

RIPON FORUM

Help sneak the FORUM
Into the Ivory Tower;
Give a FORUM gift subscription
To your alma mater's library.

JANUARY 15, 1975

VOL. XI NO. 2

50 CENTS

COMMENTARY: DEMOCRATS

WHICH PARTY?

by Dick Behn

The party is dying. There is general agreement on that conclusion, but which party? 1972 has begun to look like an aberrant remission for the GOP from a case of increasingly severe leukemia. Levels of supporters and officeholders have reached critical levels. Conservatives have suggested almost wistfully that the corpse be abandoned. Political commentators search brusquely about for the GOP's will to live. The emaciated state of the Republican Party is contrasted sharply with glowing reports on the Democratic Party, which only two years ago had a guarded prognosis.

But the superficial health of the Democratic Party may be ephemeral and its new remission may be as temporary as that experienced by the Republicans. Despite the surface signs of health, the Democratic Party is saturated with several virulent strains of viruses for which the party has no known cure.

The Democrat's Kansas City miniconvention in early December was widely reported as a medical success---the patient did not, as expected, commit suicide. The party held together long enough to develop a unified stand on affirmative action for delegate selection. Columnist Max Lerner observed that the Democrats "walked away from Kansas City toward 1976 with a brave appearance of common purpose. But a skeptical eye could detect the gait of the walking wounded. The wound is patched over, but the bullet is still there." Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak saw the convention as "a renewed triumph of McGovernism in the Democratic Party. Contrary to the hopes of moderates who elected Robert Strauss national chairman two years ago, neither what McGovern says nor his supporters have faded away."

Only labor walked away from Kansas City in rage, but that was largely because the Democrats only discussed procedure. They were careful to steer away from sensitive issue topics. Any attempt to address such issues would invariably have split the Democratic Party. Observed former Kennedy speechwriter Richard N. Goodwin before Kansas City:"The suppression of such a debate---the essential need of suppression---is both a result and a demonstration of the divided condition of the Democratic Party...In the long run, however, even the most strenuous efforts to achieve political compromise cannot accommodate important and deeply founded differences of principle and interest. Conflict and acrimony are likely to continue until one group achieves a secure domination over the Democratic Party or leaves to form a national party of its own."

After Kansas City, former McCarthy political aide Curtis B. Gans suggested:"Had [the Democrats] tried, they might have emerged with a new sense of purpose and direction, a national agenda for both party and nation. But they did not try, and while they put issues of process behind them, the Democrats emerged from Kansas City without leadership, without program and without unity, and still deeply in jeopardy of losing their third successive presidential election."

One indication of the Democratic inability to confront divisive issues occurred in Kansas City when State Sen. Joseph F. Timilty(D-Mass.) asked an issues panel:"How do we provide for integrated education?" The question was evaded by panel members. A typical response came from retiring U.S.Rep. Martha Griffiths(D-Mich.), who had been mentioned as a possible HEW secretary:"I've never been on the [House] Education and Labor Committee. The person who should answer should be one with real expertise." Said Timilty later:"If that's the way the new Democratic Party is going to operate, it's going to lose public support."

Even before the Kansas City conclave, AFL-CIO political director Alexander Barkan was so angry that he suggested "we ought to say 'the hell with the Democratic Party' and disengage ourselves from the party's activities." COPE's anger with the Democrats intensified over the quota compromise finally worked out at the mini-convention. Even labor's favorite presidential candidate, Sen. Henry Jackson(D-Wash.), has not been immune from labor's wrath. AFL-CIO president George Meany was so angry with Jackson's support for the Ford Administration's trade bill that he reportedly remarked that Jackson "better endorse us before we endorse him" and later wrote a bitter denunciation of the Washington Democrat for the AFL-CIO newsletter. Meany himself made it clear after the November elections that he did not share the exultant mood among Democrats: "I don't believe in this mandate stuff. A guy runs for office and gets elected. All of a sudden he's got a mandate. Two less votes and he's nothing."

Although Jackson is widely considered one of the leaders of the 1976 presidential pack, he showed in Kansas City that he is capable of alienating other groups as well. He annoyed many members of the National Women's Political Caucus when he told them: "I know some women with Phi Beta Kappas who wouldn't join anything more than the PTA." Democratic Chairman Strauss also showed a strain of chauvinism when he downplayed a disagreement with a lawyer for the women's caucus: "Oh, don't worry about her. I'll take her to lunch next week."

One of the dilemmas faced by the Democratic Party is that so many groups are prepared to endorse political euthanasia if the party fails to respond to their particular cure. Georgia legislator Julian Bond has indicated that he may seek delegate support in order to strengthen black influence over the eventual nominee. It is hard to envision George Wallace supporters backing a candidate backed by George McGovern supporters, and vice versa. And it is equally hard to see George Meany supporters backing the candidate of either group.

Not only does the Democratic Party have many banners, but it also has few charismatic banner-carriers. Knight Newspapers' Loye Miller, Jr., suggests that the 1976 Democratic presidential race so far is "a contest among political pygmies." The Chicago Tribune's Harry Kelly quotes one Democratic leader as saying: "Birch and Lloyd and Mo, tra-la; Jimmy and Ed and Scoop, tra-la. There isn't a heavyweight in sight."

The complexion of the whole 1976 Democratic race is changed by the abolition of winner-take-all primaries such as California's. New primaries based on proportional or congressional selection systems will virtually prohibit a first-ballot victory and encourage as many "pygmies" as possible to enter the race and control a small block of delegates. The likely result will be a "brokered" convention. But Democrats may have a difficult time explaining to voters how a "brokered" nomination is more democratic than winner-take-all primaries. With incredible temerity, U.S. Rep. Morris Udall(D-Ariz.) has observed: "The 1976 Democratic convention will be the first brokered convention in the history of reform. I say, let's get the presidential nomination out of the convention and into the smoke-filled back rooms where it belongs."

Although he is the only presidential candidate from the House now under discussion, Udall is himself typical of the limited visibility and limited prospects of many Democratic prospects. Syndicated columnist Smith Hempstone has commented: "Although his 13 years in Congress have been honorable ones, 'Mo' Udall, who once played professional basketball for the Denver Nuggets, hardly set the House afire, losing rebounds for both the speakership and the majority leadership. And while religion and marital history no longer are as important as they once were, being a divorced (he has remarried) Mormon is no particular plus."

For the Democrats, there is always Gov. George Wallace(D-Ala.), of course, but his liabilities for the party are aptly analyzed by the Atlanta Constitution's Pat Furgurson: "Right now, it more reasonable to expect that Wallace will start in the lead, and one of the middling candidates will seek his backing to be nominated. Its price will be some outrageous concessions on platform and cabinet, and if those are made, the blacks, Chicanos, and liberals will take the third-party route, and Gerald Ford or someone of his choosing will lead us for yet another four years."

But where is the "middling candidate" to come from. Former Gov. Jimmy Carter(D-Ga.) tried to make a big splash with the announcement of his presidential candidacy. Instead, he splashed dirty water on his fellow Democratic candidates, Jackson and Sen. Lloyd Bentsen(D-Tex.). Carter accused them of "trying to circumvent [the new campaign financing law] by raising very large sums of money before the law goes into effect" on January 1. Said Carter on the NBC "Meet the Press" show: "I think this is equivalent to the same thing that President Nixon did back in April 1972 when he rapidly accumulated large sums of money to finance his campaign..." Carter was later embarrassed by his own statements, suggesting he would twist the arms of Georgia political appointees for campaign contributions.

There are other governors, but they have the peculiar handicaps of winning election in a recession year. Once considered a presidential possibility, former Ohio Gov. John Gilligan(D) learned those hazards when increased taxes helped defeat him in 1974. Other "fresh faces" once thought to be ticket possibilities, Gov. Daniel Walker(D-Ill.) and Gov. Brendan Byrne(D-N.J.), seem constantly at war with Democrats in their own states and no longer seem hot executive prospects.

By virtue of their simple election, Governors Jerry Brown(D-Cal.) and Hugh Carey(D-N.Y.) were automatically mentioned as 1976 possibilities. They, however, will have deal with their states' fiscal problems before they can seriously be considered for national office. And they will have to do it without the expedient of deficit financing on which Gerald Ford can rely. Carey's huge budget problems prompted New York GOP Chairman Richard Rosenbaum to observe that the "Democrats are having a hard time finding the \$300 to \$700 million 'surplus' they once claimed to see in the current state budget...It reminds me of Carl Sandburg's advice that every politician have three hats handy at all times: one for throwing in the ring, another for talking through, and a third for pulling rabbits out of if elected." In California, former Gov. Ronald Reagan(R) chalked up a half million dollar budget surplus this past year, but Democratic House Speaker Leo McCarthy has predicted that the state's economy will erase that surplus by July---thus necessitating a tax increase and providing Californians with reminders of the financial troubles that accompanied the administration of Jerry Brown's father. The coming year may not be a particularly good one in which to be a Democratic governor; Democrats are going to get caught in the squeeze between budgets and promises.

There are other hopefuls. Two relatively young liberal senators---Birch Bayh of Indiana and Frank Church of Idaho---have indicated an interest, but both men ran into unexpected difficulties in the closing days of their 1974 reelection campaigns. New Sen. John Glenn(D-Ohio) has been called a ticket prospect, but it is hard to see what qualifications Glenn would bring to the presidential office besides a certain cosmic dimension lacked by other Democrats. And former North Carolina Gov. Terry Sanford(D) has apparently learned little from his devastating loss to Wallace in his home state's 1972 presidential primary. Sanford seems interested in exchanging the presidency of Duke University for the presidency of the United States. Not even the retirement of Duke Law School's most famous alumni has deterred Sanford.

Regardless of the Democratic presidential nominee, he/she will have to deal with the record by the current lopsided Democratic majorities in Congress. The Democratic dilemma, according to the Christian Science Monitor's Godfrey Sperling, is:"Do the Democrats have the leadership and the cohesion to move the nation forward? Do the Democrats have the creativity necessary to come up with program that will command national support? Specifically, do the Democrats really have alternatives answers to the No.1 national problem---the economy?"

If past experience is any guide, the Democrats will be content to "muddle along." And as Philadelphia Inquirer Editor Creed C. Black concludes:"If that's the best the Democrats can offer at a time like this, both their party and the country will be losers."■

COMMENTARY: CONGRESS

"WHERE IN HELL DID YOU GO WRONG?"

by J. Brian Smith

House Minority Leader John Rhodes was exchanging points with television newsman Martin Agronsky. I was sitting in the control booth that night when the program's producer, a young and gregarious Irishman, turned to me quite suddenly and in a booming voice exclaimed:"You seem like a nice enough fellow. Where in hell did you go wrong? How can you be a Republican?" We enjoyed a laugh, but the irksome question has lingered.

The most recent pounding at the polls has served to exacerbate an inferiority complex which Republicans have endured for many years. Democrats, it is believed, are hipper, more in tune with reality, and are more fun to be with at parties. "Didja ever notice that Republicans always show up at these things with prepared remarks and wonder why?" House Majority Leader Thomas O'Neill once asked a reception crowd. "It's 'cause they don't get invited out as often."

The roots of the Republican image problem go deep. I had a college professor who taught me political science. He is the epitome of the academic man; one room of his Baltimore apartment is set aside to house stacks of newspapers, yellow with age, that will one day be read for political content. He is also a good Democrat---so good that, despite the depth of his political acumen, he did not know that Republicans conduct their congressional business in a way markedly different from Democrats. He was unaware of the Democratic Caucus' power to bind its membership on certain

votes, while Republicans can vote any way they choose. It was also unknown to him that Republicans select their ranking committee members through automatic secret ballots while, on the Democratic side, it takes four members to stand in challenge of a nomination in order for a secret ballot to take place---thus requiring more intestinal fortitude than congresspersons have traditionally possessed. Under this system, only one nomination in sixty years has been challenged and, significantly, that person was not denied his position. The Democratic speaker still retains the power to appoint members to the Rules Committee without a ratifying vote by the caucus. Finally, this professor was also ignorant of the Democratic Caucus' acquisition of the power to abort legislation by sending bills to caucus subcommittees where they are frequently remodeled (or otherwise mangled).

That was precisely what happened to the Bolling Committee proposals for House reform. For 14 months, this committee laboriously studied a legislative system that had grown archaic. In the end, the Bolling panel had the audacity to propose genuine reform. The committee's recommendations were promptly directed to a caucus subcommittee headed by U.S.Rep. Julia Butler Hansen(D-Wash.). Few Hill observers were surprised at the dilutions of the Bolling reforms which emerged from the Hansen subcommittee. For U.S.Rep. Wayne Hays(D-Ohio) and other Democratic power barons to support a reform package that would have substantially reduced their own power would have been analogous to former Boston Celtics Coach Red Auerbach agreeing not to play Cousy, Russell, and Heinsohn simultaneously as a concession to other basketball teams who protested the Celtics' depth. Democrats are not that committed to House reform.

One wonders how the Democrats hold so tenaciously to a pro-reform image despite their understandable susceptibility to vested interests. One wonders why the electorate fails to contrast the Democrats' glorious pronouncements of "a new day coming" at their 1972 convention with their adoption in 1974 of the same "affirmative action" program advanced by the Republican Party. One wonders why the Democrats are not penalized for their hypocrisies.

The good news for Republicans is that reality appears to be catching up with the Democratic image. One reason is that the members of the Capitol Hill press corps are generally reporting the reality. When the Washington Post's David Broder writes that "the Republicans appear to be solidly in favor of the [Bolling] reforms," and notes subsequently that the proposals were "whipped to death," he provides Republicans with reason for hope. When Broder's Post colleague, Mary Russell, notes that "if there is to be a resurgence of congressional strength, it must come from the Democratic majority, which runs Congress," while also reporting the "passive attitude to power" of Democratic leaders, she also gives the Republican causes a dose of adrenalin.

The Republican hope is not wholly dependent on the press. The truth has many advocates, such as Common Cause Chairman John Gardner. He recently called a news conference to release a survey show that while a majority of House Democrats favor reform, their leadership remains adamantly opposed to change.

Still, Republicans have yet to come up with the sort of responsive, innovative answers to policy problems that produce majority parties; nor is it a foregone conclusion that we will. Image is not the GOP's only problem. We must fully tap our talent reservoir in order for the rebuilding process to take hold. When we do this, we stand an excellent chance of winning the potential GOP converts who are vaguely, almost subconsciously aware that the Democrats are not making too much sense. "With a little bit of nudging," a sharp young Hill reporter recently confessed to me, "I, too, could become a Republican.

In the meantime, there is encouragement in the realization that the Republican Party is not nearly as bad as it looks. We seem to suffer from a Billy Budd syndrome, in which our studding and stammering precludes effective communication. It is a problem. But it is not nearly as large a problem as if we had no answers at all.

Republicans need to remember the words of the silver-haired congressman from Missouri, Richard Bolling(D). He was asked what happened to his reforms. His answer was that "they" killed them. The "they" were not Republicans. ■

CONTRIBUTOR NOTE: J. Brian Smith is press secretary to House Minority Leader John Rhodes(R-Ariz.) and a former official at the Republican National Committee.

POLITICS: STATES

Back in 1972, the Nixon White House got wind of a report that former Beattle John Lennon would attend an anti-war rally at the Republican National Convention. According to the Washington Star-News, the White House exerted pressure to have Lennon's request for an extension of his visa be denied by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Part of the White House's information, which Lennon claims is erroneous, reportedly came from Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.). As part of the continuing battle to prevent Lennon's deportation, U.S. Rep. Norman Lent (R-N.Y.) recently wrote President Ford asking him to "consider waiving deportation" of Lennon and to "remove the obstacles to his becoming a permanent resident alien." Wrote Lent: "I understand that during his stay in the United States, [Lennon] has given generously of his time, funds, and talent to the benefit of charities in the field of retarded children, muscular dystrophy, tuberculosis, and sickle cell anemia. He has performed at the Jerry Lewis Telethon, the March of Dimes Rally, the Sickle Cell Anemia Foundation, the One-to-One Foundation of Willowbrook Institute for the Retarded." Now that the President has met George Harrison, perhaps he will give some consideration to John Lennon.

CALIFORNIA Former HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch (R) has announced he will oppose Sen. John V. Tunney (D) in 1976. Finch backed away from a 1974 race in California because of his association in various capacities with the Nixon Administration. Finch thinks that Tunney may have a primary in his own party, a possibility which seems likely for Republicans as well. Among other Republicans named as Senate possibilities are San Diego Mayor Pete Wilson; U.S. Rep. Barry Goldwater, Jr.; GOP National Committeeman William Banowsky, who is president of Pepperdine University; and State Sen. Dennis Carpenter. Finch indicated he would welcome a primary fight: "How else are we going to get our [GOP] registration up unless we have a mixed bag of candidates." The former California lieutenant governor said he would base a campaign against Tunney on economic differences with the incumbent senator. According to Finch, "being a United State senator is the best job in American politics." Meanwhile, in a recent speech, GOP National Committeeman Banowsky urged Republicans to face up to the threat "to the survival of our free system which was posed by the Nixon Administration's manipulation of government agencies. Republicans "must make it clear that we are just as shocked and sick at the abuse of power [in the Nixon Administration] as any other Americans." The conservative Republican told a Los Angeles GOP group: "If we stay in the country clubs on Wilshire Boulevard, we may well get what we deserve [in coming elections]." In another recent statement, Banowsky took issue with National Review Editor William F. Buckley's suggestions that traditional conservatives need to teach blue-collar populists some economic facts if a Reagan-Wallace presidential fusion is to be possible. Criticizing Buckley's "usual air of superiority," Banowsky wrote: "I like Bill Buckley a lot and he, of all people, would expect me to say what I think. In my judgment, what really keeps such a coalition [of Wallaceites and Reaganites] from occurring is not, as Buckley alludes, the stupidity of the ordinary people, but rather the elitism of the patricians. There is, indeed, a great gulf in the Democratic Party between George Wallace and, say, Ron Dellums. But, alas, the distance from Wallace to Buckley is even greater."

CONNECTICUT December was not a good month for the Connecticut GOP. The nomination of outgoing Gov. Thomas Meskill (R) to the federal bench failed to clear the Senate, and it was widely reported that many senators hoped Meskill's sponsor, Sen. Lowell Weicker (R), would have the nomination withdrawn. Back in Connecticut, Meskill and Weicker were drawn into a supposed scandal involving state building leases and the uncle of former GOP State Chairman Brian Gaffney. State Sen. George Gunther (R) said he had complained to Weicker about the leases, but Weicker vehemently denied it. Meanwhile, Weicker met with the GOP State Central Committee December 17 to air party complaints about Weicker's past actions and statements. Weicker had earlier indicated he might run as an independent in 1976 if the GOP did not like him. The meeting apparently helped clear the air; Weicker himself summed up reaction to him as "Give 'em hell, Senator." He told the assembled Republicans: "I've tried as best I can to create a record that would be a source of pride to Republicans...I, in no way, want to take control of the Republican Party. And I do not want to thrust myself on the party." Weicker was scheduled to announce his decision January 9 whether he would stay in the GOP; he was expected to do so. In other developments, GOP State Chairman Vincent Laudone appointed a 31-member panel headed by F. Mac Buckley, the defeated congressional candidate in the 1st C.D., to investigate possible restructuring of the state GOP.

ILLINOIS Alderman John J. Hoellen (R) is the only Republican on the Chicago Board of Aldermen. He was also chairman of the GOP's search committee for a candidate to oppose Mayor Richard Daley (R). After rejection by over a dozen possibilities, the committee settled on the able Hoellen as the party's nominee. The Chicago Tribune editorialized that Hoellen was the Republicans' "victim for the mayoral election, that horrid sacrificial rite the party goes through every four years." Indeed, Hoellen and probably the Democrats as well, are

more concerned about retaining the GOP's council seat than about the mayoralty race. Chicago Republicans are particularly affected by the lack of political enthusiasm for an election this year, but voter ennui is likely to affect the Democratic primary as well. Daley will face liberal Alderman William Singer, former State's Attorney Edward Hanrahan, and black State Sen. Richard Newhouse. Despite repeated scandals in the past year and his own advancing age and ill health, Daley is expected to win. Daley's disdain for his opponents was indicated by his response to a question regarding diversion of millions of dollars of city insurance policies to his son's insurance firm: "Any father that wouldn't help his sons in a legal way wouldn't be much of a fellow." Hoellen last ran against Daley for county clerk in 1954; he was unsuccessful then just as he is expected to be this year. The GOP slate is rounded off by Ted A. Borek, a retired auto dealer, for city treasurer, and Ronald Samuels, the black head of the fraud and consumer complaint division of the state's attorney's office, for city clerk.

DULY NOTED: STATES

New Jobs: Former Massachusetts Gov. Francis Sargent will become a fellow at Harvard's Kennedy Institute of Politics. Former Virginia Gov. Linwood Holton has resigned as assistant secretary of state for congressional relations to join a Washington law firm.

● "Helms's Club Adds to Holshouser's Troubles," by Howard Covington. The Charlotte (North Carolina) Observer, December 5, 1974. North Carolina Gov. James Holshouser is now in the lame duck half of his four-year term with only a fraction of the Republican legislative support he counted on during his first two years. The moderate Republican is now threatened by the growth of the North Carolina Congressional Club, whose mentor and chief beneficiary is ultraconservative Sen. Jesse Helms. "Behind [the NCCC's] innocuous title lives a healthy bank account, the potential for a 100-county political organization and, some say, the nucleus for a conservative movement in North Carolina." According to Covington, "While Holshouser remains a captive of the legislature and party affairs are by necessity pushed further to the rear in 1975, the NCCC has ambitious plans. Building upon its cadre of those wealthy enough and committed enough to plunk down \$100-a-year for the honor of a couple of newsletters and sit-down dinners with folks like California Gov. Ronald Reagan, the club has plans to expand. [NCCC Chairman Tom Ellis] wants to go after the small farmers, textile workers and wage earners and disgusted suburbanites who cheered George Wallace in 1972 and gave Terry Sanford the Walloping of his life in the presidential primary." The NCCC, which has given the overwhelming bulk of its financial support to Helms, is planning a "rally-style" meeting for early in 1975.

● "Bus Stops Here," by Joe Heaney. Boston Sunday Herald-Advertiser, December 22, 1974. "Somebody has to be the bad guy, even at Christmas. Somebody has to tell [former League of Women Voters president] Lucy Benson about the buses that run between Amherst and Boston, 200 miles round trip for \$10.70. Because if [Gov.] Mike Dukakis can ride the street car, why can't Lucy Benson take the bus?" Dukakis has talked about government austerity, but Benson has suggested that an under-secretary make the daily cross-state drive with her. She took her job as state human affairs secretary on two conditions: "One was that I would not have to move from Amherst and the other was that I wouldn't have to drive. The driving round trip takes four hours and that's just too long." Meanwhile, there are indications that Dukakis may be ready to get off the streetcar routine. Even before he took office, six detectives were deployed to guard Dukakis on the trip from his Brookline home to his downtown Boston office. One of the governor's first acts after he took office, however, was to order an end to the system of police bodyguards which had been used to protect him.

● "Conservative Wing of GOP---A Nose Dive," by Kenneth Reich. Los Angeles Times, December 27, 1974. The 1974 elections were bad news for California Republican conservatives, and grassroots apathy is widespread, according to Reich. Neither conservative voters nor conservative party workers showed up in large numbers last year. "On every side, there is evidence of the bitter aftertaste among conservatives of the Nixon downfall. Among some, it is disgust with all politics. Among others, it is a pessimism that the general voting public will soon forget that it was generally conservatives, such as Reagan, who backed [Nixon] to the end." The future of California conservatives, who made such sweeping gains in the 1960s, is "by no means clear," says Reich. "There is considerable speculation in conservative circles about developments in California that could bring the conservatives back---perhaps a massive strike by public employes or a tax increase supported by Gov.-elect Edmund G. Brown, Jr., and the Democratic-controlled legislature---although it is hard to see why moderate Republicans like [former Controller Houston] Flournoy and [Attorney General Evelle] Younger would not benefit as much by such developments. And, behind the scenes, there is sometimes doubt expressed even by devout conservatives that they will make it back to power in California very soon. GOP Senate candidate [H.L.] Richardson said rather bitterly in an interview last week that in his highly conservative campaign he had concluded that most Californians simply were unwilling to listen seriously to conservative arguments at this time."

● "Gov. Dan Stinging 'Peepul' With Con," by Bob Wiedrich. Chicago Tribune, December 17, 1974. Wiedrich is not impressed by Gov. Daniel Walker's Don Quixote-style jousting with the evil mayor of Chicago, Richard Daley. The Democratic governor seems to find new windmills to charge wherever he turns. "But running around claiming you're busy sticking your finger in the [state's fiscal] dike, while actually finding time to lecture school boys and indulge in a hambone ego trip listening to a ditty about yourself titled 'A Winner Walkin' Home,' is just as irresponsible [as deficit spending by legislators]. That's where the gobbledygook comes in. And the same goes for his last-minute refusal to join fellow Democrats of every possible persuasion at the Kansas City pow-wow because Springfield was allegedly burning and Gov. Dan was needed there to play the fiddle. Actually, that was sheer baloney." Perhaps Walker would be better off opening a delicatessen.

● "An Empty Chair Marked 'Governor Byrne,'" by Robert Comstock. (Hackensack, N.J.) Record, December 22, 1974. "An Empty Chair is fast becoming symbolic of Gov. Brendan T. Byrne's unorthodox brand of party leadership," writes Comstock. The New Jersey Democrat was absent for most of the business of the Kansas City miniconvention. He refused to attend a meeting of state county chairmen unless State Assemblyman Kenneth W. Gewertz(D), Gloucester County Democratic chairman, was ousted from the meeting. Gewertz' erratic behavior and temerity in calling for Byrne's resignation as governor had alienated Byrne. Byrne also declined to attend a victory celebration by Bergen County Democrats though he was only 15 miles away. The Jersey Democrat's unpolitical behavior is one reason for his inability to enact a tax passage or otherwise unify his victorious party.

● "The Hollings-McNair Battle Continues Unabated," by Hugh Gibson. Charleston News & Courier, December 8, 1974. The election of a Republican governor in South Carolina has led to a number of Democratic spats in the state. "Thus we have seen U.S. Sen Ernest F. Hollings, safely reelected for six more years, blaming his former bosom buddy, Gov. John C. West, for freezing Charles D. Ravenel out of the race and handing the governor's office to James B. Edwards," writes Gibson. "Then there was the delightful hassle over who now is the titular head of the South Carolina Democratic Party...Just about everyone got into the act after [losing gubernatorial candidate] W.J.B. Dorn claimed that honor. The most delightful touch was supplied by State Chairman Donald L. Fowler, who appeared to suggested that a hydra-headed array of titular heads will emerge from the melee... Despite Dorn's claim to that honor, however, it still appears the property of either Lt. Gov.-elect W. Brantley Harvey, Jr. or Ravenel." Ravenel is still deeply involved in paying off his campaign debts. Meanwhile, Hollings and former Gov. Robert E. McNair(D), bitter rivals, have both given indications that the possibility of a vice presidential nomination is within the realm of probability and their own interests.

DULY NOTED: REPUBLICANS

"Where Are the GOP Thinkers?" by Martin F. Nolan. Boston Globe, January 5, 1975. "It may seem like a ludicrously low-priority item, but one useful public enterprise for 1975 would be the development of a working economic philosophy for the Republican Party," writes the head of the Globe's Washington bureau. "Such a project is far from the margin of frivolity, because a Republican definition of economic beliefs is long overdue--at least three decades late."

● "Party Reforms Now Need Voter Support," by Jerold F. terHorst. Detroit News, December 11, 1974. The former presidential press secretary suggests that "the GOP National Committee will have to find a way to prove to the voters that its party-broadening decisions truly mean the demise of "southern strategy" and country-club elitism. In the aftermath of Watergate and last month's disastrous elections, the Republican Party has an especially hard, uphill struggle to win public interest and esteem. This will require changes in the party's philosophical approach as well as in its membership recruitment. For far too long it has been easier for a camel to get through the eye of a needle than for a blue-collar union man to feel at home in a Republican gathering...Mr. Ford owes the GOP a special obligation to help make it the party of the open door. He can help best by presidential actions and policies that do not turn off the kinds of voters the Republican Party needs in its ranks: the young, the poor, the black, the progressive intellectuals."

● "Ford Party's Best, Cheapest Asset," by Mary McGrory Boston Globe, December 29, 1974. Commenting on the Republican National Committee's grandiose public relations plans, McGrory writes: "President Ford is always billed as a Grand Rapids innocent, but the evidence, PR-wise anyway, is completely contrary. He does not have a single adman in his entourage, and he doesn't need one. He grasps something that none of the wizards from J. Walter Thompson and Disneyland who counseled his predecessor ever got through their heads, namely, that amiability and accessibility are perfectly acceptable traits in the nation's first citizen." Ford, writes McGrory, is "a veritable genius of public relations," and "it doesn't cost a red cent."

● "Perspective," by Eddie N. Williams. Focus, December 1974. Commenting on post-election observations by Sen. John Tower(R-Tex.) that the "GOP does not need to broaden its base by appealing to minority groups," the president of the Joint Center for Political Studies writes: "Do Republicans want blacks to join their ranks or not? For those who say the answer is 'yes,' the Tower statement could not have been more untimely. It came fast on the heels of impressive but unsuccessful bids by black Republicans for office and after a significant show of black support for hard-pressed white liberal Republicans." Williams notes, for example, that Maryland Sen. Charles McC. Mathias won majorities in 12 black Baltimore precincts. "In those jurisdictions where Republican candidates strike a responsive chord with black voters, they can cut into an essential portion of their Democratic opponent's potential support in order to shift the results of an election."

● "Formula For Reviving The GOP Elephant," by Lyn Nofziger. California Journal, December 1974. "There is hope for the Republican Party, but only if it changes its method of operating and its approach to electing people to office, which is what parties are all about in the first place... when Republicans win they win largely because of Democratic blunders, Republican money and organizational ability, and the current climate of opinion on any given election day," writes the former deputy chairman of the Republican National Committee, now a conservative political consultant. Unlike Democrats, "Republicans... talk in terms of things and philosophies instead of people... What Republicans have never learned to do is to couch their beliefs, their philosophy, their programs in terms of helping the people. Until they learn to do this they will always be a minority party." Nofziger also suggests that "Republicans also lack persistence. They quit too easily." If at first the GOP does not succeed, it tends to quit. "In short, people who make the Democratic Party work seem to be instinctively better politicians than are most Republicans. They are better at sensing issues, and better at expounding on them, keeping the opposition largely on the defensive. So, concludes Nofziger, the GOP "needs to shift away from its largely organization approach and adopt instead an approach that involves massive and continuous information programs at every level, and especially in non-election years. Republicans need to start disseminating information about their philosophy, about issues, and about their political opposition, the Democrats."

● "Richardson Responds To The Call," by David S. Broder. Washington Post, December 22, 1974. Former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird wanted Ronald Reagan appointed ambassador to Great Britain and Elliot Richardson appointed to a high Administration post like attorney general. Laird's plan to exile a possible presidential rival to Gerald Ford was mislaid, and Richardson instead appointed to the ambassadorial post---despite his longing for a domestic appointment. Writes Broder, "It has occurred to many people---probably including Richardson---that sending Richardson to London might serve several purposes for several people, in addition to giving the President an able representative in Whitehall. For [Henry] Kissinger, it eliminates a Cabinet colleague whose influence on the public and the President might have rivaled Kissinger's own. For Nelson Rockefeller, Kissinger's friend and patron, it sidetracks and attractive rival for liberal Republican support should Mr. Ford decide not to run for reelection in 1976. And for Donald Rumsfeld it detours a potential opponent for the 1980 nomination." Although Richardson knows the disadvantages of the ambassadorial assignment, "Richardson simply cannot resist the call to public service. He is of a disappearing tradition that still respects the word duty."

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 District of Columbia, chapters in fifteen 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., 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices. Contents are copyrighted © 1975 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)

In publishing this newsletter 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 Re-

publican 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 \$15 a year, \$7.50 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps. Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$6 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. Rehluss, Thomas A. Sargent, Richard Cleveland, Mark Frazier, Peter Berg, Martin Sours, and William K. Woods.

Technical Editor: Brian McCarthy

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices.