

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**

---

*Drawing the Line*

“The Unfinished Revolution: Beyond ‘One Person, One Vote’ ” by Bruce Adams, in *National Civic Review* (Jan. 1978), 47 E. 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.

The U.S. Supreme Court decisions of the mid-1960s requiring periodic reapportionment—the decennial division of states into legislative districts for voting purposes—on the basis of “one person, one vote” eliminated the gross population inequalities among legislative districts.

However, “the reapportionment revolution remains unfinished,” according to Adams, a senior official of Common Cause, the self-styled national citizens’ lobby. With no standards other than substantial population equality to guide them, the state legislatures have been free to draw districts of bizarre configuration designed to serve personal and partisan ends. The intent is to produce the greatest number of legislative victories for the majority party by fragmenting or isolating minority party votes.

Such gerrymandering, says Adams, dilutes the value of citizen political participation, makes legislators less responsive to their constituents, and enfeebles political parties by allowing them to field weak candidates.

The next reapportionment will take place in 1981 (after the 1980 census) and Adams argues that now is the time for states to reform their procedures. What is required, he contends, is the establishment of rigorous antigerrymandering standards and the creation of independent, nonpartisan commissions to draw the lines of state legislative and congressional districts.

*Locking the Door on the Suburbs*

“Self-Interest in the Suburbs: The Trend toward No-Growth Zoning” by Michelle J. White, in *Policy Analysis* (Spring 1978), University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif. 94720.

Under the banner of “no-growth,” suburban communities in the United States have been passing zoning ordinances that severely restrict the construction of any type of new housing. Justified by its advocates as an environmental safeguard, no-growth zoning has achieved a degree of respectability and has survived several key court challenges. Yet it is primarily intended to benefit residents at the expense of outsiders, says White, a University of Pennsylvania economist.

What makes the no-growth movement important is the rapid shift of business and industry from central cities to the suburbs. Without affordable suburban housing, low-income city residents must face long, costly commuting trips if they wish to compete for suburban jobs.

No-growth policies differ from traditional exclusionary zoning. Instead of using zoning to encourage higher-priced residential growth that will bring tax revenues greater than the expected cost of added