

RIPON FORUM

WHAT NEXT?

AUGUST 1, 1976

VOL. XII, No. 15

50 CENTS

EDITORIAL: Vice Presidency

FORD, SI; CONNALLY, NO

If Gerald Ford and the Republican Party still have visions of winning this November, John Connally should not be nominated for Vice President. The GOP might just as well nominate Rosemary Woods. In the public mind, the effect will be the same. The image of the Republican Party as the party of Richard Nixon, Watergate, Big Business, and sleazy deals will be re-enforced.

John Connally these days seems to be the number two hero of the Reaganite, New Right wing of the GOP and its non-GOP friends. Richard Viguerie, the conservative money raiser, pushed Connally in New Hampshire as a Democratic presidential write-in. More recently, columnist Patrick Buchanan has been pushing a Reagan-Connally ticket as the GOP's only hope: "The Rockefeller wing of the party would be outraged, the liberal press apoplectic. But the Republicans, it seems to me, are in the same stew as the old Boston Braves of the National League. They had going for them but two great assets: the brilliant left-hander Warren Spahn and the reliable right-hander Johnny Sain. At season's opening when the Braves' manager was asked what his strategy was for remaining in pennant contention, he had one answer: Spahn and Sain and pray for rain. The Republicans are in that boat today."

Buchanan's boat is a leaky one. Admittedly, Connally might boost the Republican ticket in Texas, but even Lyndon Baines Johnson had difficulty delivering that state for John F. Kennedy. In other states of the Southwest, like New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and Oklahoma, Connally's military-industrial complex background may also help. But these five states have only 25 Electoral College votes---compared to 21 for Michigan where a recent Detroit News survey showed that putting Connally on the ticket would turn a narrow Ford win over Carter into a 44-34 percent loss.

If John Connally is nominated for Vice President, Watergate will be replayed in convention prime time. All the details of Connally's acquittal in the Milk Fund case will be rehashed. Connally's abrasive handling of U.S. allies as secretary of the treasury will be re-counted. Connally's role as heir-apparent to Richard Nixon will be explored in soliloquies by Walter Cronkite, David Brinkley, and Harry Reasoner. Gerald Ford pardoned Richard Nixon to put Watergate behind the country. Nominating John Connally for Vice President would put Watergate right back on center stage. A recent poll by George Gallup showed that over half of the American public still disagreed with Ford's pardon of Richard Nixon. That's a big can of worms and John Connally would be the Democrats' can opener.

John Connally has been strong on the GOP fundraising circuit during the last two years. Many Republicans have liked what they heard, and Connally has picked up some IOU's. Those IOU's will not help Ford, however, in those places where he needs help---the northern tier of industrial states. Nominating Connally would produce the directly opposite effect of nominating another articulate southerner, Sen. Howard Baker, Jr. (R-Tenn.). Baker would symbolize the party's effort to root out the Watergate menace and cleanse the federal government. Connally would do the reverse.

The Democrats would have such fun with Connally, but they probably could let the press do a hatchet job without lifting a Democratic finger. The news analyses would be replete with Connally's receipt of \$750,000 in fees from the estate of oil millionaire Sid Richardson, of his law firm ties to Big Business and foreign countries, of his opposition to federal aid to education and Medicare, and his uneven gubernatorial record in Texas. If the GOP hopes to make an issue of Walter Mondale's record, it ought to consider Connally's as well.



One place where Connally's record has produced both praise and criticism is Vermont, where GOP National Committeeman Roland Seward and State GOP Chairman Walter Kennedy both like Connally. Former State Rep. John McLaughry, a leader of the Conservative Caucus in the state and a former candidate for lieutenant governor, does not. He's published a pamphlet, "Meet John Connally," in order to familiarize Republicans with the former governor's record. McLaughry cites Connally's support for a strong domestic counter-intelligence program, his authorship of the Lockheed loan-guarantee program, his waffling on wage and price controls, his support for a New Deal-type Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and his backing for compulsory youth service. Regarding the latter idea, McLaughry says it is "nothing more than a resurrection of slavery," an issue the GOP once had strong opinions on.

According to McLaughry, "John Connally is the symbol of concentrated political and economic power. His record in public life reflects his sincere desire to weld Big Business, Big Labor, and Big Government into what might variously be described as state capitalism or corporate socialism. His economic program is essentially that of Mussolini, shorn only of its more objectionable trappings." The Democrats may be counted on to be less kind than a conservative Vermont Republican.

If Gerald Ford hopes to become the 1976 version of Harry Truman, he should warily recall the deadly effect of Truman's 1946 cam-

paign against "the economic tapeworm of big business." John Connally is not Wall Street, but he is very nearly the personification of the southern Military Industrial Complex. Already, columnists Jack Anderson, Robert Novak and Rowland Evans, and Mary McGrory have alluded to Connally's handicaps as a Vice Presidential candidate. U.S. Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.) has circulated a letter to fellow House Republicans, noting that Connally is "indelibly associated in the public mind with Watergate."

What Gerald Ford needs is a progressive Republican who can attract northern Democratic and independent voters. Pennsylvania Sen. Richard Schweiker is the sort of person Ford needs on his ticket, but by signing on with Ronald Reagan, Schweiker has not made a Reagan-Schweiker ticket any more palatable to this target group of voters. The Vice Presidential nomination is a sweetener, but it's not the main show. Voters may be dissuaded from supporting a ticket because they don't like the Vice Presidential nominee, but they will seldom support a ticket because they like the number two man though they dislike number one. In other words, while Connally can scare a lot of voters away from Ford, Schweiker won't add appreciably to Reagan's appeal in November. Schweiker is sugar on a brick, but that does not make the brick politically palatable.

By selecting as his potential running mate, a popular senator from a state with a

large block of uncommitted delegates, Reagan has made a last-minute attempt to shore up his crumbling campaign. It is curious that the selection of Sen. Schweiker is billed as an effort to bridge the gap between moderates and conservatives within the GOP for it was Ronald Reagan and his conservative friends who widened that gap by challenging an incumbent President supported by a majority of Republicans. Nevertheless, what makes good political sense

for Reagan, makes better sense for Ford. To retain the White House, a conservative Republican such as President Ford must select a progressive Vice Presidential nominee who will appeal to those chiefly northern industrial states whose Electoral College votes are critical for victory in November. ■

Note: Copies of the McClaughry booklet are available from Connally Information Committee, Concord, Vermont, 05824. Cost: \$1.00.

POLITICS: STATES

SENATE UPDATES

● A recent poll by Market Opinion Research for the Detroit News showed Secretary of State Richard Austin has a commanding lead for the Democratic Senate nomination in Michigan. According to the poll, Austin had 49 percent, U.S. Rep. Don Riegle(D) had 13 percent, and U.S. Rep. James O'Hara(D) had 11 percent. The Republican Senate race was much closer with former Michigan Supreme Court Justice Thomas Brennan leading U.S. Rep. Marvin Esch, 15-14 percent. Former U.S. Rep. Robert Huber (who ran as a conservative in the 1970 Senate race) had 12 percent and University of Michigan Regent Deane Baker had 6 percent. The large number of undecideds in the GOP race, 53 percent, is complicated by the possibility of crossover voting in the state.

● Crossover voting also complicates the picture in the Vermont Democratic Senate primary, where Republican voters may be tempted to cross over to vote against Gov. Thomas Salmon (D) for the Senate and vote for State Treasurer Stella Hackel(D) for governor. Salmon is in trouble from what was once thought to be a token challenge from Scott Skinner, former director of the Vermont Public Information Research Group. Skinner has assembled an able and energetic organization and has generated considerable press attention for his attacks on Salmon's lackluster record as governor. Although Salmon himself is a skilled campaigner, he has declined to use those talents---perhaps in order not to alienate Skinner's backers for the November election. Salmon's lack of visibility, however, has been transferred to his campaign, where organization Democrats have mobilized in disappointing numbers. Skinner may get as high as 45 percent of the Democratic primary total; a big chunk of that support may switch to the Liberty Union Party candidate in November, thus further handicapping Salmon's effort to unseat moderate Sen. Thomas Stafford(R).

● In Nevada, former U.S. Rep. David Towell(R) is the Republican set on getting the tough assignment of contesting Sen. Howard W. Cannon (D), whose campaign chest is well stocked with contributions from the airline and defense

industries. Attorney General Robert List(R) is apparently waiting for 1978 when the gubernatorial office will be vacant.

● The post-primary period was rather tough on U.S. Rep. Philip H. Hayes, the upstart challenger who almost defeated Sen. Vance Hartke(D) in the Indiana Democratic primary. He announced his pending divorce, a not unusual development these days, as well as the firing of four key staff members in his Washington office---and their replacement with campaign staff members. The Washington staff was not sufficiently enthusiastic about Hayes' campaign. Hartke, as usual, got off to the wrong start on the wrong foot in his campaign with former Indianapolis Mayor Richard Lugar. Hartke said his campaign would take the high road---he would refuse to "get down in the gutter with Richard Nixon's favorite mayor."

● The Pennsylvania Senate race threatens to split the AFL-CIO in the state. The state organization, dominated by the eastern half of the state, has backed U.S. Rep. William J. Green(D) of Philadelphia. This action has displeased western Pennsylvania unions who like U.S. Rep. H. John Heinz(R) of Pittsburgh. The Southwestern Pennsylvania Building and Construction Trades Council has already backed Heinz, and the endorsement struggle may exacerbate the existing east-west split in the labor organization. Meanwhile, in Harrisburg, Gov. Milton Shapp(D) has returned to the job he had done so poorly before trying to disorganize the United States. Stung by repeated investigations (and convictions) into corruption in his administration, Shapp charged the federal Justice Department with cooperating with state GOP officials. The Democrats are upset by the possibility that former U.S. Attorney Richard Thornburgh, now in charge of the Justice Department's criminal division, might return to the state in 1978 and run for governor. Five middle-rank Department of Transportation employees were recently fired after the Pittsburgh Press revealed that they were still on the payroll months after conviction for official misconduct. The state's pothole problems are creating a rocky road for state Democrats.

COMMENTARY: PLATFORM

HELPING PEOPLE WHERE THEY REALLY LIVE

by Pete Wilson

Despite four decades of centralization of power and resources at the federal level of government, the people of America live at the local level. It is at the local level that their problems occur, and very likely there that solutions will be found.

Yet, not enough of the total tax dollars paid by Americans to all levels of government is available to local elected officials; nor do they have sufficient discretion and flexibility in the spending of those subventions they do receive from the federal and state governments. For this reason, the very significant beginning in the decentralization of resources and the authority to use them made by the Ford Administration through its championing of general and special federal revenue sharing programs should be applauded proudly and pressed further by the Republican Party.

But regrettably, the hopes of both local and federal officials for the revenue-sharing programs have been greater than the achievements possible because the purchasing power of the new revenues made available to state and local governments have been so greatly eroded by inflation. All too many local governments, rather than undertaking new programs to address old, unanswered needs, have instead used revenue sharing to offset the required operating costs of such fundamental public services as police and fire protection.

The greatest possible help the federal government could give to cities---just as to those struggling to meet rising household and business costs---would be to bring raging inflation under control. Otherwise, local taxpayers can anticipate the local officials will impose upon them either seriously reduced services or seriously increased taxes. It is a choice calculated to aggravate citizen disillusionment with government.

The wisdom, the integrity, and the political courage of President Ford in exercising 49 vetoes in 22 months and his legislative skill in being sustained in all but a handful have given great hope to those local officials who see the future of America's cities as being tied to the health and full productive capacity of the American private sector rather than to an endless series of stop-gap, so-called emergency measures propounded by the Congress which will surely aggravate inflation, though professed as a cure for unemployment.

The President's vetoes and budget submitted by him in January---the first of three

aimed at restoring the federal government to a balance between what it takes in income and what it expends---are the first real steps taken that we as a nation have the will to and will in fact reduce inflationary federal spending. By removing the need for the federal government to make ruinous incursions on the private money markets, we can once again make available private capital desperately needed for new housing starts, plant expansion and other private sector investment to create real and lasting jobs providing goods and services.

At a time when inflation compels city governments to elect between services reduction and tax increases, the circumstances compelling this choice are sorely aggravated by federal mandates to local governments to perform new duties and responsibilities---unaccompanied by federal funds for their performance. To prevent the further aggravation of what is already an overburdened local property tax base, the Republican Party should demand that the federal government either forebear from such mandates or conscientiously measure and compensate local government for explicitly mandated costs and for costs not expressly mandated but inherent in the performance of tasks mandated by the federal government as a local responsibility. There is all too much conversation at all levels of government about priorities. And very clearly, government cannot and should not attempt to do everything. Priorities must in fact be set and kept. All too often the federal grant-in-aid program, although reflecting a legitimately perceived need, may not in its generalized prescription respond to the most urgent priorities of America's very different communities and may as well entail local expenditures which miss the mark of the peculiar needs of the community. Congressional pride of authorship should be subordinated to the locally-devised priorities of local, elected officials who are both more accessible and accountable to their constituents and necessarily more knowledgeable of their needs.

One of the gravest threats of congressional and state usurpation of the local, priority-setting function exists in threatened legislation that would legalize public employee strikes and compel binding arbitration. The National Municipal Policy of the National League of Cities specifically enjoins the Congress to "refrain from enacting any law mandating collective bargaining for public employees, legalizing strikes or compelling binding arbitration; and to remove any existing provisions of federal law or to refrain from enacting any in the future which will either "directly or indirectly

affect municipal employee conditions of work, which are inconsistent with the functional requirements of public employment, or which will affect in any adverse manner the independence and integrity of municipal government priorities, policy and budgetary decision-making."

The legalization of public employee strikes and binding arbitration to resolve public employment impasses will assure that the Congress will be confronted with the dilemma of hundreds of New York Cities across the nation. The legalization of public employee strikes virtually guarantees the interruption of essential public services and the threat of withholding those services, thereby guaranteeing tax increases which local taxpayers cannot afford.

Similarly, compulsory binding arbitration has not prevented strikes but does for a certainty remove both the setting of the tax rate the making of basic public policy and managerial decisions from public officials who are elected and appointed to make them, and places them instead in the hands of an arbitrator who is not elected by nor accountable to the public. The public costs of merely performing arbitration are staggering, let alone the costs involved in making good the award flowing from the arbitrator. By simple operation of the marketplace, local governments must pay adequate compensation to be competitive and retain qualified employees or they will lose them. But they must also be fair to the taxpayer and consider the ability of the taxpayer to pay. An arbitrator does not have this responsibility and his decision is in no way shaped by the ability of the taxpayer to pay.

Techniques of collective bargaining legitimate in the private sector have no application to public employment. Government is a monopoly which exists to provide essential public services which are not available or not appropriately provided by the private sector. The private employer passes on to consumers the wage increases he pays his employees as an increased cost of the goods or services he offers in the marketplace. But, unlike the consumer in the marketplace who can choose a competitor's goods or services at a lesser cost, the taxpayer cannot avoid the increased costs of public services. Government is a monopoly and there is no marketplace. Nor is there a tax holiday when essential public services are interrupted. Your garbage may not be collected, but your taxes will be. And tax dollars which go to pay unreasonable wage demands, whether exacted by a strike or an arbitrator's award, are obviously not available without a further tax increase for other, more pressing municipal needs.

The effort to achieve the legaliza-

tion of public employee strikes and binding arbitration is part of a concerted effort by public employee union leadership to gain an unequal bargaining power over the public. Accompanying these efforts are efforts to organize more and more of the growing ranks of public employees. In the growing number of organized public employees is increasing political strength which public employee union leaders seek to apply to the state and federal legislative bodies in order to circumvent and overcome the firmness of local officials at the bargaining table.

A particularly insidious effort has been made recently to organize sensitive classifications of public employees as members of private sector labor unions, creating inevitable and serious conflicts of interest which gravely undermine public safety and public confidence. Will a Teamster policeman enforce a court order restraining brother Teamsters who are engaged in an illegal secondary boycott? Will a Teamster highway patrolman issue a citation to a recklessly driving trucker who is a brother Teamster? Will a Teamster - firefighter cross picket lines to save a burning building?

The Republican Party should at the very least adopt a plank expressing its unyielding opposition to the legalization of public employee strikes and binding arbitration and the inclusion of public employees in private sector labor unions. That plank should make clear the insistence of the Republican Party that sovereignty continue to reside, as it has for the past 200 years of this Republic, in the people, and that we will resist by every legal effort the transfer of that sovereignty to public employee union bosses.

The Republican platform committee should consider further the fact that public employee strikes, though illegal, frequently occur. If the prohibition of such strikes is not to be a hollow threat, it must be accompanied by a prohibition against the granting of amnesty to striking employees. And to provide an additional disincentive to public employee strikes, public bodies should be prohibited from granting or offering any improvement in wages, hours, or benefits beyond that offered prior to the commencement of a public employee strike.

Turning from public employees to private unemployment, it must be admitted that the costs of unemployment---both to the unemployed individual and to the nation, are staggering. The costs to the jobless worker are both monetary and personal. As a nation, we suffer the loss of revenues, productivity, and purchasing power while increasing our expenditures for maintenance of the unemployed.

But the Republican Party must be honest with the American people and insist that they be told the true causes of unemployment. The GOP must oppose the enactment of legislation which will create expectations which cannot be met. President Ford, both in his State of the Union message and his budget message, has emphasized that we must first cure inflation if we are to make any inroads upon unemployment. His economic policies have in fact brought us down from double digit inflation and stimulated the economy to the point where three million more American men and women are employed than when he assumed the office of President.

The answer to persistent unemployment in the private sector is not to create a monster by bringing everyone who is unemployed onto a public payroll. Public service employment by definition should be created only by the need for services. Public service job programs which have been advertised and sold by the congressional majority as emergency stop-gaps should not be endlessly renewed either as an election year ploy or as a real and permanent answer to private sector unemployment.

The real answer to unemployment is to restore the job-producing capacity of our private sector economy. And the most vital role to be played by the federal government in this regard is to reduce inflationary federal spending---that is, to pursue the admirable beginnings made by President Ford---and to remove itself from the private money market so that venture capital will again become available in sufficient quantities to create real and lasting private sector jobs that produce goods and services that turn over in the economy. Only by reducing escalating federal spending will we avoid the need to repeatedly go into the private money market and avoid federal borrowing that drives up investment capital that is desperately needed for private sector economic growth.

President Ford has urged large and permanent tax reductions---matched by federal spending cuts---to leave more money in the hands of American consumers. He has urged tax incentives for the construction of new plants and equipment to provide new jobs in areas of high unemployment and he has proposed tax incentives to encourage a much broader investment in the American economic future by encouraging the ownership of common stock by citizens of low and moderate income. This is the way of economic reality and the course America must pursue to reverse inflation and unemployment by encouraging private sector economic growth.

The Republican Party must actively support this course and actively oppose such measures as the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill which promise

probably unattainable goals and advocate the achievement of "full employment" by public service employment that would very likely be counter-productive because it requires federal spending of a magnitude that would once again touch off a raging and perhaps uncontrollable inflation. The actual costs of the legislation, assuming a \$8,000 per capita cost for each of the public service employment positions it envisions, would likely exceed \$30 billion a year...rather than the \$25 billion a year its sponsors admit (less savings in unemployment insurance and welfare). This cost must be financed either from additional taxes or from additional borrowing in the capital market or both---leading us back into the same dismal stagflation from which we have begun to extricate ourselves. The Republican Party must realize and insist that the American people be told that this nation is in grave danger of diverting too much capital and manpower from the private sector into the public sector. There is a limit to our ability to do so. If we exceed that limit, we will suffer the gravest consequences. Growth in the public sector does not add to economic productivity nor does it contribute to the tax base. Someone must make a profit to pay the taxes to support government.

Cities have as real a stake in the health and growth of the private sector economy as does the businessman or investor. Public service employment has imposed upon local governments added costs at the very time we are seeking desperately to reduce them. Patrol cars for police officers, desks and typewriters for stenographers---these equipment costs, while a real burden, are the least of it.

Far more important is the fact that we are creating a level of services that cannot be supported by the local tax base. Local governments inevitably are faced---when the federal funding of public service employment is withdrawn---with massive layoffs and a sharp reduction of services or a sharp increase in local taxes. Anticipating that fateful day are a cadre of workers within each local bureaucracy created by the public service employment program who will, for their own preservation, lobby for the retention of their positions. Moreover, even manpower programs (under Title I of the Comprehensive Employment Training Act) which seek to train people for employment in the private sector, can function only in an economy able to absorb the trainees. If the private sector is so starved for necessary investment capital that it cannot offer employment, then manpower programs that train people for jobs which will not exist can at best provide only temporary maintenance and end in a return to unemployment and understandable disillusionment on the part of the trainee.

The clear remedy for this vicious cycle

is not to continue to starve the private sector for the capital it needs to provide jobs, but instead to provide it by the simple device of refraining from the spending that occasions the issuance of Treasury notes at an interest rate with which private borrowers cannot compete.

These are the truths the American people must be told. I think they are ready to believe that the federal government cannot tax and spend our way to prosperity. Political leadership exists in telling the people the

truth and in doing what you tell them must be done. That happens as well to be the record of presidential performance for the past 22 months. It is performance and not rhetoric. It is a record of which the Republican Party can be proud and for which the American people can be grateful. ■

Contributer Note: Pete Wilson is mayor of San Diego, California. His article is adapted from June testimony before the Republican National Platform Committee.

COMMENTARY: COLLEGES

COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A PUBLIC INVESTMENT

by Edward Goldberg

Over the last decade, an explosion of community colleges has taken place. Today, there are approximately 1200 in existence. Significantly different in philosophy from four-year colleges and universities, the community colleges have as their long-term goal, total service to their communities. Specifically:

- * Service under various open access admission policies, policies geared to accept almost all who apply no matter what their skill level;

- * Service under policies which provide strong occupational-oriented programs to as high as 60 percent of their student bodies;

- * Service under community-oriented programs to the totality of cultural, intellectual, and leisure needs of the geographical areas in which they are located.

To carry out their long-term goals, community colleges have developed basic skill testing programs for incoming students, have developed basic skill programs to bring entering students up to a college level, have developed strong personal and vocational counseling programs to aid students in charting the directions they want to take, have developed a wide range of tempting activities for community residents, and have, not insignificantly, kept their tuitions low.

The colleges have become unique institutions when compared to traditional institutions of higher education. They have discovered needs in their communities and have vigorously moved to meet them. And, in doing so, they have served a major societal purpose since it is critical that we provide basic collegiate education to a large number of individuals rather than (within the current level of societal spending on higher education) provide opportunities for advanced work to a few people; e.g., there are already too many Ph.D.s

in history and many other advanced degree fields.

This is particularly true when you look at those who are typically attracted to a community college:

- * mature students whose average age is well above the typical college age.

- * women returning to college after full-time homemaking;

- * students from families with low incomes;

- * students who for a variety of reasons cannot attend a college outside of their locality;

- * students attending on a part-time basis; and

- * senior citizens.

For these students and community residents, the community colleges have provided opportunities they would not otherwise have had.

A few statistics tell part of the community college story. While the number of students in two-year institutions jumped 235 percent from 1964 to 1974, the number of students in four-year institutions jumped only 61 percent. Based on 1972-73 data, the average expenditure per pupil was \$1,126 for public two-year institutions, compared to \$2,356 for students attending public, four-year institutions and \$6,768 for students attending private, four-year institutions. The average age of community college students is estimated to be 28; in 1974, 42 percent of community college students were over 21 compared to 14 percent over 21 in the first two years of four-year colleges. While in 1965, only 13 percent of community college students were enrolled in vocational course, by 1975, this figure had jumped to 50 percent. In community colleges, 53 percent of the students in 1974 worked to contribute to course costs while only 40 percent of those in four-year institutions did the same. The income for working students averaged out to \$3,900 for community college students and \$2,400 for

those in four-year institutions.

The recent economic downturn for state and local governments has coincided with doubts about the wisdom of society expending more funds for higher education. Questions are being raised about the effectiveness of higher education expenditures on the part of society (Are the educated students worth it?) and the efficiency of the expenditures (Are we getting as much effort on the part of colleges as we possibly can?).

Based on these questions and others, higher education has been in financial difficulty far beyond what one might have expected simply as a consequence of the decrease in the rate of increasing enrollments. Part of the reason stems from the misguided efforts of some higher education advocates stoically to maintain that all is well. Rather than clean house and appropriately silence higher education critics, their approach has been to bury their heads in the sand. And with every revelation of abuses, all in higher education suffer. Hopefully, wisdom is beginning to show itself in this regard.

Still, all across the country (with obviously some exceptions) funds for community colleges from counties and states are not keeping pace with rising enrollments. Higher education is no longer one of the top priority budget items in many governmental jurisdictions.

Community colleges, in addition to facing local and state resistance to increased funding, have never done as well as many think they should in securing federal funds. Although the reasons are complex, as relative new-

comers to the higher education scene, community colleges have often had to overcome traditional federal funding patterns---patterns which saw funds going primarily to four-year institutions and universities and to secondary schools in the case of vocational funding.

Given these local, state, and federal funding problems, community colleges are in danger of having to curtail enrollments and services. The threat clearly is there in locality after locality. The need is to secure adequate funding in order that these unique and valuable institutions can fulfill their mission.

There are several ways in which local citizens and politicians can get involved. The first involves lobbying to secure more funds for higher education at the state level with the expectation that funds would then flow to the community college sector. Lobbying could also be undertaken for an increased share of higher education funds to go to community colleges. Secondly, lobbying needs to be done to increase local support of community college budgets in jurisdictions where local support helps to fund the community colleges. The third involves lobbying in Washington to secure set-asides in various federal bills (i.e., vocational education) so that community colleges get a fair share of the funding. It is hoped that such lobbying support will be forthcoming to aid the colleges before permanent damage is done. ■

Contributor Note: Dr. Edward Goldberg is director of the Office of Community Colleges of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education.

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., 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices. Contents are copyrighted © 1976 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)

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 \$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
Clifford Brown
Robert H. Donaldson

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. Rehtuss, Thomas A. Sargent, Richard Cleveland, Mark Frazier, Peter Berg, Martin Sours, and William K. Woods.

Technical Editor: Brian J. McCarthy

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices.

MSWILLING 0002426021577CP01
DANIEL J SWILLINGER
214 12TH STREET SE
616 A ST SE
WASHINGTON DC 20003