

# Michigan Political History Society NEWS

Vol. 7, No. 2

Michigan Political History Society • P.O. Box 4684 • East Lansing, MI 48826-4684

Winter 2002

## Michigan State AFL-CIO relives slices of its history

On October 4, 2001, the Michigan Political History Society in cooperation with the Michigan State AFL-CIO presented a special program titled "The AFL-CIO—Where It Came From And Its Impact On Michigan." Mark T. Gaffney, president of Michigan State AFL-CIO, served as Master of Ceremonies of this historical role-playing event, which featured

speakers narrating select historical happenings from the union's history.

Mark Gaffney began the evening's historical chronicling with a review of the Knights of Labor, the early national AFL, and the early national CIO. Walt Campbell, former secretary-treasurer of Michigan State AFL-CIO, followed with financial reports and the telling of anecdotes about the union's past. Governor George Romney's signing of PERA, the public employee bargaining order, was recounted by Ralph Liberato,

Photos by MPHS Director Sharran Moore



An attendee looks at photo display.

years, including a discussion of Ted Sachs's reapportionment and the 1982 recommendations for governor. A series of historical committee reports followed featuring speakers Ed Scribner, former president of the Metro-Detroit AFL-CIO, Douglas

*Continued on page 2*



Michigan State AFL-CIO President Mark Gaffney chronicles union's history.

former political director of Council 55, Council 11, and Council 25, AFSCME. Derrick Quinney, Michigan State AFL-CIO Occupational Safety and Health Director, and Tim Hughes, Legislative Director, presented an update on current legislation of the union's early

## Michigan's redistricting before *Apol*\* is explained

by Robert S. LaBrant

Under the provisions of Michigan's first (1835) constitution, both houses of the legislature were elected from multi-member districts in proportion to numbers in the population. However, new settlers from the east pressured the constitution-makers of 1850 to depart

from the equal-population principle so that their sparsely settled counties could elect their own representatives. A revised apportionment formula in the 1850 constitution provided that a newly organized county could obtain separate representation when its population reached "a moiety of the ratio of representation."\*\*

*Continued on page 2*

### At a Glance

<b>AFL-CIO Event</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Redistricting</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Koopman Talk</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Politics &amp; Christianity</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Glenn Allen</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Annual Meeting</b>	<b>8</b>

# AFL-CIO history *Continued from page 1*

Fraser, former president of the International U.A.W., and Candy Landers, Secretary-Treasurer Local 24, Hotel and Restaurant Workers.

In addition, the audience received handouts chronologically detailing significant political and legislative events of Michigan's labor movement. In its next issue, the *MPHS News* will feature selected information from the handouts' timelines. The article will also describe how and why the Michigan State AFL-CIO became more politically involved during the twentieth century. The Michigan State AFL-CIO furnished the handouts.

The evening's organizers included MPHS members Laura Paige, Kevin Kelly, Sharman Moore, and Gina Nelson, with Laura Paige chairing the organizing committee. Laura Paige credits Mark Gaffney with doing "a lot of the work. He selected the presenters and put

together the entire program. We would not have had a successful program without him."

MPHS extends sincere thanks to Mark Gaffney and the AFL-CIO staff, Patti Reid, AFL-CIO president's secretary, who sent out invitations, Mary Holbrook, Director of Information Systems, for putting together the invitations, and Tim Hughes, for helping with handouts, for serving as a speaker,

and for putting the easel of old photos together (see accompanying photo).

The MPHS also thanks MPHS member Joyce Crum for all the secretarial help she provided.

MGTV taped the meeting and has video copies available upon request. Videos cost \$25 plus \$5 shipping and handling. Call MGTV at (517) 373-4250 to purchase a copy. ■

## Write for the News

The *MPHS News* invites writers to submit articles for publication. We are looking for well-researched Michigan political history pieces. Excerpts from book-length Michigan political histories or biographies are fine. We also appreciate book reviews for newly published books on political history or past political personalities.

For detailed information on submissions, send a self-addressed, stamped envelope to the editor, Delores Rauscher, 412 Marshall St., East Lansing MI 48823. If you prefer, send an e-mail to the editor at rausche5@msu.edu, and she will send you the guidelines as an attachment.

## Redistricting *Continued from page 1*

The upper peninsula won special protection through a provision guaranteeing that area at least three representatives and one senator regardless of population. At the same time, the Michigan Senate was divided into single-member districts over the objections of Democrats at the constitutional convention who feared that parochial representation of special interests would develop in a single-districted system.

In 1908 a third constitution was adopted, which extended the rural-small town advantage of "moiety" representation to all counties and dropped the special provision for the upper peninsula. The legislature was required by this constitution to reapportion after every federal census, but failed to do so after the 1930 and 1940 censuses. By 1950 over half the population lived in the Detroit metropolitan area, but the residents of this area elected only 27 percent of the House of Representatives. Urban voters initiated constitutional amendments to restore equal-population apportionment in 1924, 1930, 1932, and 1952, but all of these proposed amendments were defeated by the electorate. In 1952 an alternative "balanced legislature" amendment, initiated and supported by the Michigan Farm Bureau, was adopted, guaranteeing area representation in the Senate but preserving the moiety clause for the House. (Area representation in the Senate was based on single-member districts whose geographical boundaries, written into the constitution, were unrelated to population but provided

districts of approximately equal territorial size.) The only significant change provided districts apportioned by the Board of State Canvassers if the legislature failed to carry out its decennial duty.

In 1959 Democratic and labor groups decided to turn to the courts for reapportionment relief. Gus Scholle, President of the Michigan AFL-CIO, filed suit in the Michigan Supreme Court arguing that the 1952 apportionment formula violated the due process and

“ In 1959 labor groups decided to turn to the courts for reapportionment relief. ”

equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. The state Supreme Court rejected the suit as non-justiciable, and Scholle appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which consolidated the Michigan case with the Tennessee case of *Baker v. Carr*.\*\*\*

In the meantime, in April 1961 the voters approved a call for a constitutional convention composed of one delegate from each House and Senate district. In the subsequent election of delegates, in October 1961, 99 Republicans and 45 Democrats were elected. The two parties proposed competing apportionment plans for the new constitution. The Republican-proposed apportionment

formula weighted representation in both houses by 80 percent population, 20 percent area. The GOP also proposed creation of a bipartisan apportionment commission, with recourse to the state Supreme Court in the event of a deadlock. The Democratic proposal mandated equal-population districts for the legislature.

While delegates to the constitutional convention were debating the merits of competing Democratic and Republican apportionment plans, the U.S. Supreme Court announced its decision in *Baker* and remanded the Michigan *Scholle* case to the state Supreme Court for reconsideration in the light of *Baker*. In spite of this dramatic development, however, the Michigan convention approved the Republican apportionment proposal by a straight party-line vote. The new constitution was ratified in April 1963, making the legal challenge to the 1952 apportionment formula moot.

The new bipartisan Apportionment Commission was composed of eight members, four each of whom were appointed by the major parties' state central committees from constitutionally defined regions of the state. Predictably, the commission deadlocked and several rounds of litigation ensued. In June 1964 the plan proposed by two Democratic commissioners was finally ordered into effect by the Democratic majority of the state Supreme Court. In 1965 and 1966, 34 Republican citizens challenged the apportionment as a violation of state constitutional standards, arguing that political subdivision boundaries should not have been subordinated to a single federal standard of strict mathematical equality. They also complained that the plan was an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander, alleging that the Democratic commissioners had used data to draw district lines which would maximize Democratic strength and minimize Republican representation. The case was dismissed by an evenly divided state Supreme Court, and the appeal was rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court. Partisan judicial voting in the Michigan apportionment cases increased the bitterness of the contests for control of the legislature, as well as contributing to the growing stridency of the judicial elections.

The 1964 apportionment established single-member districts for both the 38-member Senate and the 110-member House. The population distribution was "the most equal" in the nation at the time, with a population variation of less than one percent in any one district from the average district population. County, city and township boundaries were frequently crossed to equalize the population of districts.

“  
**Democrats had the upper hand in the redistricting struggle because they controlled the Supreme Court.**  
”

In the 1962 election, which was based on the 1954 apportionment, 55.9 percent of the vote for the House members was Democratic, yielding to the Democrats 47.2 percent of the seats; in the Senate, 51.7 percent of the vote produced 33.3 percent of the seats for Democrats, clearly under-representing Democratic voters. In the 1964 election, based on the new apportionment, 57.3 percent of the vote for House candidates was Democratic, giving the Democrats 65.1 percent of the seats, and 58.1 percent of the vote for the Senate went to Democrats giving the Democratic candidates 60.5 percent of the seats. While this pattern might be expected to result from equal-population districts whose boundaries were drawn by Democrats, the effect did not carry over to a second election. In 1966 Republicans regained control of both houses. National political tides—Democratic in 1964 and Republican in 1966—exerted their pull in Michigan as elsewhere, apparently outweighing districting. In 1968, however, the Democrats recaptured the House and in 1970 tied in the Senate.

The 1970 census was the first population count to show the people in Michigan's suburbs outnumbering those in the cities.

In meetings of the Apportionment

Commission, 19 redistricting plans failed of majority approval. Twelve plans proposed by the four Democratic members and seven proposed by the four Republicans were rejected by 4–4 votes after little or no discussion. On January 28, 1972, the final day it could lawfully act, the commission spent the last two hours in continuous recess because neither party wanted it said that its members walked out first. At midnight the commission adjourned, and the issue moved to the Michigan Supreme Court.

Throughout commission proceedings, it was known that the Democrats had the upper hand in the redistricting struggle because they controlled the state Supreme Court.

The Republican commissioners filed their redistricting plan with the state Supreme Court on February 18, 1972, with equal-

population districts that varied in population by less than one-tenth of one percent. The following day the Democratic commissioners filed their proposal, a plan which had not been submitted to the commission and which reduced population variances to less than one-hundredth of one percent.

Republicans charged that the Democratic plan (called the Hatcher-Kleiner plan, after its sponsors) was illegal and unconstitutional because it had not been previously submitted to the commission. The Michigan Supreme Court upheld the Democratic plan by a 4–3 vote. Republican Governor Milliken assailed the court's decision as "a politically motivated attempt to gerrymander the state to assure Democratic control of the legislature."

In the 1972 election, which was based on the new apportionment, the House Democratic majority increased from 58 to 60 out of 110 seats. In 1974 the House majority increased to 66 seats, while the Senate, which had been tied at 19–19 between the two parties for four years, was converted to a 24–14 Democratic majority. The Democratic Party increased its majority to a 70–40 edge in the 1978 election.

In 1973, a new element was injected into the ongoing debate by the U.S.

*Continued on page 4*

## 1952 House Apportionment



Source: *Reapportionment of the Michigan Legislature*, Citizens Research Council of Michigan, 1952.

## 1984 House Apportionment



Source: *Michigan Manual*, State of Michigan, 1984

Supreme Court's opinion in *Mahan v. Howell*, which allowed a 16.4 percent variation in Virginia's state legislative apportionment. The Republican Apportionment Commissioners tried to reopen the debate that had preceded the 1972 decision. They filed a suit in the state Supreme Court asking that the 1972 Republican plan be substituted for the Hatcher-Kleiner plan on the grounds that the GOP plan, which violated fewer political boundaries, constituted a "rational policy" supportable under the standards of *Mahan v. Howell*. However, by a vote of 4-3 the Court rejected the suit.

A second challenge in the courts was mounted to contest the structure of the Apportionment Commission itself. In August 1973 the plaintiffs filed a suit in federal district court alleging that Michigan's constitutional provision requiring minor-party candidates to win 25 percent of the statewide vote for governor in order to win seats on the Apportionment Commission violated the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The plaintiffs also challenged the right of political parties, which have a vested interest in the outcome, to appoint the commission's members. Finally, they

“ Dennis O. Cawthorne introduced a constitutional amendment to make the Apportionment Commission “independent and nonpartisan.” ”

argued that the commission itself was apportioned unconstitutionally, since its members were appointed from districts of grossly unequal population.

Early in 1975 a three-judge federal district court upheld the constitutionality of the Apportionment Commission against all claims, a judgment upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court later in the year.

Having failed to overturn the state's apportionment process in the courts, Republican leaders, joined by foes of the partisan character of the process, returned to the legislature for relief. In 1978 House Republican leader Dennis O. Cawthorne introduced a constitutional amendment to make the Apportionment Commission "independent and nonpartisan." He proposed that one member each be selected by the majority and minority leaders of the two houses of the legislature; these four members would in turn choose a chairman. The commission would be assigned the tasks of both legislative and congressional districting; prompt review would be available in the state Supreme Court. The key feature of the Cawthorne plan was the tie-breaking chairman, who would have to be acceptable to both sides and therefore could presumably mediate conflict. Common Cause

supported the proposal, but there were not enough votes in the legislature to put it on the ballot.

In November 1978 an issue automatically placed on the ballot every 16 years gave the voters an opportunity to call a constitutional convention. While this would have opened an alternative path to changing the structure of the Apportionment Commission, it was rejected by an overwhelming 76.7 percent of Michigan's voters, who were apparently reluctant to open up the general constitutional revision process.

The key role of the state Supreme Court in reapportioning the state in 1982 was widely recognized. By 1980 the Apportionment Commission was assumed to be irrelevant because its members,

evenly divided between the two parties were expected to dead-lock automatically. The Court after the 1980 election was composed of three Democrats, three Republicans and one Independent—Justice Charles L. Levin, who had formed his own Nonpartisan Judicial Party in 1972. Justice Levin and Republican Chief Justice Mary S. Coleman, the two members of the Court whose terms expired in 1980, were both reelected in November. Justice Levin therefore appeared to hold the key to the shape of Michigan legislative politics for the eighties.

*Robert S. LaBrant is senior vice-president, Political Affairs and General Counsel for the Michigan Chamber of*

*Commerce (1977 to present). His professional expertise is in campaign finance and election law, lobby law, and legislative/congressional redistricting.*

Redistricting standards used by Bernie Apol in 1982 and codified in 1996 that limited the way state legislative districts could be drawn. Key features of the standards included provisions that limited the breaking of county, city and township boundaries, and provided for an acceptable variation in population between districts.

*Moiety*, a method of calculating ratio of representation that seems to have originated in Michigan, limits the applicability of the ratio of representation. When a specified area (a county) attained a population equal to one-half the ratio of representation, it was entitled to a representative. (Editor)

Case decided March 1962. Decision forced state legislatures to redistrict state legislative seats to reflect urbanization. (Editor) ■

## Book talk highlights Paul Henry's contribution to Christian political thought

On September 18, 2001, the Michigan Political History Society hosted a book talk featuring Douglas L. Koopman, who discussed his newly released book *Serving the Claims of Justice: The Thoughts of Paul B. Henry* (see book review in this issue of the *News*). Activists of both major political parties attended the event, including many who had worked with Henry when he served in the state legislature.

Douglas Koopman, Associate Professor of Political Science at Calvin College and Program Director of the Paul B. Henry Institute, has long been active in practical politics, serving fifteen years as a personal, committee, and leadership staff person in the U.S. House of Representatives. For nearly three of those fifteen years he worked in close association with Congressman Henry. Professor Koopman's close association with Congressman Henry gave him a broad understanding of Henry's approach to public-policy issues and his contribution to the understanding of Christian political thought.

Koopman's talk canvassed Henry's personal character and political views and explained the main tenets of his political

philosophy. He also welcomed audience questions and participation in the discussion. His thorough understanding of Henry's ideas allowed him to move beyond discussion of the book and to answer the audience's questions about how Henry would respond to current events. For instance, when asked whether Congressman Henry would support President Bush's decision to attack Afghanistan, Koopman affirmed that Henry would have considered it the just thing to do, irrespective of the religious beliefs of those responsible for the attack on America. The audience's questions and comments revealed a high bipartisan regard for Congressman Henry and added force to Koopman's speculation about what political heights Henry might have reached had he not lost his battle with brain cancer in 1993.

Koopman also provided information about the Paul B. Henry Institute, established at Calvin College in 1997 and dedicated to promoting "serious reflection on the interplay between Christianity and public life" (*Serving the Claims of Justice*, 287). The institute serves as a national

Photo by MPHS Vice-President Barbara Sawyer-Koch



**Douglas Koopman (right) and MPHS President Peter Kuhnmuensch.**

resource for scholars, journalists, and others engaged in the study of Christianity and politics. He described in some detail the Paul B. Henry Semester in Washington, D.C., offered during Calvin College's spring semester. The Henry Institute presents this study program in cooperation with the Washington Center for Internships and Experiential Learning. (For more information visit the Henry Institute web site at <http://www.calvin.edu/henry/core.htm>.)

*Barbara J. Sawyer-Koch contributed to this article.* ■

# Serving the Claims of Justice: The Thoughts of Paul B. Henry

By Douglas L. Koopman

Foreword by David S. Broder. Paul B. Henry Institute, 2001. 286 pp. \$14.95. Available at bookstore@calvin.edu.

Reviewed by Barbara J. Sawyer-Koch.

*Serving the Claims of Justice* celebrates the life and work of U.S. Congressman Paul Henry. For his book, Douglas Koopman provides twelve of Henry's papers, which Koopman then nicely complements with nine essays from those who knew Henry well

Photo courtesy of Paul B. Henry Institute, Calvin College



Paul B. Henry, early 1980s.

in his various roles as a political philosophy professor, Michigan state legislator, and member of Congress.

In the foreword, nationally syndicated columnist David S. Broder calls Paul Henry a notable exception to the cynical journalistic caricature of "the political class." Broder says that even though Henry worked in an "atmosphere of rancid partisanship," he made it known to his colleagues that he intended to get things done. They, in turn, responded positively to his motivation. In fact, he was such a forceful personality in that regard "that others found it embarrassing to be cynical."

This book's insights into Henry's personal character and political views are especially useful to seasoned readers interested in politics, particularly its moral and religious dimensions. It also aids the larger mission of the Paul Henry Institute

to prompt public discussion of the interplay between religious faith and political practice.

Koopman does an excellent job of selecting the Henry papers included in the book and in tracking Henry's developing philosophy and wisdom from his days as a doctoral student at Duke University to the citizen-statesman he was at his death in 1993 at the age of 51. Without proselytizing, the material presented illustrates how Henry integrated his own vibrant Christian faith with high level public service. Just as Henry did in his academic and political life, the writings bring views about faith and public life into the open to be addressed with thoughtfulness and civility.

Two compelling themes come to light: First, Paul Henry had a substantial faith in America's governmental and political party systems and individuals' involvement in them. "Political involvement," he said, "means seeking justice in and through the public institutional structures." He continually urged Christians to get involved in American politics. A member of the Reformed Christian Church, Henry chides politically conservative Christians about their view of the legitimacy of politics, the issues on which they choose to focus, and their style of activism. Koopman identifies a thread in Henry's early writings wherein he criticizes evangelical Christians for what Henry calls a "deadened social conscience." Henry called on evangelicals "to expand their concerns beyond individual salvation to wider social problems," particularly racial injustice, poverty, global infant mortality, the arms race and world hunger. Rather than focusing on single moral issues, he suggests it is better for religious institutions to "associate with the principles of justice at the more abstract level" and to encourage persons of faith to become actively engaged in political activism within existing political structures.

Secondly, the Henry writings and the observations demonstrate how Henry integrated his Christian faith into his political beliefs. He called upon the Christian community to recognize that

civic involvement is in itself a legitimate form of Christian service. For instance, in an excerpt from one of Henry's books called *Politics for Evangelicals*, Henry writes that civic involvement "must begin if we are serious about bringing God's Word to bear on man's social existence."

In contrast to the popular concept of politics as the struggle among competing self-interests, Henry defines politics as the just allocation of resources among the entire citizenry. For Henry, practicing politics and engaging in political justice should be one in the same thing. Henry writes:

Justice is the giving to every man his proper due. The Christian who enters politics must do so with the aim of achieving political justice. He does this by subjecting his own personal ambitions and desires to the scrutiny of God's revelation in the Scriptures. And as God gives the grace to do so, he learns to make the needs of his neighbor his own.

The practical application of this conception of political justice is demonstrated in

## Michigan Political History NEWS

is published three times each year  
by the Michigan Political  
History Society,  
P.O. Box 4684,  
East Lansing, MI 48826-4684

**President**

Peter Kuhnmuensch

**Vice President**

Barbara J. Sawyer-Koch

**Secretary/Treasurer**

Kevin A. Kelly

**Past President**

Robert S. LaBrant

**Legal Counsel**

Tom Downs

**Editor**

Delores Rauscher

Henry's discussions of seven policy issues, ranging from prison reform to environmental issues. In his contributed essay, entitled "Hands and Feet to Faith," U.S. Senator Mark O. Hatfield points out that "Henry fought to wrestle justice from abstract concepts and unattainable ideals and to bring justice into the lives of every individual as a concrete reality."

Christians who have studied the concept of servant leadership from the spiritual perspective may interpret Henry's leadership style and values to be based on living the life of a servant leader. The following biblical quotation is often referenced as the origin of this concept: "Whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant and whoever wants to be first must be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Matthew 20:25-28). In other words,

“Justice is the giving to every man his proper due.”

one who leads in the style of Jesus leads people without the use of coercion or dependence on institutional position for authority. Instead, by serving people, he leads as they recognize his ability and choose voluntarily to follow. Paul Henry had a reputation for appropriately dealing with the uses, legitimacy, and requisite ethical constraints of power in daily life and in his roles in government. This focus may explain Henry's belief that justice is at the heart of politics and the right of all individuals.

Henry's goal to bring justice "into the lives of every individual" gives his philosophy broader application beyond the Christian community. Says Koopman, Henry argued "for the American political system's compatibility with Christian principles without requiring America's founders to have a firm or self-consciously Christian worldview." The securing of dignity and rights for all individuals is of course a key goal of our republican form of government. Since Henry's ethical and moral applications of political justice and the assurances of liberty and equality are also integral concerns of our federal and state governments, Henry's writings speak to non-Christian and secular politicians as well as to Christians.

Paul Henry was known as a person of

## For Judge Glenn Allen, some disappointments proved fortuitous

As the late Judge Glenn Allen\* saw it, a couple of disappointing incidents during his lifetime may actually have proved to be good fortune in disguise. One incident was the Depression Era bank closures in 1933 and another was the loss of his seat as mayor of Kalamazoo in 1958. Although the incidents seem fortuitous only in retrospect, they may have helped him become what Governor Engler called, "one of Michigan's distinguished public servants."

Born in 1914 Glenn Allen spent roughly the first half of his life in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and the last half in the Lansing area. As a child he attended the normal school at Western Michigan University and then University High School.

In the fall of 1932, he was pleased to attend Amherst College. His stay there was cut short because of the financial crisis of the early thirties. "I was there [at Amherst] in 1933 when all the banks closed," explained Allen, "I didn't have enough money to eat; I sold my saxophone in order to get enough money to eat." Regardless of Allen's personal sacrifices, his father still could not find money enough for Allen to continue his education at Amherst, so Allen instead walked the three blocks from his parents' home to the campus of Kalamazoo College and finished his undergraduate work there. At the time

integrity, conviction, credibility, and courage, who successfully integrated his faith into his politics. His academic and political careers were characterized by a constant search for justice, providing powerful evidence that politicians can be principled and effective. Doug Koopman is to be applauded for commemorating this special man in such a fitting tribute.

(See related article, MPHS book talk with Doug Koopman, in this issue of the News)

Photo courtesy of State Archives of Michigan



Judge Glenn Allen

Allen thought himself very unfortunate to have to quit Amherst, but he later came to believe that this misfortune proved helpful to his later career. "I don't think I ever would have been mayor of Kalamazoo if I had graduated and stayed at Amherst," said Allen.

His undergraduate work completed, Allen earned his law degree in 1939 at Columbia University in New

York City. He then served as law clerk to two Michigan Supreme Court justices.

His service to the state of Michigan began in 1941 when he won a seat on the Kalamazoo City Council, getting just enough votes to win the last of the seven possible seats.

After only about a year on the council, World War II pulled him out of the council and into the military. He received an appointment as an assistant judge advocate and also became a second lieutenant of the 94<sup>th</sup> Infantry Division. He earned four battle stars and a Bronze Star. His infantry division fought at the Battle of the Bulge in George Patton's Army. He was also a legal adviser to General Patton.

By 1951 Allen was back in Kalamazoo and that year received the most votes in the race for Kalamazoo City Council, thereby automatically winning the mayor's seat. He thought that the council pushed through at least three important measures during his tenure: cleaning up the river, extending the boundaries and thereby doubling the

*Continued on page 8*

*Barbara J. Sawyer-Koch is vice-president of the Michigan Political History Society. She is currently a member of the YWCA Board, of Zonta International, and consultant to the Athena Foundation, and she is former administrator of the Michigan Department of Treasury. She is also trustee emeritus of Michigan State University. She holds a master's in public administration from Michigan State University. ■*

Please highlight and  
Mark Your Calendar  
for the

## Michigan Political History Society Annual Meeting

March 2, 2002, at 9:00 a.m.

Michigan State  
Medical Society Building

120 West Saginaw Street  
East Lansing, Michigan

# Judge Glenn Allen *Continued from page 7*

city's area, and constructing the first permanent mall in the United States.

In 1958 Allen experienced another disappointment that turned to fortune. He decided to run for a fifth term as mayor. Allen confessed, "My wife Virginia advised me not to do it, but I did." Although elected to the council he did not garner the highest number of votes and therefore lost the mayor's seat. "I felt rather bad about it," he said, "until six weeks went by and the phone rang. The voice said, 'This is George Romney.'"

Romney invited Allen to serve as one of three top officials of Citizens for Michigan and as such to "be in charge of getting a constitutional convention." He was instrumental in getting the new convention approved and then served as a delegate in 1961 and 1962. He was pleased with the way the delegates worked together. "I think both parties used a lot of common sense," he said.

In 1963 Governor Romney appointed Allen to the position of state controller

(now called state comptroller) and budget director. After William Milliken became governor, Allen became his legal advisor. In 1974 the governor appointed Allen to a vacated Michigan Court of Appeals judgeship, a position he maintained through 1986, forced then to resign due to an age limitation.

Judge Allen never retired. Instead he sometimes still served on the appellate court. Residing in a cottage on Mackinac Island, he spent his summers as a Mackinac County Circuit Judge in the city of St. Ignace. He was, he thought, the only judge in Michigan to go to work by ship.

*\* Judge Glenn Allen was a life-time member of the Michigan Political History Society. He died Tuesday, November 6, 2001, at his home in DeWitt.*

*The quotes for this article come from a 60-minute videotaped interview of Judge Glenn Allen conducted by Tom Downs in December 1999. To borrow the video contact Joyce Crum at (517) 336-5742. ■*

Michigan Political History  
Society

P.O. Box 4684

East Lansing, MI 48826-4684

