

RIPON FORUM

VOL. IX, No. 14

JULY 15, 1973

25 CENTS

National Security

by Tanya Melich

The White House's contempt for constitutional government and particularly for the rights of individual Americans is no more blatantly illustrated than in President Nixon's May 22 Watergate statement. It is a document of great significance, not only for its contribution to Watergate historiography, but because it so clearly exemplifies the abuses of power practiced by the President and his staff.

An analysis of what the President described as the three "important national security operations" which became "entangled in the Watergate case" reveals his arrogance toward and distrust of the American political system. Whether in the final analysis the President is found to be criminally culpable for his participation in these operations, the activities he described prove that he failed to fulfill his Presidential responsibilities to uphold the Constitution. It is significant that nowhere in this long statement did he mention his constitutional responsibilities.

Offenses considered by an impeachment proceeding need not be limited to indictable crimes but can cover any action the House of Representatives feels is a major violation of an officeholder's duties. There is sufficient evidence in the May 22 statement for the House to institute impeachment hearings. But whether the House deigns to take this step, the statement itself suggests White House disdain for democratic processes.

Nixon uses national security as an excuse for obstructing justice, for massive onslaughts against the rights of Americans, for burglary, for electronic surveillance and other illegal acts.

National security is an important element in keeping this nation strong, but maintaining it in the Nixon manner could destroy the nation's democracy. One is reminded of a U.S. military officer's description of a search-and-destroy mission in Vietnam where he reported that in order to save the village his unit had to destroy it.

The President and his aides seem to have been guided in their actions toward others by their estimate of an individual's loyalty to the President. The index of loyalty to the President apparently was the degree of one's agreement with the President on important issues. Traditional American give-and-take does not seem to have been acceptable behavior at the White House — at least when it came to major policy.

The White House also seems to have equated agreement on major issues as an index of one's loyalty to the nation. For example, if one disagreed with the President

over his Cambodian decision, then one was not simply expressing an opposing view but was attacking the United States. In its view, such an individual was being anti-American.

The degree of opposition does not seem to have made a difference to the White House in considering an individual disloyal and thus, in its view, a risk to national security. Whether you were Joseph Kraft writing a column, an anti-war leader peacefully demonstrating or a Weatherman plotting violence, the White House considered all a threat and sanctioned harassment for all.

It was and is this failure to differentiate between *loyal* opposition and revolutionary attacks that is a major flaw in the Nixon "national security" defense.

His defense also falls short because of its total disregard for due process of the law. The White House appears to have assumed itself to be able to determine what was right and wrong for the nation even if that determination required the performance of illegal acts.

The President stated that he ordered a series of "fewer than 20 taps" on persons who had access to leaked information and to security files. He claimed that this special program of wiretaps "was undertaken in accordance with procedures legal at the time and in accord with longstanding precedent." The program was instituted in mid-1969 and terminated in February 1971.

The White House installed these taps without a court order claiming their legality came from a statute allowing the President to use taps against "foreign intelligence activities." However, the Administration's target here was not foreign intelligence activities but domestic newspaper leaks.

The Administration argued that the statute also covered domestic security, but on June 20, 1972, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously rejected the Administration's contention. By then, however, the taps had been withdrawn and the privacy of several individuals had already been invaded.

When the wiretapping was first revealed, the White House claimed the leaks concerned the SALT negotiations. When reporters pointed out that the SALT preparations were just beginning in mid-1969 and that the leaks relating to the negotiations did not occur until the summer of 1971, the Administration changed its story.

It then said that the leaks related to the first U.S. bombing of Cambodia, a National Security Council meeting on the Middle East, and the downing of a U.S. intelligence plane over North Korea.

Nixon says his Administration began a series of major diplomatic initiatives in mid-1969 and that these activities could not have been "carried forward unless further leaks

could be prevented." There does not appear to be any evidence to link such initiatives with these leaks.

Morton Halperin, one of those tapped while an NSC staff member, said that "in May, 1969, none of the people thus far identified as being put under surveillance was privy to the preparations then under way for the President's major diplomatic initiatives. If the criterion was simple access, the people tapped in the early spring of 1969 would have been Henry Kissinger, Gen. Alexander Haig and Lawrence Eagleburger, then Kissinger's personal assistant." None of these initiatives ever appeared as leaks in the press.

The names of all those placed under electronic surveillance for this particular operation are still not public knowledge, but it would seem that in the case of Joseph Kraft and Morton Halperin the motive was suspicion about their views, not possible leaks. Halperin's security clearance was never lifted and both he and Kraft appeared on the Colson "enemy list." They were political enemies of the White House, not agents of a foreign government.

Nixon also disregarded constitutional processes, rights and safeguards in approving the 1970 Intelligence Plan. It is difficult to understand why the President, after warnings that much of the plan's actions were illegal, would nevertheless approve it.

The President showed a lack of appreciation for the seriousness of this issue when he assigned Tom Huston, a 30-year-old, ultra-conservative ideologue, who had little experience in the intelligence area, to develop such a plan, and then to act as the White House liaison with the Inter-Agency Group on Domestic Intelligence and Internal Security, the plan's evaluation group.

According to a June 15, 1970 memorandum prepared by Huston, the President "after careful study" approved the following illegal acts:

- * Monitoring communications of U.S. citizens using international facilities, such as overseas telephone and telegraph circuits.
- * Intensification of electronic surveillance against U.S. citizens and groups thought to be a threat to internal security.
- * Opening sealed mail before its delivery.
- * Removing restraints on the use of surreptitious entry. (Huston noted in an earlier memo that such entry, even by federal agents, "amounts to burglary.")
- * Establishment of a domestic intelligence operation composed of the directors of the CIA, FBI, NSA, DIA and the military counterintelligence agencies to evaluate domestic intelligence. (This was illegal in that the CIA was prohibited from dealing with domestic matters.)

Other parts of the plan not judged illegal but still considered a threat to constitutional rights were rebellion of military undercover agents, an increase in campus sources working for federal intelligence agencies and CIA coverage of American students and others abroad.

The President claims the plan was only in effect for five days, between July 23 and July 28. He rescinded the plan because of opposition from J. Edgar Hoover.

Nixon stated that because "approval was withdrawn

before it had been implemented, the net result was that the Plan never went into effect."

Illegal acts were authorized by the President and whether there was time to implement them does not mitigate the fact that the President approved activities aimed at greatly infringing upon the constitutional rights of Americans.

The seriousness of the President's actions is further compounded by the fact that the Administration has never provided the public with proof that the orders for the plan were actually rescinded. As of this writing, there is no documentation that the plan or part of it was not put into effect.

There are several incidents and documents to indicate that, in fact, the plan or at least major parts of it were implemented. Sen. Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.) has cited an internal FBI memo, dated September 16, 1970, which approved the hiring of student informers and potential student informers. The burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office and the electronic surveillance of Ellsberg are two other known examples.

Also, if Nixon believed that national security was so threatened that illegal procedures were necessary, then the opposition to these procedures by one man would not have been sufficient to cause the plan's abandonment. Surely, the national security risk, as perceived by the President, had not disappeared in five days.

Considering the gravity of Nixon's decision, it is incumbent upon him to explain to the American people what was so dangerous that the law had to be disregarded. Nixon mentioned bomb threats, Kent and Jackson State and other campus disturbances and indicated some of this activity was receiving foreign support.

The CIA has said that it reported to the White House that it found no significant support for these activities from foreign sources. Instead the CIA maintained these activities were solely indigenous and grew out of frustrations with internal problems, most specifically the government's pol-

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, chapters in sixteen cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of subchapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions and revenues from its publications and contract work.
THE RIPON FORUM is published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 14a Elliot Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Second class postage rates paid at Boston, Massachusetts. Contents are copyrighted © 1973 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the Editor is welcomed.

In publishing this magazine the Ripon Society seeks to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well-researched proposals and for a spirit of criticism, innovation, and independent thinking within the Republican Party. Articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of the National Governing Board or the Editorial Board of the Ripon Society, unless they are explicitly so labelled.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are \$10 a year, \$5 for students, service-men, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$3 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

Robert D. Behn, Chairman

Robert H. Donaldson

James Manahan

Tanya Melich

Robert G. Stewart

Ralph Thayer

Contributing Editors: Clifford Brown, Glenn Gerstell, William A. Koelsch, Daniel J. Swillinger, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Richard W. Rahn, John A. Rehfuss, and Thomas A. Sargent

Assistant Editors: Judith H. Behn and M. Victoria Golden

Art: Leslie Morrill and Annie Greene

Advertising Manager: Deborah Bowen

icy on Vietnam and Cambodia. The White House once again confused disagreement with Presidential policy with disloyalty to the nation.

The President claimed that the "Plumbers" unit, formed during the week following the Pentagon Papers publication in the *New York Times*, was established "to stop security leaks and to investigate other sensitive security matters." While the President stated he "had no knowledge of any illegal means to be used" . . . and "would have disapproved had they been brought to my attention," it is hard to believe that a man who a year previously had sanctioned the Huston plan would, in the heat of the Pentagon Papers controversy, caution prudence.

It is a fact that members of the Plumbers did break-in and burglarize the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist, did forge State Department documents, did illegally use electronic surveillance. No doubt the unit performed other illegal acts, as yet not publicly identified. John Dean has also testified that Egil Krogh, Jr., head of the Plumbers unit, told him that authority for the psychiatrist burglary had come "right out of the Oval Office."

While the President claimed he "did not authorize and had no knowledge of any illegal means to be used to achieve this goal" of investigating Ellsberg's associates and motives, *he never said that he never authorized or encouraged illegal conduct by the Plumbers.*

Other questions are raised by the President's statement. Why did he find it necessary to establish an extra-legal group within the White House to fulfill a job that rightfully was the responsibility of the FBI? Ehrlichman's excuse that the FBI was a sieve is not a sufficient rationale for the President to form his own secret police operation. It was Nixon's responsibility to insure that the FBI was run properly.

On what legal basis did Nixon have the right to direct Assistant Attorney General Henry Peterson to limit his investigation of Watergate? The President claimed that he ordered this obstruction of justice because E. Howard Hunt had been part of the Plumbers unit and that if this fact were known it would damage national security.

Yet a week later, when Attorney General Richard Kleindienst told Nixon that there was irrefutable evidence that Hunt had burglarized Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office, Nixon reversed his orders. One wonders what serious security matters caused the President to first order the limitation.

The pattern is clear. As with the 1970 Intelligence Plan, Nixon has cited national security for ordering illegal action when the facts have not been publicly known. But when the facts have become public, he has retracted his call for illegal action and never explained the specific national security concern requiring the first decision.

One of Nixon's most confusing statements is his claim that he "suspected, incorrectly, that the CIA had been in some way involved" in Watergate. If he harbored such suspicions, all he had to do was to call the director of the CIA.

If Nixon believed the CIA was involved in covert activities intertwined with Watergate, what could it have been doing that was legitimate? The CIA is prohibited

from involvement in internal security matters. Either the President knew the CIA activity was illegal or he was not aware of its activity. Either course indicates a flagrant disregard of his Presidential duties.

Nixon's seven-point summary is an apology for both what he admits is his failure to fulfill his responsibilities as the result of lack of vigilance and ignorance and by knowingly breaking the law purportedly for national security reasons. Several points should be noted:

* Nixon denied knowledge of "any illegal surveillance activities for political purposes." He did not deny knowledge of similar activities for other purposes.

* Nixon maintained he "set in motion internal security measures, including legal wiretaps" which he felt were necessary for national as well as domestic security. The Supreme Court has since ruled such taps illegal. At the time they were imposed, there was considerable debate within the legal community as to their legality. It would appear that the Administration determined to impose the taps and then wait to see if the law would catch up with it. Nixon did not indicate that he thought the other internal security measures were legal.

* Nixon never explained why he suspected the CIA was involved in Watergate (outside the Hunt link) nor did he explain why he believed an unrestricted investigation of Watergate would expose covert national security operations. Unless this is explained, considering the CIA's denial of involvement in any Watergate activity, it would appear that national security was used as a cover-up for illegal domestic political activity.

* Nixon said he ordered the FBI not to "carry its investigations into areas that might compromise these covert national security activities or those of the CIA." In other words, Nixon was ordering a legal agency not to investigate an extra-legal agency (the Plumbers unit) or a legal agency (the CIA) whose Watergate involvement could only have been illegal.

In summary, Nixon has said he assumes "responsibility for such action [of the Plumbers unit] despite the fact that I, at no time approved or had knowledge of them." He has also said relative to unethical and illegal campaign activities that: "To the extent that I may in any way have contributed to the climate in which they took place, I did not intend to: to the extent that I failed to prevent them, I should have been more vigilant." But he did not mention responsibility for any illegal noncampaign acts he sanctioned. Nowhere in his statement did he indicate an understanding that his acts helped to subvert the Constitution, that individual liberties were ignored, that the democratic process was seriously impaired.

Nowhere did he indicate a recognition that illegal activities, regardless of their justification, are a major threat to the American system. His statement is built around the undefined spectre of a national security which must be secured even if it means sowing the seeds of a police state.

The May 22 statement is truly appalling for if it stands without clarification from the President, it proves that he is no longer worthy to govern this country. ■

Editorial Board COMMENTARY

To Resign

by Robert G. Stewart

The President should resign.

The issue is not his personal innocence or guilt in Watergate. The issue is the damage which has been done and is being done to the institution of the presidency of the United States.

With varying degrees of substantiation, Watergate, the conspiracy of espionage, sabotage and campaign financing irregularities of which it was a part, and the ensuing coverup with its payoffs and perjury have been traced to high Presidential subordinates in and out of the White House.

Unlike a court of law, the court of public opinion looks beyond the conduct of the President when it measures the presidency. It looks to the conduct of the entire team which comprises the institution. As a result of the admissions of some members of the Nixon team and of the indictments of and charges against many others — too many others — the Nixon presidency has been disgraced before the public.

It might have escaped with only embarrassment had the President been candid with the people from the outset of the Watergate disclosures. Instead, the White House responses to the accusations about Watergate have been like those of a boy whose mother has discovered chocolate on his fingers. The boy first denies there is any chocolate there at all. Then he admits it is chocolate but explains that he only took a piece to give to his sister. When pressed he says yes, he took a tiny bite, but only to make sure it was all right for his sister to eat. Further prodded he runs to his room, slams the door, and cries that his mother never believes anything he says.

The President continues to refuse to submit to questioning about Watergate, hiding behind the now tiresome phrases "executive privilege" and "constitutionally inappropriate." This conduct has only served to increase the public's suspicions. Over two-thirds of

the American people now refuse to believe the President's denial of involvement in the coverup. The President has destroyed his credibility.

The scandals and loss of credibility have resulted in a complete loss of whatever rapport the President may have had with Congress. The President has been demeaned, and as a result of some disclosures, derisively ridiculed. Foreign nations have lost confidence in the United States, and the business of government at home has come to a near standstill pending completion of the Senate hearings which may last another year. The problem is not going to go away. The media and the public will not let it.

In short, the President has lost his ability to govern effectively and he will not soon regain it.

But even more damaging to the

fair, the wiretapping of the President's own National Security Council staff, an attempt to intimidate Sen. Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.) while he was investigating Watergate, and others. The attitude has even appeared at lower levels of government. Witness the entrapment activities of federal agents infiltrating the anti-war movement and the Gestapo-type raids by narcotic agents into homes of law-abiding American citizens.

Thus, the public has learned that its leaders are unaware that laws are nothing more than voluntary restraints whose function, Harvard president Derek Bok recently reminded us, is to keep men free. The public has learned that its leaders do not know the only purpose for "national security" — the preservation of the Constitutional rights and liberties of the na-

This issue of the FORUM presents two opposing views on whether the President should resign, written by FORUM Editorial Board members. Neither has attempted to address specific opposing arguments, but each has instead prepared a brief in support of one side of the controversy. This debate format is intended to allow FORUM readers to balance the two sides of the controversy and draw their own conclusions.

Nixon presidency than Watergate and its ramifications have been the public disclosures of an attitude held by the President and many of his subordinates which is intolerable in a free society. The attitude is one of near paranoia about any dissent, power at any cost and passion for "security" and "law and order" no matter how excessive the means to attain them. This attitude has been testified to and has been evidenced by at least these disclosures:

- That the President approved and temporarily set into motion a secret plan for employing the combined intelligence facilities of the federal government to spy on Americans; that the plan involved burglary and illegal eavesdropping and was so insidious that J. Edgar Hoover finally vetoed it.

- That the White House compiled and maintained a "hit list" of its political enemies, and set out to use the federal government machinery to "get" them; that the enemies were many of the most distinguished public officials, news commentators, celebrities and private citizens in America, whose "crime" was to oppose the President or one or more of his policies.

Added to these are the Ellsberg af-

tion's citizens. Excess in the pursuit of either destroys the very ends they serve. A public exposed to such excess can only fear its government.

This, then, is the case for the resignation of the President. The Nixon presidency has been disgraced. The President has lost his credibility and ability to effectively govern. The public has become witness to a litany of excess in the exercise of power. Who did which act is no longer the issue.

Jefferson warned that free government is not founded in trust. He said nothing about respect. The presidency of the United States is the world's symbol of free government. Even if it is not to be a repository of trust, it can and must embody statesmanship, tolerance, respect for individual dignity and liberty and an abhorrence of corruption and excess. And it must appear that way.

The Nixon presidency has lost that image. The President can prevent a permanent stain on the institution of the presidency only by stepping down. The personal sacrifice is great and the temporary disruption of government may be annoying. But on balance the long term public good demands it. ■

Editorial Board COMMENTARY

Or Not To

by Robert Donaldson

The suggestion that the incumbent President of the United States should resign his office is utterly without merit. This becomes evident when, in addition to the context of present circumstances, the idea is examined from the perspectives of both past practices and probable future consequences.

No matter that a Nixon resignation is totally *unlikely*, given the President's psychic make-up and past behavior in time of crisis. (Doubters on this point should re-read both *Six Crises* and *Nixon Agonistes*.) More important, as a remedy it is inherently *inappropriate* for the surrounding circumstances and *undesirable* for the country's internal health and external relations.

Of President Nixon's personal guilt in the Watergate matter and associated events there is still considerable doubt. After a week of testimony, John Dean — the only individual yet to come forward to charge the President with conspiracy to obstruct justice and other criminal acts — has been unable to substantiate his allegations with solid evidence. Dean's conclusions of Presidential involvement rest entirely on his own inferences and assumptions. Drowning the Ervin Committee in a sea of words and exhibits on matters unrelated to the main point, Dean managed to obscure but not eradicate the flimsiness of his assertions. The present "evidence" against the President would never serve to convict him, either in a court of law or in the Senate of the United States.

The President's own statements on these matters, regrettably, are both

scanty and selective. But they add up to a denial of Presidential involvement in both the planning and coverup of Watergate. Clearly, the President must now speak more clearly and directly to Dean's allegations. But, as Dean acknowledges, it is essentially his word against that of others, including the President.

Some who advocate resignation argue that, even if the President was not directly involved in Watergate, his isolation and consequent ignorance of the coverup constitute gross irresponsibility. Clearly so — and we may hope that Nixon is now chastened. But irresponsible behavior on the part of a President is neither criminal nor unprecedented; to borrow Stewart Alsop's example, the Watergate scheme itself "is no more inherently idiotic than the Bay of Pigs operation."

Other proponents of resignation point beyond Watergate to the chilling covert activities undertaken by the Nixon Administration in the name of national security, and performed either through the misuse of the FBI, CIA and other agencies, or directly by White House operatives. These shocking and inexcusable actions certainly warrant public debate and new congressional guidelines. But in no way is Nixon's removal fitting either as remedy or punishment. Deception, surveillance, and other such acts performed in the name of national security, though taken to new depths by the present Administration, were not invented by Richard Nixon. They are unfortunately a long-practiced and long-sanctioned phenomenon in postwar America, as examples from the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations reveal (Bay of Pigs, CIA covert funding of domestic political groups, FBI bugging of Martin Luther King, and a whole host of actions documented by the Pentagon Papers). The mere replacement of Nixon by Agnew is hardly an appropriate remedy.

Moreover, as the colloquy between Jeb Magruder and the Ervin Committee pointed up, the climate has been such in recent years that similar tactics — involving violation both of laws and of moral and political sensibilities — have been all too commonly practiced by political dissenters. This does not excuse their use by those in political office. But it does indicate that the blame should not be placed exclusively on one man.

It should be clear that this brief against resignation is not written as a defense of President Nixon personally or of the substance and style of his Administration. The point is rather that those who grasp the resignation proposal as a means of ridding the country of Nixon's political leadership should look beyond their animosity toward the man and examine the probable effects of this awesome step.

Removal of the President — *either* by his resignation under fire *or* by impeachment — would have profound consequences not lightly to be risked. The behavior of Wall Street indicators and the fluctuations of the dollar during the present Watergate revelations would seem like a slight nuisance in comparison to the serious economic ramifications of such an unprecedented change of political leadership. The national hypnosis with Watergate would be only a faddish infatuation compared with the internal trauma and polarization which Presidential removal would bring. The country's foreign policy, delicately and personally orchestrated by the President and as yet basically undamaged by Watergate events, would be seriously endangered by Nixon's abrupt departure. To cite only one example, the Soviet-American détente, which is so much a product of Brezhnev's slowly-built confidence in Nixon's "realism," might well be irreparably damaged. Indeed, Brezhnev's own position *vis à vis* the Kremlin "hawks," staked on the success of these dealings with Nixon, would not likely be unaffected.

This may appear to be the view of a Cassandra. But the risks are sufficiently plausible and fearsome as to be taken only should incontrovertible evidence of "high crimes and misdemeanors" by the President become available. Only then would impeachment, and it alone, be the proper course. For the present, resignation is both inappropriate, given the existing evidence, and unnecessarily dangerous, given the serious domestic and international consequences.

The Constitution provides impeachment as a remedy for "high crimes" in government. But it also provides safeguards for those accused of such crimes — even an accused President. Remembering this, let us keep our national sanity and avoid the temptation to press for extreme and perilous solutions. ■

POLITICS: REPORTS

MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON — Massachusetts's five black state representatives, the Black Caucus, are making serious noises about a switch from Democratic to GOP ranks.

They and a large number of white liberal Democrats are furious about the Democratic legislative leadership's support for New Majority Party positions on busing and the right of discriminating fraternal organizations to hold state liquor and gambling licenses.

In a two-week period in May and June, the Black Caucus was actively opposed by the leadership on these issues, as well as on the preservation of the nation's foremost equal education statute, the Racial Imbalance Law. But the most fervent battle took place when the leadership opted to protect a flock of white, Irish Boston senators rather than give the black community a rightfully deserved senate seat in the new redistricting plan.

Republican legislators stuck with the Caucus through all the floor fights, so when one black took to the house microphone to praise the Republican leadership and Republican Gov. Francis W. Sargent's exemplary record of appointing blacks to the bench and to key posts in his Administration, and when the Ripon Society of Boston-Cambridge wrote the members of the Black Caucus and presented the arguments for why they should become Republicans, a party switch gained credibility in the press.

Whether the Caucus actually becomes Republican, independent, or allies itself with a substantial wing of liberal Democrats who are disenchanted with the increasingly conservative and despotic Democratic legislative leadership, Republicans are bound to reap some benefits.

But no one will reap more benefits than Sargent who looks now to be facing a tough re-election bid in 1974. Although Sargent's good record with minorities is beyond question, he has shown no public enthusiasm for the

Black Caucus switch and what it would mean to the beleaguered GOP, reflecting an obvious disregard for party fortunes that irritates many Republicans.

During a private meeting with the Caucus about a veto at the height of the switch talk, Sargent failed to even mention the possible party change.

Discounting for the moment a more-and-more possible primary challenge from Middlesex County Sheriff John Buckley, a progressive who advocates heroin maintenance, the Governor's chief problems lie not with the liberals but with conservatives and the business community. In fact, his Administration's greatest liabilities stem from support for two black commissioners of the Welfare and Corrections departments through crises exacerbated by Democratic legislators who have supported New Majority Party positions.

The NMP posture of the legislative leadership appears to be both an attack on Sargent and an attempt to bolster the gubernatorial chances of a party regular and former house speaker, Attorney General Robert Quinn. He will go into a Democratic primary against the state's smoothest liberal, Michael Dukakis.

However, boosting Quinn by picking on issues that are dearest to the blacks and white liberals the leadership is again splitting the party, forcing the bloodied winner of the preliminary, whoever he is, into a championship match with Sargent. ■

RNC

WASHINGTON, D.C. — The Republican National Committee's new director of political activities says he will not put the RNC into the business of massive candidate recruitment for the 1974 congressional elections.

Edward Mahe, Jr., who has been active in politics in Texas and New Mexico as well as in the House and Senate Republican campaign committees, sees the RNC as "supportive" to state and local efforts at candidate recruitment. Mahe's vision of his job con-

trasts sharply with that of his predecessor, New Majority Campaign director Ken Reitz, who had planned an expensive candidate recruitment effort organized by RNC staff before he suddenly resigned in April. (Mahe took over the job of both Reitz and Political Division director Ed DeBolt).

Mahe plans to leave campaign management to the Senate and House Committees and organize his small staff to work with local party personnel in recruitment. "If a candidate does not have local support, it does not help to have RNC support," says Mahe.

Like RNC co-chairwoman Janet Johnston, Mahe feels that Watergate will have minimal effects on 1974 Republican campaigns. "It does not affect the average person; it does not affect their paychecks. It does not affect making the streets safer or solving the drug abuse problem. It is not a gut issue. The danger is that staunch Republicans will stay home and not vote."

Mahe, who reflects both competence and sincerity, feels that Republicans can make gains in the House next year, but that the Senate will be a tossup.

The Colorado native says he does not "like labels at all," and he resented being labelled as a conservative in a previous issue of the FORUM.

Commenting on the Steiger Commission, whose task is to examine ways of broadening the base of the party, Mahe said, "It's full of fine people, but no election was ever won or lost because of some committee ruling stored away in some vault in Washington." ■

OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA CITY — Republican prospects in Oklahoma in 1974 received a significant boost with the recent decision by popular Sen. Henry Bellmon to seek re-election.

Bellmon had let it be known that he was not certain that he would run again but eventually decided to make the race. His most likely Democratic opponent will be former U. S. Rep. Ed Edmondson, who was defeated for the Senate in 1972 by Dewey Bartlett by over 25,000 votes. Bellmon's trouble with the Republican Party has stemmed from his feud with Repub-

lican State Chairman Clarence Warner and his vote against the anti-busing constitutional amendment. However, the Senator remains formidable and is the strongest political figure in the state today.

Republicans are also taking dead aim on the governorship. Gov. David Hall, who is expected to seek re-election, is a formidable, personal political machine in operation. The two Republican contenders at this time are former State Sen. Denzil Garrison of Bartlesville, who has excellent contacts with Democratic politicians across the state, and wealthy Republican State Sen. Jim Inhofe of Tulsa. Garrison will probably be a stronger candidate if for no other reason than his lengthy legislative experience, access to adequate financing and his contacts with many Democratic political figures.

Garrison lost the 1966 congressional race, however, to Ed Edmondson. There is some aversion to Republicans nominating another wealthy Tulsan to run for governor.

Although Watergate will undoubtedly help the Democrats in the state, the Democrats have their own problems. Newspaper stories that the IRS is investigating Gov. Hall's tax returns for criminal penalties plus the recent indictment of popular State Treasurer Leo Winters, long the chief fundraiser for Democrats in the state, spells trouble for the Democrats; however, conviction is far from certain. Judge Luther Bohannon has moved the trial to Muskogee, deep in Democratic territory, and Winters's chief defense is that he is the victim of Republican harassment. ■

PENSIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C. — Senate leadership would like to see action on pension legislation in this session, hopefully before the August recess. (See "Protecting Private Pensions," by John K. Dirlam, FORUM, February 1973.)

The bills likely to be considered this summer are the Williams-Javits pension bill (S.4), the Administration/Curtis bill (S.1631) and the Bentsen bill (S.1179).

The Williams-Javits bill, now on the Senate calendar, was reported out of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with one major change — on retrospective vesting. The bill now provides all employees over 25 with pension credit for retrospective service. The bill formerly limited retrospective benefit credit to workers 45 years or older, meaning that workers under 45 would have vested pension rights only for future service.

A cost study prepared by the Labor subcommittee has estimated that this change would result in additional costs of not more than 0.2 percent of payroll costs or 9 percent of present plan costs.

On June 12, the Pension subcommittee of the Finance Committee finished hearings on the Administration and Bentsen bills and should report out this bills shortly after the July 4 recess.

The Williams-Javits bill may be considered in its entirety with or without amendments from the Administration bill or the Bentsen bill, or vice-versa.

According to Michael Gordon, who wrote the Williams-Javits bill, "The chances of something like the Williams-Javits bill or the bill itself in its present form passing the Senate are excellent. We have 53 co-sponsors, over half the Senate, and we are likely to get more."

The Bentsen bill is considered something like Williams-Javits; the Administration bill is not, though there seems to be widespread support for the tax incentive provisions of the Administration bill. According to Gordon, "The House is uncertain but moving more quickly now that it sees what's going on in the Senate." ■

ILLINOIS

CHICAGO — Illinois Republicans elected replacements for State GOP Chairman Victor Smith and Republican National Committeeman Robert Stewart on July 7 at a meeting here.

The new state chairman, Springfield businessman Donald Adams, describes himself as neither a liberal nor a conservative but a "working Republican" who would take an "aggressive" role as party chief.

Adams, who can boast that Spiro Agnew is the godfather of his four-year-old son, defeated Belleville attorney William Steihl for the GOP chairmanship. Smith, who held the party post for 13 years, resigned after he was named to the U.S.-Canadian Boundary Commission.

In a four-man race for national committeeman, the winner was former U.S. Rep. Clifford D. Carlson of Geneva. The self-described "moderate-conservative" was elected to fill out the unexpired term of former U.S. Rep. Charlotte Reid when she was appointed to the Federal Communications Commission in October 1971; he retired when redistricting placed both he and U.S. Rep. Leslie Arends in the same district last year.

In the national committee election, Carlson defeated former Commerce Department official John Henry Altorfer, Evanston businessman William C. Croft and Decatur businessman H.G. "Skinny" Taylor. Two other prominent Republicans, U.S. Rep. John B. Anderson and insurance multi-millionaire W. Clement Stone, withdrew their names from consideration.

It may be of possible significance for future Illinois election contests that Carlson is a strong backer of Illinois Attorney General William Scott and Adams had some post-election praise for U.S. Attorney James R. Thompson.

In other Illinois political news, *Chicago Tribune* political editor Neil Mehler attributes part of former Illinois Gov. Richard Ogilvie's political misfortunes to his dismissal of Jeb Stuart Magruder from his 1968 campaign staff. According to Mehler, the Magruder firing prompted the enmity of White House staff of chief H.R. Haldeman, who blocked needed political assistance in last year's gubernatorial campaign.

Mehler also reports that Sen. Charles Percy's political stature in the state party was enhanced by a mid-June meeting with Illinois party officials. Although the turnout reportedly was not as great as the Percy staff had hoped, his reception to his new "party-leader" efforts was favorable. ■

No August Forum

POLITICS: PEOPLE

● At a Utah Republican state convention on June 23, State Rep. **T. Williams Cockayne** was elected to succeed that state's articulate and forthright GOP chairman, **Kent Shearer**. Cockayne, 66, a retired business executive, defeated **Neal Christiansen**, a 38-year-old real estate agent, 454-375, after a third candidate was eliminated on the first ballot. Sen. **Wallace Bennett**, 74, announced his projected retirement in 1974 at the convention, thus officially opening the field to possible successors.

● Dr. **James W. Ralph**, who garnered 35 percent of the 1972 GOP primary vote against Sen. **Clifford P. Case**, has been nominated as a GOP assembly candidate in New Jersey's Bergen County. On the basis of a recount, Ralph won a ticket spot by a four-vote margin, largely thanks to the coattails of U.S. Rep. **Charles Sandman's** gubernatorial triumph. Ralph, who was an unknown ear, nose and throat doctor when he challenged Case in 1972, is closely affiliated with the New Jersey Conservative Union. **James Quaremba**, who showed surprising strength in the 1970 Senate primary as an unknown challenger of GOP nominee **Nelson Gross**, narrowly lost his own bid for a Bergen County assembly nomination. After a pointed delay, Gov. **William Cahill** publicly endorsed Sandman who had defeated him for renomination. In return, the conservative Sandman said some nice things about the Governor's progressive record in his own state platform. In another fence-mending move, Sandman tapped former state chairman **Webster Todd**, a progressive, to be Republican state finance chairman.

● New Hampshire Sen. **Norris Cotton's** announcement that he will not be a candidate for re-election has opened the way for U.S. Rep. **Louis Wyman** (R) to seek his seat next year. Wyman's informal announcement of candidacy followed immediately on Cotton's revelation that age and his wife's heart condition had prompted his decision to retire. Although Wyman has a head start, other possible Republican candidates include moderate U.S. Rep. **James G. Cleveland**, Attorney General **Warren Rudman** and former Governors **Walter R. Peterson** and **Wesley Powell**. Although former Minnesota Sen. **Eugene McCarthy** has indicated he will not pursue a New Hampshire Senate campaign, the Democrats will not lack for possible candidates. Leading Republican contenders for Wyman's seat include the son of a former senator, Executive Councilor **John Bridges, Jr.**; former U.S. Attorney **David Brock**; and Deputy House Speaker **Kimon Zachos**.

● While Ohio State Sen. **Donald E. "Buz" Lukens** (R) was on his honeymoon in Switzerland, the Ohio Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Butler County Board of Elections which ruled Lukens ineligible to run for elective office for five years. The former con-

gressman, an acknowledged gubernatorial aspirant, held a press conference on July 2 to announce he would appeal the decision in federal courts — and take his case as high as necessary. In order to be eligible for next year's political season, Lukens's case must be settled by February 7, 1974.

● Wisconsin GOP elections held on June 6 may signal a move away from the leadership of Republican National Committeeman **Ody Fisher** and former Gov. **Warren Knowles**. **David C. Sullivan**, a conservative lawyer-engineer, defeated candidates more congenial to the Fisher-Knowles faction and succeeds **John E. Hough** as state chairman. Knowles's sister-in-law was defeated in the election for party vice chairman. With the departure of **Melvin Laird** for Washington to command the White House troops, Attorney General **Robert Warren** looks like the most likely Republican candidate to challenge Gov. **Patrick Lucey** in 1974.

● Insurance businessman **David Green** was elected to the Oregon Republican Party's top post in June. GOP Chairman **Floyd Hart**, who suffered a heart attack in June, is moving to Hawaii. Green, who ran unsuccessfully for the Oregon legislature last fall, was elected unanimously when Portland businessman **James McCreight** dropped out of the race.

● California Gov. **Ronald Reagan's** controversial tax reform initiative has qualified for a November 6 referendum. The vote on the plan, which would limit the state's tax take, may have a strong impact on Gov. Reagan's presidential ambitions.

● Two conservatives, Republican State Sen. **Robert Bauman** and Democratic State Sen. **Fred Malkus**, easily defeated their ultra-conservative opponents in the July 10 primary in Maryland's 1st. C.D. The special election to succeed the late U.S. Rep. **William D. Mills** will be held August 10.

Getting The Move On

Effective August 20, the offices of the Ripon Society will be located at 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. We realize that this dislocation is as traumatic for FORUM readers as it is for us. However, we hope to keep a closer watch on the government from this vantage point and even Ron Ziegler knows the government bears watching these days. Nevertheless, the FORUM will be both edited and printed in the Boston area — the FORUM editor being suspicious of power and aware that power corrupts and that Washington power is beset by an energy crisis. So although Harvard Square has been abandoned, the FORUM will retrench on Breed's Hill where we hope to have a good view of the harbor should the British attempt a second attack.

IMPORTANT! IMPORTANT!

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 14a Elliot Street, Cambridge, Ma. 02138. Second class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.