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Almost three decades of Phoenix elections have seen mayor and council candidates nominated by the Charter Government Committee, with election being virtually assured (only two candidates in the past twenty-six years have broken this pattern). Thus the CCC has functioned even more successfully than some of the major political machines of the east. Since this group essentially selects the city leadership, we were interested in knowing how representative its membership was of the larger population; therefore we analyzed these men's positions in business, government, and policy-influencing groups, as well as their social and residential patterns. This research into the power structure was followed by an attempted analysis of issues presented as part of the political campaign process. Hopefully, we would uncover both who the CCC members were and what their interests were, as evidenced in policy statements, press releases, and campaign speeches.

Of the 42 names we were able to obtain from CCC and from other sources, we were unable to obtain occupational or other data on seven individuals. Although this is advertised as readily available information, a total membership list had not been published by the press, nor was it available at campaign headquarters. CCC claims to have about 200 members, most of whom are just "citizens". Our list is comprised of people who hold what may be thought of as significant duties within the organization (from the chairman of CCC itself to chairman of operative campaign groups, such as speech coordinator or poll signs); from the results we are going to report it would seem that the

1. Although three of our 42 subjects are women, this paper will use the masculine pronouns and, indeed, will follow reality in treating these women as their husbands' chattel; we feel this has enabled us to acquire the maximum relevant data for our purposes.
"common people" - if there are any - must play comparatively insignificant roles.

A number of industries were highly over-represented on GCC. Furthermore, the statistics available underestimate this relationship, for we are comparing GCC members holding high-level positions (board of directors, owners, executive officers; or in law firms, lawyers) with total employment at all levels (clerical, operative, etc., as well as management). Despite this damping effect, for those members whose business connections we could trace, we found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>% of Phoenix population members employed at all levels</th>
<th>% of GCC members at high levels</th>
<th>GCC members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>law</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps as important as the striking numerical disparity, however, is the fact that these industries, which are logically very important in a rapid-growth area such as Phoenix, are the industries and indeed many of the particular companies shown to be most central in the Phoenix power structure .

Below is McLaughlin's visual representation of the Phoenix power structure, using the Gutman-Lingoes smallest space analysis technique for the area's 92 largest enterprises (in terms of net worth, sales, and minimum number of employees) plus certain other public, semi-public, or charitable organizations. The numbers superimposed on the chart represent SGC members connected to those businesses or organizations (47% of SGC-affiliated are represented in this power structure).
In addition to their capacity to select city government officials, CGC members are themselves heavily represented in state and city government. City involvement is through previous and incumbent councilmen, a former mayor, and numerous direct vendor relationships. CGC members are also currently serving on the State Board of Accountancy, the Agricultural Employment Relations Board, the Civil Rights Advisory Board, the Compensation Fund Board of Directors, and the State Parks Board.

Although the "Phoenix 40", established in February 1975 to fight organized crime and to pursue other civic vigilante endeavors, is essentially composed of the presidents and other high-level executives of a more national group of corporations (several public utilities, the Catholic Diocese, Del Webb Corp., Sperry Rand, Motorola, Greyhound), there are also representatives from many of the local power structure companies. Three of these companies' representatives are also CGC members: Sam Mardian Jr. of Mardian Construction, Newton Rosensweig of Rosensweig Jewelers, and Jarrett Jarvis, lawyer.

Another organization which provides both interaction opportunities and a certain amount of policy influence is the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce. Although we could not get a list of all members, 33% of the CGC members do belong to the social arm of the Chamber (the Phoenix Thunderbirds).

For all their claims to openness, we found it rather difficult to find information about CGC members - especially their private lives. Yet, as we suspected we were dealing with an elite, we wished to know something about their income level and other class indicators. A somewhat obvious index of income in any city is the type and area
of housing. As our map indicates, CGC homes are
concentrated almost exclusively (87.5%) in sections
8 and 2 of the city. This concentration is especially
significant when contrasted with the fact that only
30% of Phoenicians live in these large and beautiful
districts. Not only are these subjectively among the
most desirable areas, however; they are also the areas
of highest education, residential property cost, and
median income: $15,375 and $24,000, compared to Phoenix's
median household income of $11,956. Perhaps more
significant is that 61.5% of the households in the
combined areas have incomes above $15,000 and 36% have
incomes above $25,000.

Indicators of social elites are not readily
obtained in Phoenix, which is one of the many cities
without Social Register, "gentlemen's clubs", or other
measures used by Baitzell and Domhoff. However, there
are three local country clubs of locally high status,
with limited memberships, expensive entry ($4000) and
yearly fees, and admission only by reference from
present members. These are: the Arizona Country Club
(812 members), the Phoenix Country Club (195), and
Paradise Valley Country Club (987). Assuming that there
is no overlap in membership lists, this would mean that
.17% of Phoenix families hold membership in these three
clubs. The membership lists were obtained for Arizona
and Paradise Valley Country Clubs; comparison showed twelve
of the CGC members belonged (28.6%). Half of these club/
CGC members were also members of the Phoenix Thunderbirds,
a club for the Chamber of Commerce. Another 10 CGC
members were Thunderbird members also but were not listed
for either of the two elite clubs.
An attempt was made to analyse the issues which CCG supports in its campaign efforts. This was planned to involve four approaches: interviews of current CCG members; interviews of previous CCG candidates who are now independent incumbents (and regarded as renegades); review of newspaper coverage of CCG activities for the three months prior to the primary election of November 1975; and a review of the campaign literature.

(1) Four CCG members were contacted. Although their responses could be subjectively rated as varying from helpful and friendly to hostile and suspicious, the sum of every conversation was: "Contact Bell Trailer (this year's General Chairman) - I really can't discuss any of this with you." Several attempts to contact Trailer of course were made, but they were successfully parried at the secretarial level. Therefore, there is no substantive information which can be reported from these attempts.

(2) Interviews were secured from two politicians who had formerly been backed by CCG but are now independent: Rosendo Gutierrez and Gary Peter Klahr. Their statements dealt with the candidate selection process as "amorphous and incestuous"; with the main requirements being political experience, quietness, scandal-clean, and the "right background". Klahr in particular saw this background homogeneity as responsible for candidates who, once elected, would not need orders or directions from any particular group, but would "instinctively" make the decisions which would be right for that group. Klahr also saw this process as yielding city council members and mayors who are malleable by the ongoing non-elective city bureaucracies. Therefore, the goal of CCG is to merely not disturb the equilibrium established over the last 26 years in how the city is actually run. To maintain this balance, CCG attempts to depoliticize the political selection process, by keeping it issue free. The public is only
to be presented with an aura of honesty, efficiency, and competency; no issues are to be presented which might either polarize the electorate or require post-election action.

(3) A review of newspapers (the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, both published by the Pulliam Press) for the three months before the primary election found an abundance (approximately one per day, between the two sources) of both editorials and articles referencing the CGC or their candidates. The newspapers have long had a decided pro-Charter Government and pro-Charter Government Committee slant; therefore it was expected that most of these would continue to show that bias, which they did. However, they said little (or, to be more exact: nothing) about what political issues the candidates were concerned with. The only article other than those extolling CGC's record of efficiency and incorruptibility was one which dealt with the desirability of making 30-day jail sentences mandatory for convicted prostitutes. (Since the primary, one of the candidates has courageously taken a public stand against "Smut for Children", as the Arizona Republic of November 26 has succinctly phrased it.)

(4) A visit to CGC headquarters garnered only one piece of campaign literature: a section with photos and experience qualifications of the candidates, and another section to sell the CGC itself. The only issue statement made is: "We are committed to total support of the City Charter as adopted in 1946... This will be our order of priorities:"
IE FACTS ABOUT IARTER GOVERNMENT
if you mean, Charter Government!

in 1968 a 40-member citizens committee was

studied to write a new Charter for the City of

- one which would eliminate politics in city affairs, provide professional management, automatic authority for establishing city policy by the Mayor and six elected Council members, a

administrative authority, and a loose-knit council of

the new City Charter produce the


No. Because the then Council refused to

see the Charter.

sai happened?

The first Charter Government Committee was

used by concerned citizens determined to obtain
true, non-politico-management of city affairs.

They said, "It is the sole purpose of this com-
titee to support and elect a City Council which

roughly understands the new City Charter, j

will direct the management of the City of

in accordance with the Charter.

"On election day this Charter Government

committee will have completed its work and will

end.

Note: Two years later a new group of com-

nieters gathered together and re-formed

new Charter Government Committee to sup-
carry candidates pledged to adhere and abide by

a Charter.

The first Charter Government Council took

office in January of 1960. Under Nicholas Udall

Mayor, the Council, composed of Helen Foster,

jay Goldwater, Margaret Echec, Frank

urry, Harry Rosenweig and Charles Wacker,

implemented the reforms called for in the

ners had adopted two years earlier.

A professional City Manager was employed.

ta and inefficient administration, which

ways accompanies purely political administra-
tion, disappered. The benefits of this stable,

uncontrollable city administration, divorced from

politics, was apparent to all citizens. Two

later a new Charter Government Committee was

formed to support candidates pledged to continue

the reforms and abide by the Charter.

Since that beginning there have been 14 Char-

ter Government Committees, organized by con-

scious, non-politico-minded citizens, for help and

support able candidates pledged to following the

Charter.

is the Charter Government Committee

above made up of the same people?

No. Each new committee has new faces, new

people, joining with some of the older hands to

insure the continuity of Charter Government.

How the efforts of the Charter Government

Committees proved beneficial for the citizens

of Phoenix?

Answer this question for yourself. We have

had 20 years of an efficient, no politics,

management, no scandals. We have had 20 years of

a stable tax rate, 25 years of unprecedented

growth. This city has met the challenge of that

growth, providing adequate streets, sewers, traffic

control, libraries, recreational services, city water,

tax and police protection, and answered every

other legitimate municipal need.

We have had a stable fiscal policy. Our city

enjoys an extremely high credit rating in the

financial markets. Phoenix is recognized for many

of the innovative policies of Charter Government

Councils such as the birth of the Arizona

nates, the establishment of the Convention Center,

the increase in library services, the Central Ordi-

er, the additions to the city park system, and

programs for the disadvantaged.

Most of the great cities in the U.S. are now

overwhelmed with financial problems - increased

taxes and the loss of municipal credit. Phoenix is

truly a stand-out city because here the people

have been able to participate in public

provide city citizens, to prevent political cor-

pugers, and to protect the mechanism they chose
to accomplish these benefits — which is a strong

City Charter which clearly separates policy mak-

ing from administration.

What is the Charter Government

Committee?

A group of representative citizens with a

demonstrated interest in the future of Phoenix.

What does the Charter Government

Committee do?

The committee assists men and women of

competence and community interest who are dedi-

caution in communicating the provisions to the
easel, and willing to serve on Council or as

Mayor.

Is the Charter Government Selection

Committee always made up of the same people?

No. Each year a new group of citizens serves

on the Selection Committee. Continuity is pre-

erved by the participation of some people who

have served in the past. This year's Selection

Committee had a majority of new members.

What is the reason for the tradition that

Council members and Mayors are asked to serve

only two full terms by the Charter Government

Selection Committee?

The citizens asked to serve Council or as

Mayor are not selected because of their political

ambition. It is believed that a longer tenure in

office promotes personal ego and supports personal

political power. Remember, we passed a Constitu-

tion Amendments to prevent the President of the

United States serving more than two terms. The

convention of limited service tends to thwart those

who might desire to become political leaders.

Are Councilmen and members elected with the

support of the Charter Government Committees

always asked to serve in full term?

We are committed to total support of the City

Charter as adopted in 1948.

This will be our order of Priorities:

PUBLIC SAFETY

Police Protection

PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection

Water

Sanitation

CULTURAL, RECREATIONAL and

SOCIAL SERVICES

PHS Charter Representation Committee

John O. Bolen, President

John H. Conner, Secretary

PHS Charter Representation Committee

John O. Bolen, President

John H. Conner, Secretary

PHS Charter Representation Committee

John O. Bolen, President

John H. Conner, Secretary
PUBLIC SAFETY
Police Protection
Fire Protection

PUBLIC SERVICES
Water
Sewers
Streets
Sanitation

CULTURAL, RECREATIONAL, and SOCIAL SERVICES

While these issues are not designed to galvanize the electorate, they are provenly successful in ensuring a continuity in Phoenix's elected officials, to match the stable system of city manager and city bureaucracies. Although many of the fine links have not yet been illuminated, we have seen that there is a group which can classify as a local social and business elite, which effectively is the political group in control of these ismeneless politics.
the pretentious idea
a review of Arizona journalism

it's just a job — page 12
opening the door — page 15
drama makes news — page 16

Go away, kid... Y'bother me!!
Phoenix 40: pulling the media strings

Be fair. Be objective. Be detached.

It goes back to the rules every journalist picks up on Day One. Conflict of interest is anathema to a good newspaper. It is to be avoided.

In Phoenix, a number of major media executives rub shoulders with other influential figures in a group known as "Phoenix 40," which works for the betterment of the community.

Whether it works to create an atmosphere for the betterment of a free press is open to question.

The organization was formed in February 1975 under the guidance of the late publisher of the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, Eugene C. Pulliam. Its elite membership includes:

- top executives from the state's five largest banks (combined assets of more than $6.7 billion);
- top executives from the state's largest employers (including Motorola, Inc., Greyhound Corp., Mountain Bell, the Salt River Project and Arizona Public Service);

Also sharing membership in the 40 are: L. D. "Pat" Murphy, Republic editorial page editor; Loyal Meek, Gazette editor; William R. Shofer, Phoenix Newspapers public relations director; Tom Chauncey, president of KCOI; Radio and TV (CBS); and Karl Eiler, president of Combined Communications, Inc., which owns KTVK Radio and TV (NBC).

According to Murphy, the 40 has no minority members or women among its ranks. He said at least six women in the Phoenix area were asked to join the group, but all declined because of other commitments.

"We don't have any one-legged black on the 40 just so we can have a minority member," Murphy said.

"That would be tokenism..."

Murphy said the 40 wised people who could "pick up the phone and get things done..."

"In less than 60 days (after the group's formation) we got three major pieces of legislation passed."

— Murphy

With nearly all power takers covered — banks, utilities, bus business and the media — the 40 has the potential for wielding a lot of clout.

Murphy, one of the group's organizers, said citizen involvement in the community prompted its formation. He said the crime situation in Phoenix was the main priority because no one was doing anything about it.

The 40's goal was to bring the "movers and shakers" into action, he said, adding:

"In less than 60 days (after the group's formation) we got three major pieces of legislation passed."

Murphy, as top man in the editorial department of the state's largest newspaper, editorialized in favor of the legislation but denied that the 40 influenced his position.

The question that arises is whether the media can remain objective news disseminators or analysts while top executives are involved in a group with the power and influence of the Phoenix 40. They insist they can.

"It probably does damage our credibility somewhat. And our independence."

— Meek

Walsh maintains that Phoenix Newspapers, Inc. speaks for itself and is not influenced by Phoenix 40 activities. He says he is an objective newsmen.

"I have never utilized my news position to try to promote something I was personally involved in," he said.

But Gazette Editor Meek, while insisting his position on the 40 doesn't color what his paper prints, had this to say: "I'm a member of the Phoenix 40 only because I am editor of the Gazette and not because I'm my own editor."

Meek denied any collusion between the group and its media members to protect Phoenix 40 issues and proposals in a favorable light.

"They're not a pressure group in the sense that they would attempt to sway our editorial judgment," he said. "So far as the Phoenix 40 affecting what the Gazette may say or do, there has been no problem with that at all and I don't anticipate any..."

Meek said the 40 has never discussed the possibility after the public might misinterpret the relationship between the media and the rest of their group. But he admitted that relationship might have hurt the paper's credibility.

Meek said he thought people might conclude that there is some collusion between the two, but suggested the public has a different image of the Phoenix 40 than the group has of itself.

"It probably does damage our credibility somewhat. And our independence," he said.

However, as an editor, Meek said it is helpful to him to hear the views on community problems of men who (Continued on Page 4)
If the Phoenix 40 has no control over the media, why do the papers consistently agree with Phoenix 40 statements and positions?

Meek told the PI that if the Gazette ever took a stand opposite to that of the group, "we'd probably have to dissociate ourselves from the Phoenix 40." But, according to Meek, there is a slim chance of that ever occurring.

"I'm relying on Mr. Pulliam's judgment in having fired me in the first place," he said.

"From this I assume I will have a contribution to make to whatever objective the Phoenix 40 might undertake."

Phoenix Newspapers PR Director Shover said, "Our newspaper has never been dictated to by any group. Most newspapermen, he said, are too independent to let anyone tell them what to do.

"We try to keep our papers independent," Shover said. "My side of the Phoenix 40 is what goes on in the community not trying to get the Phoenix 40 into the paper."

KTRK President Idler said the 40 has never asked him to slant news in its favor and that his stations have "handled it like many other editors and I wouldn't ask them to handle it any other way."

"Our broadcast policy is not to take sides," he said. "We do not editorialize on Phoenix 40 policies and we go out of our way to be objective and fair."

Maricopa County Attorney Moise Berger claims he is a victim of a concerted attack by both the Phoenix 40 and the Republican and Gazette. Berger ran against the group because he failed to prosecute 'land-fraud' figure Ned Warren on charges of improperly influencing public officials when a key witness's testimony was found to be unreliable.

On Sept. 9, 1975, the Phoenix 40 issued a report blasting Berger's handling of the county attorney's office, charging him with incompetence and lackadaisical prosecution of organized crime.

In a Sept. 11, 1975, news release Berger said: "We have a monopolistic newspaper that is a member of the Phoenix 40 that has been trying to control the people of this town. It does not speak for the people. It speaks for its own interests and the interests of the group it favors, like the Phoenix 40, of which it is a member."

"If I were to be replaced as editor, I would no longer be on the Phoenix 40," Meek said.

Burger also accused Phoenix Newspapers and the 40 of suppressing news about "friends of the newspapers." He alleged that the papers had underplayed stories concerning his prosecution of U.S. Sen. Paul J. Fannin, a Phoenix Republican, on drunken driving charges, and about a multi-million dollar bank loan default involving fallen San Diego Innskeeper C. Anthony Smith and the Phoenix-based Valley National Bank.

After the news release there were at least 38 articles and three editorials in the Republican and Gazette concerning Berger's handling of the county attorney's office. A red ink headline on page one of the Sept. 8 Gazette read: "Survey shows 45% Disapprove of Way Berger Handles Job." The survey was commissioned by the Greyhound Core, whose president, Raymond Shaffer, is a 40 member.

On Sept. 14, a Republic editorial titled "Mr. Burger is confused," written by Murphy, called for the controversial county attorney's resignation. The Gazette followed suit the next day with an editorial headlined "Burger Should Resign."

In October, Burger yielded, announcing that he would not seek re-election.

Immediately the volume of articles about him dropped off, and in November the Republican and Gazette editorially praised Berger's decision. From October 1975 until February 1976, a check of both papers showed only two articles on Berger.

In response to Berger's claims of conspiracy between the media and the 40 to force him from office, Idler said: "Anyone who was not doing his job and had been singled out for not doing his job might say the same thing."

Walsh then denies any collusion between the 40 and the newspapers to force Berger out of office. He also denied that news stories were slanted against the county attorney.

"I think you're wrong in simply saying that the papers were going after Berger in news stories," Walsh said. "I would say that that is not right."

Nonetheless, where Berger is concerned, the record shows at least 38 articles published in September preceding his decision not to seek re-election.

Republic Managing Editor Hareff K. Milks denied any effort to slant news stories against Berger. Milks said he was a member of the 40 and declined comment about the group. And, he said he received no publisher's directives concerning Berger.

But does a publisher have to hand a writer a complete written order of his editors about policy decisions?

"When you've been in the business as long as I have, you know just how," said Pat Murphy. "When you sit with a publisher every day after day or just get a five-minute exposure on this subject or that subject... You just have a feel of what is good judgment, what is common sense, what the institution or what the publisher feels without having to write it down."

The PI talked to other state newspaper editors about the potential for conflict of interest when journalists get involved in groups such as the Phoenix 40.

Scottsdale Progress Editor-Publisher Jonathan Marshall was not asked to join the 40 and said he wouldn't anyway because "I don't agree with their ideals."

(Continued On Page 19)
a vote against
the straw poll

(60 per cent), while Priscilla Kahn got 78 votes (18.3 per cent) and Douglas C. Kennedy drew only 19 votes (16.5 per cent).

After the ballots had been counted for the Sept. 4 primary, the Citizen reported that:

Garcia was the Ward 4 winner, receiving 2,702 votes (58.1 per cent). Arnold received 1,588 votes (41.7 per cent).

Douglas Kennedy was the Ward 2 winner with 1,455 votes (34.5 per cent). Kuha received 1,405 votes (33.3 per cent) and Richard Kennedy received 1,355 votes (32.1 per cent).

How could the results be so different?

One point was made in the last paragraph of the straw ballot report:

Because the primary election for the council candidates is strictly within each ward, the results of the average straw balloting could prove far different from what actually happens.

But the most basic reason for the disparity was the Citizen’s failure to follow the major basic rule of polling: Be sure that every segment of the population is properly represented.

According to Dr. Raymonde V. Bowers, who has conducted survey research and on for 20 years, one straw ballot — which aired the Feb. 4, ‘76, reader to vote on the issue of University of Arizona surgery professor Dr. Irleit Packock was “...fraught with so many classes as to make the results meaningless.”

In a Feb. 6 letter to Citizen Editor Paul A. McCallip, Bowers cited four biases and posed two questions on the purpose of the poll.

Bowers contended that the Citizen:

• Cannot know how representative its readers are of the Tucson public.

• Cannot know how representative the respondents are of all Citizen readers.

• Does not know how much the readers know about the issue or how useful their opinions are and

• Has no way of preventing the ballot box from being “stuffed.”

Bowers letter was never printed. But McCallip did reply to selected portions of it in his “Letters from the editor” column of Feb. 11.

In an interview, Bowers said that the “many” represented “an unknown one per cent or an unknown segment of the population. We don’t know who they are or what they think, if society they represent.”

Citizen Associate Editor Tony Silettt told the PI that the straw ballots “make interesting copy.”

“...they are fairly accurate. I think there’s no better of wider group of people than our readers in the community.”

“Just because they’re unscientific doesn’t mean they’re not valid,” Silettt added.

The front-page results of the Peacock poll on the Apr. 13 defeated the idea. The governing and co-chair emphasized that the authority, for the conclusions came from readers responding to a straw ballot.

The headline on page one read:

“By 2-1, straw ballots say Peacock should leave UA.”

Headlines announcing the results of an April 12, 1974, straw ballot were less “‘insensitive.”

The results of the poll, carried on the News page, were headlined:

“Tucsonans angered, frustrated by threat of ‘busing’; this ballot, which ran April 1, was also different in that it appeared along with an editorial stating:

“Not does the Citizen believe that order children bused out of their neighborhoods is in any way desirable, to the Citizen has issued in several editorials.

Grover Banks, president of the Tucson chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, questioned whether “forced busing” was the issue face “tucsonans.”

He said the issue is being how the schools will be desegregated.

Banks said the Citizen’s use of “emotionally loaded” words, such as “disputed,” “forced busing,” “federal government’s threat,” and “fighting in explaining the

‘an unknown one per cent of an unknown segment of the population’