** Italian restaurant on South Tejon Street has been there since the mid-1950s and is a favorite family dining place still run by its founding family.

**Vallejo’s** on South Corona Street is yet another venerable family-run restaurant. Since 1958, it has served family-style Mexican food in an old, close-to-downtown building.

**Cy’s Drive-In** across from the Uintah Gardens Shopping Center, is a throwback to the 1950s and 1960s. Inside you can look at Elvis Presley

posters as you enjoy your milkshakes and burgers. One of the few local spots to offer curbside in the car ordering and delivery. All you have to do is put on your headlights for a server to come out to take your order.

**Poor Richard's** is a complex of bookstore, toy shop, and restaurant on North Tejon Street downtown. It is a well-established and popular hangout. So too is **Josh & John's Ice Cream**, next to **Kimball's Peak Three Theater**, a much-visited local downtown landmark.

The Broadmoor hotel offers the **Golden Bee** and the **Tavern** as major longtime destinations for tourists and locals.

Manitou Springs boasts a dozen or so fan-favorite places, including **Adams Mountain Café**, the **Keg**, the **Loop** and the **Crystal Park Cantina**. The latter two are fine Mexican food places. The Keg has been on Manitou Avenue for decades. It is a blue-collar dining and drinking locale serving Calicrate Beef from the local **Ranch Foods Direct** operation.

Another prize is **Fargo's Pizza Co.** on East Platte Avenue. It has been there for 46 years and has hosted thousands of birthday parties, family reunions and athletic team celebrations. It is the J.C. Penney of salad bars and pizza, and it also has an arcade game room for restless children.

Other popular places for pizza are **Panino's** and **Roman Villa**.

Another favorite is the historic home-style **Juniper Valley Ranch**, where the food is served in separate bowls and you help yourself to exactly how much you want. The ranch is a scenic 15-mile drive south on Colorado 115.

Distinctive local entertainment venues can be found at **Iron Springs Chateau Dinner Theater** on Ruxton Avenue in Manitou and the aging **Western Jubilee Recording Co.** just east of downtown in Colorado Springs.

**THOMAS E. CRONIN AND ROBERT D. LOEVY**

---

And let's hear it for our local libraries and bookstores — including **Hooked On Books, Barnes & Noble, Books for You**, etc. ... Our local booksellers and librarians are unsung heroes — here and everywhere.

Colorado Springs is blessed with landmark hotels. The original **Antlers** opened two years after the city was founded. The **Cliff House** in Manitou Springs and **The Broadmoor** are ancient and honorable and have hosted a number of presidents and hundreds of celebrities. Think Teddy Roosevelt, Clark Gable, Thomas Edison, Bob Hope and more.

Among our greatest landmarks are our parks — **Monument Valley Park, North Cheyenne Canyon Park, Palmer Park, Garden of the Gods, Memorial Park, Ute Valley Park, Pulpit Rock**, etc. Restaurants and entertainment centers come and go, but let's hope our amazing and invaluable network of parks live on for ages to come.

As the holiday season reminds of cherished memories, let us celebrate these landmark places that have given character and friendship to those of us privileged to live in the Colorado Springs region.

*Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy write regularly on politics and Colorado.*



