

November/December
1978

RIPON FORUM

Volume XIV, Number 8
Price \$1.50



POST ELECTION ISSUE

On The Cover —

A Heartland Strategy
for 1980?

1. Governor William Milliken
Michigan
2. Governor-Elect Albert Quie
Minnesota
3. Governor Robert Ray
Iowa
4. Governor James Rhodes
Ohio
5. Governor James Thompson
Illinois
6. Governor-Elect
Lee Sherman Dreyfus
Wisconsin
7. Governor Otis R. Bowen
Indiana
8. Governor-Elect
Richard Thornburgh
Pennsylvania

RIPON FORUM

COMMENTARY	
Edward W. Brooke	2
A Heartland Strategy For 1980	2
ADDENDA AND ERRATA	4
VIEW FROM HAWKINS GORE	
The Inflation Protection Plan	5
HOUSE ELECTIONS: Slow Road Back	7
REPUBLICAN CONTROL OF THE SENATE IN 1981: A Pipe Dream or a Realistic Prospect?	10
BUREAUCRACY MARCHES ON	13
THE ASCENDANCY OF THE WASHINGTON LAWYER AND LOBBYIST: An Unintended Result of Campaign Finance Reform	14

RIPON FORUM

Editor: Arthur M. Hill II

Executive Editor: Steven D. Livengood

Art Director: Elizabeth Lee (The Graphic Tuna)

THE RIPON FORUM is published monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc.

In the publication, the Society hopes to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well researched proposals, and a spirit of creative criticism and innovation in the Republican Party. Manuscripts and photographs are solicited, but do not represent the views of the Society unless so stated.

Contents are copyrighted © 1978 by the Ripon Society, Inc., 800 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Second class postage and fees paid at Washington, D.C. and additional mailing offices.

Subscription rates: \$15 per year, \$7.50 for students, servicemen, Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas, add \$6. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

The Ripon Society, Inc., John C. Topping, Jr., President, is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are business, academic, and professional men and women. It is headquartered in Washington, D.C., with fifteen chapters, several affiliated subchapters, and National Associate members throughout the United States. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications and contract work.

COMMENTARY

Edward W. Brooke

The defeat of Ed Brooke for re-election to the U.S. Senate is a tremendous loss to progressive Republicans and to the cause of innovative problem-solving at the national level. His name has been associated with imaginative approaches to as broad a range of issues as any Senator during the past dozen years, from foreign policy to energy and urban policy. In the field of housing, where he served as ranking minority member on the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, he was responsible for the Brooke Amendment setting a maximum rent level for public housing tenants and for the proposal (not yet enacted) which would allow young families to save for a down payment by putting funds tax free into a special account. In addition, he has provided courageous leadership for women's rights and on the issue of abortion.

The Ripon Society has had a close link with Senator Brooke over the years, having provided the Research Director and a number of campaign workers for his initial Senate campaign in 1966. We will miss his intelligent espousal of moderate Republican ideals in the Senate and hope that a future Republican administration will find a use for his talents.

A Heartland Strategy For 1980

Perhaps the most significant result of the 1978 elections from the standpoint of 1980 Presidential politics was the success of Republican gubernatorial candidates

Richard Thornburgh in Pennsylvania, Lee Dreyfus in Wisconsin, and Albert Quie in Minnesota. Republicans now control governorships in the seven Great Lakes states from Pennsylvania to Minnesota.

These seven states cast a total of 133 electoral votes, nearly half the number needed to win the White House. In close Presidential elections since 1960, these states have been closely contested, as the chart on this page makes clear. In 1976, Jimmy Carter carried Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin by narrow margins and Walter Mondale's Minnesota by a much healthier margin. Carter's position in each of these four states has eroded significantly.

Carter's 11,116 vote margin in Ohio over Gerald Ford resulted largely from an unusually strong showing among Protestants in Southern Ohio. Since 1976, Carter's standing has fallen among these voters as affinity for his born again Christianity has given way to more mundane concerns about foreign policy or inflation. Carter's ace-in-the-hole to stem this voter attrition was a Democratic capture of the Ohio governorship. Ohio is still an old fashioned patronage state and there control of the governor's mansion is probably worth at least one hundred thousand votes in a Presidential election. Lieutenant Governor Richard Celeste came close but could not topple Republican Governor James Rhodes.

In 1976 Carter carried Pennsylvania by only 2 percent while the Democrats controlled the governorship. Richard Thornburgh has led a Republican resurgence that extends to Congress and the state legislature. A reinvigorated Republican Party under the leadership of Thornburgh, a Republican of Presidential stature, should provide Carter far more of a challenge than the dispirited Keystone State GOP of 1976.

Carter's narrow victory in Wisconsin occurred when Democrats had a lock on all state offices. The resounding gubernatorial victory of Lee Dreyfus not only deprives the Democrats of the governor's mansion, it also gives the Wisconsin GOP perhaps its most inspiring leader since the elder La Follette. Until this year, voter identification with the Wisconsin GOP had been eroding. Dreyfus' victory may change all that.

Until November 7, 1978 the Carter-Mondale ticket would have seemed unbeatable in Minnesota. The 57-43 percent margin for the Democratic ticket in 1976 reflected both Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party dominance and the appeal of native son Mondale. After its recent trouncing, the DFL remains in severe disarray while Republicans should have a new sense of purpose under Governor Albert Quie and Senators David Durenberger and Rudy Boschwitz.

Republican prospects have been bolstered in at least two of the three Great Lakes States won by Ford. Governor James Thompson's landslide re-election victory and Senator Charles Percy's convincing come-from-behind victory have solidified Republican strength in what may now be the most Republican of the nation's populous industrial states. Democratic Senator Adlai Stevenson may be the next casualty of the Illinois Republican onslaught in 1980. For at least a generation, Indiana has been the most Republican of the Great Lakes States in Presidential elections. The modest Republican gains in 1978 in Indiana further underscored the

distance Carter would have to go to carry Indiana in 1980.

Of these seven states, only in Michigan do Democrats have grounds for optimism. Even though they could not defeat Republican Governor William Milliken, they toppled Senator Robert Griffin and two Republican Congressmen. Moreover, much of the 53-47 percent 1976 Republican Presidential margin was attributable to Gerald Ford's native son status. Despite the modest Democratic comeback in Michigan, Carterites should not celebrate too vigorously. Successful Democratic Senate candidate Carl Levin, sensing Carter's popularity in the Wolverine State, publicly invited the President to stay home.

Even in a close Presidential election, it is conceivable that Carter could lose every Great Lakes State from Pennsylvania to Minnesota. This would be particularly true if the Republican Presidential ticket were selected to maximize the appeal to these battleground states. With a 133 electoral vote sweep of these Great Lakes States, Republicans need pick up only 137 more electoral votes to capture the White House. Implementing a Heartland Strategy, the Republicans could put particular emphasis on the Great Lakes States, the Great Plains States, and the two Upper South States of Virginia and Tennessee.

	Electoral Votes	Rep. % 1960	Rep. % 1968	Rep. % 1976
GREAT LAKES				
Illinois	26	49.9	51.5	51
Indiana	13	55	57	54
Michigan	21	49	46	53
Minnesota	10	49.2	44	43
Ohio	25	53	52.5	49.9
Pennsylvania	27	49	48	49
Wisconsin	11	52	52	49
GREAT PLAINS				
Iowa	8	57	56	51
Kansas	7	61	61	54
Missouri	12	49.7	50.6	48
Nebraska	5	62	65	61
North Dakota	3	55	59	53
South Dakota	4	58	56	51
UPPER SOUTH				
Virginia	12	53	57	51
Tennessee	10	54	57	43

NOTE: Republican Percentages are of Two Party Vote

The six Great Plains States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota cast a total of 39 electoral votes. Ford carried all but Missouri in 1976, but his victory margin was only 2 percent in both Iowa and South Dakota. The Republican sweep in Iowa and the gubernatorial victory in South Dakota shore up GOP prospects in these two marginal states.

Republican gubernatorial victories in 1977 in Virginia and 1978 in Tennessee have further bolstered Republican pro-

spects in the Upper South. Tennessee and Virginia have developed a Presidential Republican voting habit. In 1976 Virginia was the only state of the Confederacy to support Ford. Carter's sweep of Tennessee was in large measure attributable to the widespread resentment at Senator Howard Baker's seemingly shabby treatment at the 1976 GOP Convention. If Baker is on the 1980 ticket, Tennessee and much of the Upper South and Border States could be wrested from Carter.

A Heartland Strategy directed at the Great Lakes, Great Plains and Upper South states has several advantages: 1) It builds on existing Republican strength—the GOP will control governorships in 12 of these 15 target states 2) It does not involve writing off any of the rest of the country—a successful appeal to the Heartland must be broadbased and 3) It should maximize prospects for Republican Senatorial and Congressional gains.

Together with a strong showing in these 15 Heartland States Republicans could expect to carry all or most of several regions that have been effectively conceded by Carter. Ford carried the eight Western Arid Zone States of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming. In the wake of Carter's water policy nearly any Republican Presidential nominee can anticipate most or all of these 35 electoral votes. Similarly virtually any moderate Republican Presidential nominee should carry the Upper New England States of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont.

A Republican ticket that swept the Heartland States, the Western Arid Zone, and Upper New England would win the White House by adding any one of the following combinations:

- 1) California
- 2) New York
- 3) New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware
- 4) Texas
- 5) Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Hawaii, Oklahoma
- 6) Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts
- 7) Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma.

A Republican sweep or near sweep of the Heartland States would place Carter in a virtually impossible situation. Not only would he have to hold on to his entire Deep South base, New York and Texas, he would also have to wrest California and New Jersey from the GOP. In addition, Carter would have to score a breakthrough in the Pacific Northwest.

Which potential nominee would seem best equipped to run successfully on a Heartland Strategy? Perhaps this can be answered best by looking at the kinds of Republicans who have won handily in Heartland States in the last few years—James Thompson in Illinois, William Milliken in Michigan, Richard Thornburgh in Pennsylvania, Lee Dreyfus in Wisconsin, Richard Lugar in Indiana, John Danforth in Missouri, Robert Ray in Iowa, David Durenberger in Minnesota and Howard Baker in Tennessee. Each of these Republicans is articulate, aggressive and fairly moderate in political philosophy.

But whether or not he or she comes from one of the Heartland States, the Republican Presidential nominee should epitomize these qualities. ■

Addenda and Errata

We certainly hope that you received your '78 Election Preview Issue before election day. The issue was mailed out two weeks before election day. But somehow, the *Ripon Forum*, like most small magazines, appears to receive second class mail service in more ways than one when compared to *Time* or *Newsweek*. Those who received their *Forums* before election day could have cleaned up on many election pools. As far as we can tell, the *Forum* predictions—while hardly infallible—were more accurate than those of any other national publication.

The *Forum* predicted a GOP net gain of two Senate seats; Republicans actually gained three. The *Forum* predicted a net gain of five to seven governorships; the election saw a gain of six. The *Forum* projected that the GOP would "gain control of both houses of the state legislature in several states that will face critical reapportionment decisions in 1981." This happened. Only in one area were our projections too optimistic. Rather than registering a 15 to 25 seat gain in the House of Representatives as projected by our soothsayers, the GOP picked up a net of a dozen Congressional seats and the Nonvoting Delegate position to Congress from the Virgin Islands.

For the benefit of those who were cover to cover readers of the last *Forum*, here are some results you may have missed in the national news coverage. In Delaware, Crusader Rabbit lost. The right to work referendum was beaten in Missouri as a major political effort by organized labor reversed the 60-40 lead right to work forces initially forged in the polls.

Even though Senator Jesse Helms raised six and a half million dollars to defeat Democrat John Ingram whom he outspent 20-1, the New Leadership Fund recently received a heart-rending plea to help eliminate the two hundred thousand dollar debt Helms' campaign faces. Oh, the perils of deficit financing!

A little noticed result of Bill Brock's emphasis on state legislative races: Republicans picked up a net of at least 62 women legislators, Democrats gained a net of one. In general, the election results were a tribute to Bill Brock's political judgment and management.

Our 50 state report had a few errors besides several predictions that were not borne out by the voters. In Florida, the Democratic nominee and successful candidate for the First District Congressional seat was Earl Hutto, not Curtis Golden whom he defeated in the runoff. At least one Democrat has been re-elected to the Senate in Iowa history—former Senator Guy Gillette.

In Pennsylvania, our proofreader at one spot promoted Frank Rizzo to Governor. Fortunately, the 2-1 defeat of the Rizzo-backed referendum to amend the Philadelphia City Charter to permit Hizzoner to serve another term makes this nightmare seem even less probable.

In an interesting twist of fate most of those candidates whose names we misspelled or garbled won. Fortunately, most of them were Republicans, including successful Congressional Candidates Newt Gingrich in Georgia, Ohio's Lyle Williams, Daniel Crane in Illinois, and Ned Regan, who won the race for New York State Comptroller. Democrat Joe, not Joel, Fisher won re-election to Congress in Northern Virginia.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION: 1. Title of Publication: Ripon Forum. 2. Date of Filing: October 1, 1978. 3. Frequency of issue: Monthly. A. No. of issues published annually: 12. B. Annual Subscription Price: \$15.00. 4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 6. Name and Address of Publisher: The Ripon Society Incorporated, 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. Name and Address of Editor: Arthur M. Hill II, 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 7. Owner: The Ripon Society, Inc., 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: none.

10. Extent and Nature of Circulation	Average No. of Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	Average No. of Copies of Single Issue Published Nearest Filing
A. Total No. of Copies Printed	3000	3500
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors, and Counter Sales	0	35
2. Mail Subscriptions	1176	1443
C. Total Paid Circulation	1176	1478
D. Free Distribution by Mail, Carrier or Other Means: Samples, Complimentary, and Other Free Copies	1794	1972
E. Total Distribution	2970	3450
F. Copies Not Distributed		
1. Office Use, Left Over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing.	30	50
2. Returns From News Agents	0	0
G. Total	3000	3500

11. I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete. Steven D. Livengood



View From Hawkins Gore

The Inflation Protection Plan

by Hollis Colby

One frosty November afternoon as us old fellers was settin' around Blodgett's General Store, up here in the Gore, a mighty distinguished-looking feller come in and set down next to the potbelly stove. We was nacherly curious, and each of us silently cast about for some tactful way of laying bare his provenance.

While we was thinkin' away Luther Leach, too simple to be devious, fixed the stranger straight in the eye and says, "You look like a mighty danged important feller to be warm-in' yer feet at the stove here in Hawkins Gore, mister. Jest who might you be and what is yer business in these parts?" Sometime the direct approach is best, as Luther has often proved.

"I'm glad you asked that question," said the distinguished-looking gentleman, "because it gives me the opportunity to inform you simple rustics about the brilliant new plan President Jimmy Carter has invented to protect the workers of America from the ravages of inflation."

"You see," he continued, "I am Dr. John Law Harley, and as it happens I am President Carter's chief advisor on economic affairs. I am here in rural Vermont for a few days of hunting before returning to my portentous duties in Washington, D.C., administering President Carter's brilliant new plan."

"Gentlemen," Dr. John Law Harley continued, waking up Perley Farnham who had dozed off, "like all good Americans you are probably concerned about inflation."

"Yes," says I, "the Cruellest Tax of All." Can't say I didn't remember somethin' from all them Republican speeches these past 50-60 years.

"President Carter is about to act boldly, in cooperation with an enthusiastic Democratic-controlled Congress"—at this point something suspiciously like a snicker was heard from several of those present—"to protect the American worker against inflation. You see, if any group of workers holds its wage and salary increases to seven percent, and inflation continues above that level, President Carter will send those workers a tax refund for the difference."

"S'pos'n us old fellers here was workin'," supposed Perley, "and we all got \$10,000 per annum. An s'pose we held our wage demands to a 7% increase, or to \$10,700 for the next year. And suppose that meanwhile inflation had raged onwards by another say 10%. Do you mean to say that President Jimmy Carter would send each and every one of us a nice Federal gov'mint check for \$300?"

"Precisely right, sir," replied Dr. Harley. "That way you'll be protected against erosion of your gains through excessive inflation."

"Now what if some member of our illustrious hypothetical group outdoes hisself in production that year," inquired Ebenezer. "Is he stuck at 7% along with the reg'lar sluff-offs?"

"Not at all, my good man," replied Dr. Harley. "The 7% ceiling is for the group as a whole. Within that group an individual can make more, so long as someone else falls short of the 7%."

"That should explain a lot of next year's fist fights," noted Elias.

"What if a feller gets a promotion?" asked Luther.

"That, sir, does not count as a pay raise, so long as it is a bona fide promotion and not simply a pay raise," replied the learned Doctor. Luther did not seem entirely satisfied with this.

Meanwhile Perley had been scribbling a bit on the back of

a Red Man pouch, and consulting his well-thumbed Statistical Abstract of the U.S. "Lemme ask you this," he says. "Now if inflation marches along 'bout 10% a year, while all the workers is holding their wage and salary increases to 7%, the gov'mint will be paying out 3% of the wage base to workers as inflation compensation, ain't that right?"

"Yes, sir, that is right," replied the eminent scholar in our midst.

"Naow I figures the private payroll of this country to be some \$900 billion, three percentum of which is \$30 billion," says Perley. "Where is our esteemed President Jimmy Carter gonna lay his hands on such an amount of money?"

"Well, sir," replied Dr. Harley, "that is a detail that awaits my concentrated attention upon my return to Washington, D.C. I have been researching where the government has been getting its money in the past, and at the moment it seems to me the easiest way to get it is just to print it up like we have been doing to the tune of \$50 - 60 billion a year. As you may have heard, President Carter is committed to getting the deficit down to \$30 billion next year. So if we do have to print another \$30 billion to make ends meet under this bright new program, the deficit won't be any more than the \$60 billion President Carter faced when he came into office in the first place."

This arithmetical tour de force percolated slowly through the consciousness of us dumb old Vermont farmers. Presently Ebenezer spoke up.

"Dr. Harley, did you intimate that you was in these parts to do a little hunting?"

"Yes, just a brief moment of relaxation before plunging back into my important duties for the President of the United States."

"Waal," says Ebenezer, "I have a bit of advice for you. Now that this story is out, if I was you I wouldn't get too far off in the woods by yourself during hunting season, if you know what I mean."

The distinguished visitor stared blankly at the author of this advice, while the rest of the Hawkins Gore Historical, Literary, and Athletic Wagering Society nodded in solemn agreement. And Elias, our genial storekeeper, set about once again to mark up his price tags. ■

The National Women's Education Fund has published a *Campaign Workbook* designed to assist women seeking public office. Anyone who needs a copy should contact the Fund at 1532 16th St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

House Elections: Slow Road Back

Republicans made only minor gains in the U. S. House of Representatives in the 1978 election. The GOP captured 22 seats formerly held by Democrats, including six seats held by 1974 Watergate Democrats, but lost ten formerly Republican seats for a net gain of twelve seats. Expectations for large gains in Pennsylvania, California, Texas, New Jersey and Indiana did not materialize, although a net of three seats in California, and two seats each in Pennsylvania and Texas was made. However, these gains barely outweighed the loss of two seats each in Michigan and Florida.

Perhaps the most striking fact about this election was the failure of strong Republican gubernatorial and senatorial candidates to provide coattails. As indicated in Table 1, this situation prevailed nationwide. It is particularly evident in those states where the Party suffered its greatest losses in 1974. In that year, Republicans lost 50 seats to the Democrats while gaining only 5 formerly Democratic seats. In the four intervening years, the Party has regained only seven of those seats plus the old Jerry Ford seat that had been initially lost in a 1974 special election. Thus, of 54 seats lost in special elections or the general election in 1974, only eight are again Republican.

Republicans have picked up 26 other seats that were Democratic in 1974 while losing 11 more Republican seats for a net gain of 15. However, few gains have been made in those states which were most heavily hit in 1974. These states are: Indiana—loss of 5 seats; New Jersey—loss of 4 seats; New York—loss of 5 seats; Illinois—loss of 3 seats; Michigan—loss of 4 seats; and losses of two seats each in North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and Wisconsin.

As of today, Republicans have regained a net of two seats in Indiana; two seats in New Jersey; two seats in California; two seats in Illinois; one seat in Wisconsin. The GOP has not recovered its seats in New York, Tennessee, North Carolina and Virginia. It has lost a net of one additional seat in Michigan.

The net losses were greatest in the traditional areas of Republican strength in the East and Middle West. Including the special elections of 1974, Republicans have suffered a net loss of 16 seats in the East and 12 seats in the Midwest in the past four years.

Thus in the East, as indicated by Table 1, Democrats now hold a 79-38 advantage as compared to a 63-54 advantage as of January 1974. In the Middle West, Democrats hold a 64-54 advantage as compared to a 66-52 Republican edge in January 1974. Republicans now are only marginally better off in the East than in the South where the GOP holds 30 percent of the House seats and continues roughly to hold its own (a net loss of 3 seats since January 1974 but a gain of 4 seats in 1978).

While marginal gains are being made in the South these

gains are much more than offset by losses in the East and Middle West. A part of the problem is that of tailoring candidates to specific districts. Greater gains would be made in the East if more moderate candidates were nominated in swing districts. The one issue campaign of Kemp-Roth in particular did not seem to assist Republican House candidates this year.

However, there were some bright spots in individual victories. There will be 36 new Republican Representatives, 22 of whom took formerly Democratic seats. Pennsylvania has gained three moderate Republicans—Bill Clinger, Don Ritter and Charles Dougherty. Jim Courter in New Jersey was able to win back the seat held by Helen Meyner while Marge Roukema got 47 percent of the vote in her race against Democrat Andrew Maguire, and has indicated that she will take him on again in 1980. In New York, Bill Green retained his Manhattan seat while Gary Lee replaced Republican William Walsh of Syracuse and conservatives Gerald Solomon and Bill Carney won convincing victories. Olympia Snowe of Maine was the only new Republican woman member elected to the House.

In the Middle West, the loss of Garry Brown and Elford Cederberg in Michigan was offset by the elections of Joel Deckard in Indiana, Toby Roth in Wisconsin, Tom Tauke in Iowa, and Lyle Williams in Ohio to formerly Democratic seats. Robert Davis in Michigan, Douglas Bereuter in Nebraska, Arlen Erdahl in Minnesota and James Sensenbrenner in Wisconsin replaced Republican incumbents. In the South, Larry Hopkins in Kentucky, Newt Gingrich in Georgia, Ed Bethune in Arkansas and Carroll Campbell in South Carolina won open Democratic seats, while Jon Hinson replaced his former boss Thad Cochran in Mississippi and Ron Paul and Tom Loeffler won in Texas.

In the West, Dick Cheney from Wyoming will rejoin fellow Ford aide Loeffler in the House, and there are seven new Republicans from California—three of whom (Norman Shumway, Chip Pashayan and Dan Lungren) replaced Democratic incumbents. Maybe 1980 will lead to quantity as well as quality but it will require a concentrated effort to build up power in former bastions of strength.

The enormous increase in advantages of incumbency in the last few years and the greater ideological agility of Democratic incumbents make the GOP path back to a competitive position in the House particularly arduous. If the Republican Party is to have a reasonable chance of capturing the House by 1984 it must:

- run candidates who can appeal to an independent ticket splitting constituency,
- make strong Presidential runs in 1980 and 1984 particularly in the Northeast and Industrial Midwest, and
- secure a fair break in redistricting following the 1980 Census.

TABLE 1: Changes in U. S. House of Representatives Following 1978 Election

STATE	Before Election		After Election		Republican Change
	R	D	R	D	
EAST					
Connecticut	4	2	5	1	(1)
Delaware	0	1	0	1	0
Maine	0	2	0	2	0
Maryland	5*	3	6	2	(1)
Massachusetts	10	2	10	2	0
New Hampshire	1	1	1	1	0
New Jersey	11	4	10	5	1
New York	27	12	26	13	1
Pennsylvania	17	8	15	10	2
Rhode Island	2	0	2	0	0
Vermont	0	1	0	1	0
West Virginia	4	0	4	0	0
TOTAL	81	36	79	38	2
MIDDLE WEST					
Illinois	12*	12	11	13	1
Indiana	8	3	7	4	1
Iowa	4	2	3	3	1
Kansas	2	3	1	4	1
Michigan	11	8	13	6	(2)
Minnesota	4	4	4	4	0
Missouri	8	2	8	2	0
Nebraska	1	2	1	2	0
Ohio	10	13	10	13	0
Wisconsin	7	2	6	3	1
TOTAL	67	51	64	54	3
SOUTH					
Alabama	4	3	4	3	0
Arkansas	3	1	2	2	1
Florida	10	5	12	3	(2)
Georgia	10	0	9	1	1
Kentucky	5	2	4	3	1
Louisiana*	5	3	5	3	0
Mississippi	3	2	3	2	0
North Carolina	9	2	9	2	0
Oklahoma	5	1	5	1	0
South Carolina	5	1	4	2	1
Tennessee	5	3	5	3	0
Texas	22	2	20	4	2
Virginia	4	6	4	6	0
TOTAL	90	31	86	35	4
WEST					
Alaska	0	1	0	1	0
Arizona	2	2	2	2	0
California	29	14*	26	17	3
Colorado	3	2	3	2	0
Hawaii	2	0	2	0	0
Idaho	0	2	0	2	0
Montana	1	1	1	1	0
Nevada	1	0	1	0	0
New Mexico	1	1	1	1	0
North Dakota	0	1	0	1	0
Oregon	4	0	4	0	0
South Dakota	0	2	0	2	0
Utah	1	1	1	1	0
Washington	5	2	6	1	(1)
Wyoming	1	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	50	29	47	32	3
GRAND TOTAL	288*	147*	276	159	+12

*Includes 2 Democratic seats (Maryland, Illinois) and one Republican seat (California) which were open but are here apportioned to the Party which had previously held them and which in all three cases held them in 1978.

TABLE 2: Changes Caused by 1978 Elections — New Republican Members

TOTAL REPUBLICAN NEW MEMBERS	36	LOST REPUBLICAN SEATS	10
NEW REPUBLICAN SEATS	22	NET REPUBLICAN SEATS	12

GAINS

DEFEATING DEMOCRATS (14)

1) New Jersey — 13	James Courter (Meyner)*
2) New York — 29	Gerald Solomon (Pattison)*
3) Pennsylvania — 4	Charles Dougherty (Eilberg)
4) Pennsylvania — 15	Donald Ritter (Rooney)
5) Pennsylvania — 23	William Clinger (Ammerman)
6) Indiana — 8	Joel Deckard (Cornwell)*
7) Iowa — 2	Tom Tauke (Blouin)
8) Kansas — 2	James Jeffries (Keys)
9) Ohio — 19	Lyle Williams (Carney)
10) Wisconsin — 8	Toby Roth (Cornell)*
11) California — 14	Norman D. Shumway (McFall)
12) California — 17	Charles (Chip) Pashayan, Jr. (Krebs)*
13) California — 34	Dan Lungren (Hannaford)*
14) Texas — 22	Ron Paul (Gammage)

TAKING OPEN DEMOCRATIC SEATS (8)

1) New York — 1	Bill Carney (Pike)
2) Illinois — 22	Daniel Crane (Shipley)
3) Arkansas — 2	Ed Bethune (Tucker)
4) Georgia — 6	Newt Gingrich (Flynt)
5) Kentucky — 6	Larry Hopkins (Breckenridge)
6) South Carolina — 4	Carroll Campbell, Jr. (Mann)
7) Texas — 21	Tom Loeffler (Kreuger)
8) Wyoming	Richard Cheney (Roncalio)

REPLACING REPUBLICANS (14)

1) Maine — 2	Olympia Snowe (Cohen)
2) New York — 33	Gary Lee (Walsh)
3) Kansas — 5	Robert Whittaker (Skubitz)
4) Michigan — 11	Robert Davis (Ruppe)
5) Minnesota — 1	Arlen Erdahl (Quie)
6) Nebraska — 1	Douglas Bereuter (Thone)
7) Mississippi — 4	Jon Hinson (Cochran)
8) California — 18	William Thomas (Ketchum)
9) California — 33	Wayne Grisham (Clawson)
10) California — 37	Jerry Lewis (Pettis)
11) California — 39	William Dannemeyer (Wiggins)
12) South Dakota — 1	Leo Thorsness (Pressler)
13) Colorado — 5	Kenneth Kramer (Armstrong)
14) Wisconsin — 9	James Sensenbrenner (Kasten)

LOSSES

DEMOCRATS DEFEATING REPUBLICANS (5)

1) Maryland — 8	Michael Barnes (Steers)
2) Michigan — 3	Howard Wolpe (Brown)
3) Michigan — 10	Donald Albosta (Cederberg)
4) Florida — 12	Edward Stack (Burke)
5) Washington — 7	Mike Lowry (Cunningham)

DEMOCRATS TAKING OPEN REPUBLICAN SEATS (5)

1) Connecticut — 5	William Ratchford (Sarasin)
2) New York — 23	Peter Peyser (Caputo)
3) Pennsylvania — 25	Eugene Atkinson (Myers)
4) Ohio — 3	Tony P. Hall (Whalen)
5) Florida — 9	Bill Nelson (Frey)

*Indicates winners over Democrats elected in 1974 in traditional Republican districts.

As of November 30, it appears that House seat #1 in South Dakota was won by Democrat Thomas Daschle rather than by Republican Leo Thorsness. This would reduce the net GOP House gain to 11 seats, and is not reflected in these tables.

Republican Control of the Senate in 1981:

A Pipe Dream or a Realistic Prospect?

Only a few months ago, many political analysts casually conceded Democratic control of Congress for the next couple of decades. The strong Republican showing in 1978 in U. S. Senate races, however, gives the GOP a reasonable chance of taking control of that body in 1980. If the Republican Party captures the White House and of course the Vice Presidency in 1980 it should require only nine additional seats to organize the U. S. Senate. This assumes no party switches between now and then as a result of death of incumbents. The GOP's magic number could be reduced to eight if Virginia's Independent Senator Harry Byrd, Jr. cast his lot with the Republicans.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the 1978 Senate results was the almost total assertion of Republican supremacy in traditionally Republican states. The only traditionally Republican state in which the GOP lost a Senate race was Nebraska, where tremendously popular conservative Democratic Governor J. J. Exon won the seat of retiring Republican Senator Carl Curtis. Republican incumbents won handily in Idaho and Alaska, (which has recently assumed the status of a GOP stronghold), Alan Simpson won the Senate seat being vacated by Wyoming Republican Clifford Hansen, and Nancy Landon Kassebaum handily held on to James Pearson's Kansas seat. Moderate Republican Congressman William Cohen trounced his Democratic opponent, Maine's Democratic Senator William Hathaway, and South Dakota Congressman Larry Pressler captured by a huge margin the seat now held by Democrat James Abourezk. The slender victories of New Right Republicans Roger Jepsen in Iowa and Gordon Humphrey in New Hampshire break up the all-Democratic Senate delegations in two of the GOP's traditional strongholds.

Republican fortunes were fairly bright in a cluster of normally closely contested states. Mark Hatfield won a convincing re-election in Oregon, Charles Percy pulled out of a political nosedive to paste his Democratic challenger Alex Seith, and Pete Domenici edged Democrat Toney Anaya in New Mexico. Republicans David Durenberger and Rudy Boschwitz broke a long-time DFL lock on Minnesota's two Senate seats. Congressman William Armstrong trounced Democratic Senator Floyd Haskell to reestablish a GOP base in this Rocky Mountain state.

The three Republican losses in closely contested states seem in significant degree self inflicted. Senator Edward Brooke's loss in Massachusetts was largely a result of his decision to seek a divorce before the 1978 election. Senator Robert Griffin's defeat was mostly a function of his on again off again candidacy and his uncharacteristic high absentee record right after he decided to hang up his political cleats. By all indications New Jersey's liberal Republican Senator Clifford Case could have defeated Democrat Bill Bradley. Had Case taken conservative Jeffrey Bell's primary challenge more seriously, the GOP would have retained the Garden State seat.

"It is quite early to establish a morning line on 1980, but at this point a GOP pickup of six seats seems probable, and a pickup of as many as ten seats seems conceivable."

This year Republicans did surprisingly well in traditionally Democratic Southern and Border States. Congressman Thad Cochran, a fairly moderate Mississippi Republican, captured the seat of retiring Democrat James Eastland. All five Southern Republican Senate seats were at stake and the GOP successfully retained each one as Tennessee Senator Howard Baker, Texas Senator John Tower, South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond and North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms won re-election, and John Warner held the seat of retiring Republican Senator William Scott. Republicans lost the Border State seat of cancer-stricken Oklahoma Senator Dewey Bartlett, but came within an eyelash of defeating West Virginia Democratic Senator Jennings Randolph. As some wags have suggested, Republican Arch Moore ran well among live voters but not quite strongly enough to offset the votes of West Virginia's most traditional Democratic strongholds, its cemeteries.

Incumbents and Current Outlook

The eight to ten seat pickup necessary to enable Republicans to control the Senate seems attainable. Twenty four Democratic seats are at stake as compared to only ten Republican seats. It is admittedly quite early to establish a morning line on 1980 Senate races. But at this point, a GOP pickup of six seats seems probable and a gain of as many as ten seats seems conceivable, particularly if the Republican Party captures the White House while running strongly in the Great Lakes Region.

Donald Stewart (D) Alabama. Leans Democratic. Stewart should be favored for re-election if he can maintain sufficient distance from labor and come across as bullish on defense spending.

Mike Gravel (D) Alaska. Leans Republican. Gravel would have been beaten in 1974 if a Bircher had not won the GOP primary. He may yet bail himself out through his Alaska, Inc. scheme to parcel the state's mineral resources out to residents. Republicans, however, seem ascendant and likely to nominate a more moderate challenger.

Barry Goldwater (R) Arizona. Leans Republican. Goldwater could probably win one last term if he chose to run. If he decides to retire, lively primaries are likely in both parties, with the ultimate outcome anyone's guess.

Dale Bumpers (D) Arkansas. Safe Democratic. Although the GOP captured the second of Arkansas' four House seats, Republicans don't seem strong enough to win a Senate race.

Alan Cranston (D) California. Tossup. In both 1968 and 1974, Cranston enjoyed easy rides against extremely conservative Republicans. State Assemblyman Ken Maddy who mounted a strong campaign for the GOP gubernatorial nomination could garner the resources to defeat Cranston. Should Maddy win the GOP nomination he would seem to have an edge over the Democratic Senate Whip.

Gary Hart (D) Colorado. Leans Democratic. Hart is more adept and telegenic than his colleague, Floyd Haskell. Still, if Republicans can locate a strong challenger, Hart could face an uncomfortably close race.

Abraham Ribicoff (D) Connecticut. Leans Democratic. If Ribicoff, a Connecticut institution, seeks re-election, he should be favored despite advancing age. A Ribicoff retirement could open up a free-for-all and put this seat in the tossup category.

Richard Stone (D) Florida. Leans Democratic. Stone narrowly won election to this seat in 1974 thanks in large part to a strong run by an American Party candidate. Stone's strong championship of Israel and opposition to Castro has solidified his financial and electoral base in Dade County. Moreover, the 1978 elections have further solidified Democratic control of Florida.

Herman Talmadge (D) Georgia. Safe Democratic. Talmadge is anything but safe, but it is not clear whether he has more to fear from Georgia voters or the Justice Department. Should Talmadge's legal troubles prove devastating, he may choose not to run or may be beaten in the Democratic primary. The Democratic nominee would still be strongly favored particularly if Jimmy Carter is heading the Democratic ticket. Slender Republican hopes would seem to depend either on Talmadge's narrowly surviving the Democratic primary and facing further damaging developments or on the mounting of a serious black independent Senate candidacy such as that of Charles Evers this year.

Daniel Inouye (D) Hawaii. Safe Democratic. Hawaii has become a Democratic stronghold in state elections and Inouye is the strongest of its Democratic officeholders.

Frank Church (D) Idaho. Tossup. Church will be Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but it is doubtful that this is a plus in Idaho. Church should be vulnerable in increasingly Republican Idaho unless the GOP bails him out by nominating a weak or fireeating challenger.

Adlai Stevenson (D) Illinois. Tossup. Stevenson may be hurt by black resentment at the way he used his Senate Ethics Committee chairmanship to bloody Ed Brooke. Two potentially strong Republican challengers include Attorney General William Scott and Peoria Mayor Richard Carver,

incoming head of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Thompson's presence on the GOP national ticket would be likely to tip this seat to the GOP.

Birch Bayh (D) Indiana. Tossup. Bayh has squeaked through in the past against opponents of varying strength. Bayh would appear to be the underdog against Governor Otis Brown, one of the most popular Indiana politicians of the twentieth century. Even against other Republican challengers Bayh can anticipate a difficult race.

John Culver (D) Iowa. Leans Republican. Culver's position seems, if anything, shakier than Dick Clark's was going into the 1978 elections. Governor Robert Ray would seem a strong favorite if he chose to run for the Senate. GOP Congressman James Leach would also seem to have an edge over Culver. Inflation and farm concerns are likely to hurt Culver in Iowa in 1980 and to spill over onto the Democratic Senate campaign.

Robert Dole (R) Kansas. Leans Republican. Dole barely won re-election to his seat in 1974 when he suffered from guilt by association with Watergate. Dole's championship of farm interests has strengthened his stand with the home folks. He should win unless his Presidential perambulations spark some resentment that he is slighting home state interests.

Wendell Ford (D) Kentucky. Safe Democratic. Unless Ford makes some major misstep, Kentucky's weakened GOP seems unlikely to defeat him.

Russell Long (D) Louisiana. Safe Democratic. As long as Russell Long wants this seat, he can have it. Republicans would stand a chance only if Long were to retire.

Charles Mathias (R) Maryland. Leans Republican. As long as Mathias is the Republican nominee, this seat should stay in the Republican column. Mathias may face a serious right wing challenge. Such a challenge would assume kamikaze dimensions in Democratic trending Maryland. A strong Republican gubernatorial ticket in 1978 gathered only 29 percent of the vote against a unified Democratic Party. Mathias would be strongly favored to beat any Democrat, but no other Republican would seem to have more than a remote chance of holding this seat. Conservative GOP Congressman Robert Bauman would have a chance of defeating Mathias in the primary, but the Eastern Shore Congressman would then be a prohibitive underdog against any likely Democrat.

Thomas Eagleton (D) Missouri. Tossup. In 1974 Eagleton won handily due to Watergate, the Nixon pardon, and sympathy for his treatment by George McGovern in 1974. Eagleton's volatile personality and cosmetic legislative stance have become more obvious. Former Governor Christopher (Kit) Bond would seem to stand at least an even chance of defeating Eagleton. Bond has the next year in which to decide whether to challenge Eagleton or to seek to oust Governor Joseph Teasdale.

Paul Laxalt (R) Nevada. Safe Republican. Laxalt won narrowly in 1974, but the articulate conservative spokesman has strengthened his position in increasingly Republican Nevada.

John Durkin (D) New Hampshire. Leans Republican. Durkin is perhaps the most vulnerable single Democratic incumbent. Republicans should win this seat unless they nominate an even more controversial or abrasive challenger.

Jacob Javits (R) New York. Tossup. Javits, one of New York's most successful officeholders of the twentieth century, will be 76 in 1980. If he retires, the scramble for the GOP nomination could include Henry Kissinger and Congressman Jack Kemp, Bruce Caputo and Hamilton Fish. Of these possible GOP nominees, only Kissinger would seem a strong favorite to defeat any Democrat.

Robert Morgan (D) North Carolina. Leans Democratic. Jesse Helms required six and a half million dollars to barely hold on to his seat against a weak Democratic challenger. The 1980 Republican nominee is not likely to be nearly so well funded.

Milton Young (R) North Dakota. Leans Republican. Congressman Mark Andrews is a strong favorite to win this seat for the GOP in 1980.

John Glenn (D) Ohio. Safe Democratic. Aside from Inouye, Glenn is the safest non-Southern Democrat up for re-election in 1980.

Henry Bellmon (R) Oklahoma. Leans Republican. Bellmon squeaked through in 1974, but that was hardly a banner Republican year. Bellmon should be able to hold on to this seat but it is doubtful that any other Republican could keep it in the GOP column.

Robert Packwood (R) Oregon. Leans Republican. Packwood is one of the best campaigners and political organizers in the Senate. He should be favored even against a challenge from Portland's popular Democratic Mayor Neil Goldschmidt.

Richard Schweiker (R) Pennsylvania. Tossup. Schweiker until 1976 was known for his nearly acrobatic skill at keeping his ear to the ground. In his flirtation with Reagan that year, Schweiker seriously misjudged his hold on Pennsylvania Republicans. By 1980 Schweiker will have had four years to recoup, but the would-be Veep has fractured his once solid ties to organized labor. If Schweiker plays ball with incoming Governor Richard Thornburgh, he may be able to forestall a serious primary challenge. There are so many imponderables that the crystal ball on this race is quite murky.

Ernest Hollings (D) South Carolina. Safe Democratic. Hollings appears to have a clear edge against any conceivable Republican challenger.

George McGovern (D) South Carolina. Leans Republican. McGovern's talk about a 1980 Presidential candidacy may be an implicit admission of his home state weakness. If Republicans nominate a candidate only half as attractive as Larry Pressler, they should pick up this seat.

Jake Garn (R) Utah. Leans Republican. Garn has strengthened his position since 1974. He should win, although

Democratic Congressman Gunn McKay, Governor Scott Matheson or former Governor Calvin Rampton could mount a serious challenge.

Patrick Leahy (D) Vermont. Tossup. Leahy could be beaten by Republican Congressman James Jeffords or Governor Richard Snelling. Now that the Democrats have captured the lieutenant governorship a Snelling candidacy seems improbable.

Warren Magnuson (D) Washington. Tossup. "Maggie" will be 75 in 1980. He could be quite vulnerable to such Republican challengers as former Governor Dan Evans or Attorney General Slade Gorton. Democratic prospects, even should Magnuson retire, may be hurt by a bitter primary not only for the Senate seat but also for the governorship held by Democrat Dixie Lee Ray.

Gaylord Nelson (D) Wisconsin. Tossup. Nelson could be very vulnerable to Congressman William Steiger whose successful capital gains rollback push has gained him much visibility and fundraising potential. Should Steiger choose not to oppose Nelson with whom he is personally quite friendly, the liberal Democratic Senator would still not be home free. In 1974 with virtually no financing and in the aftermath of Watergate and the Nixon pardon, 34 year old State Senator Thomas Petri got 37 percent of the vote against Nelson. Six years later, Petri who has developed a strong reputation in the State Senate, might put it all together.

Republicans stand a realistic chance of capturing in 1980 as many as ten seats now held by Democrats. Meanwhile Republican losses are likely, if anything, to be smaller than in 1978. The likeliest outcome at this point would seem a net pickup of about six seats, leaving the GOP just a few seats short of Senate control. With some concerted effort, however, the GOP could conceivably score the gains necessary to control the Senate. Both Republican moderates and conservatives have a seemingly identical interest in such a development. Republicans of all viewpoints might want to consider the following:

- 1) Foregoing primary challenges to incumbent Republican Senators who run well with their state's electorate in current opinion polls.
- 2) Recruiting the strongest possible challengers to oppose seemingly entrenched Democrats.
- 3) Focusing party resources as much as possible on closely contested Senate seats.
- 4) Persuading corporate PACs to reduce their investment in Democratic Senate incumbents. Once corporate PAC managers realize that Republicans have a realistic chance of securing control of the Senate, their contribution patterns might take on the more partisan pattern now found among labor PACs.

At a minimum Republicans should enter 1981 in the strongest position they have enjoyed in the Senate in two decades. With luck and some intelligent advance planning, they may exercise numerical control as well as domination on issues.

BUREAUCRACY Marches On!

The Philip Hart Senate Office Building now under construction has sparked a minor furor in Congress. House members have turned a jealous eye at the plans calling for saunas, a rooftop dining room, a gymnasium, a tennis court and offices with 16-foot high ceilings. This is pretty heady stuff for a Senator and almost fit for an HEW Secretary.

In its pre-Labor Day adjournment haste the House did the unthinkable—it voted down the funds needed to complete the third Senate office building. This was a seemingly unprecedented violation of the sacred principle of comity—the notion that neither house of Congress should meddle in the other's business.

In the middle of this imbroglio rode the Architect of the Capitol George White. White's new "Master Plan for the United States Capitol" assumes not only the completion of the \$120 million plus Hart Building but also the eventual construction of four more Senate office buildings and six House office buildings in addition to the three existing House office buildings.

Some observers of Capitol Hill have hit upon an ingenious scheme which might obviate the need to follow the "Master Plan". If there is an inexorable law mandating growth of Congressional staff, perhaps we can save the taxpayers money by reducing the size of Congress. Is there any inherent reason each state should have two Senators instead of 1? A Constitutional amendment could give us 50 Senators each serving three year terms. A similar reduction in the size of the House would only slightly affect the power balance (i.e. toward smaller states).

It is quite doubtful that these innovations would command either a simple legislative majority or a two-thirds Constitutional majority from Congress. Such changes could, however, be instituted by a Constitutional Convention, an increasingly likely possibility if the Congressional royalists do not adopt more plebeian tastes.

Another far out suggestion which might have some merit would call for the removal of air conditioning from the Congressional office buildings. In view of Washington's oppressive summer heat and humidity this move would probably result in Congress going on recess before Memorial Day and returning after Labor Day. These abbrevi-

ated Congressional sessions and resulting lower volume of legislation could save taxpayers tens of billions yearly.

You may have been wondering why Jimmy Carter's Department of Labor is making so little progress in reducing black teenage unemployment which is now hovering between 40 and 50 percent. The reason—they have far more important things to do. As Mike Causey of *The Washington Post* recently reported, the apparatchiks at Labor are striving mightily to purge sexism from the English language. Although Carter's minions (perhaps peopleions would be a more appropriate phrase) have stripped the Manpower Administration of its sexist title, they have left the name of the Women's Bureau undisturbed. Perhaps they can not decide whether it should be renamed the Unisex Bureau or the Woperdaughter's Division.

While the Labeurocrats may not yet have their own house in order, they have not hesitated to impose their Newspeak on outside contractors preparing materials for Labor. Among the words that have been excised from this Bowdlerized English is "mankind". "Longshoremens" has been transmuted to "longshore workers". The ultimate blasphemy is the personal pronoun "he", "she", "him", or "her". The Labor guidelines admonish contractors to avoid such sexist language. Perhaps this is the most lasting achievement of Carter's New Puritans. Not content merely to ban four letter words, they have created a whole new class of unprintables—the three letter word.

take it from *Steve Allen*:

HOMES FOR LIVING PROVIDES THE MAXIMUM EXPOSURE THAT SELLS HOMES!

All across the country, people who are looking for homes look to *Homes For Living* magazine for pictures, prices and descriptions of homes for sale.

America's number one magazine for home buyers gives your home the kind of exposure that brings about a quick sale.

More than 12,000 sales associates are ready to send buyers your way! When you consider that 30% of all homes are bought by people relocating from other cities... that's IMPORTANT!

Call, write or stop by our office today for your complimentary magazine.

Planning to relocate? We have *Homes For Living* magazines with pictures, prices and descriptions of homes for sale from more than 800 *Homes For Living* members in all 50 states and Canada. Ask for your copy.



Better Homes
Realty, Inc

6045 WILSON BLVD.
ARLINGTON, VA. 22205

532-3253

The Ascendancy of the Washington Lawyer and Lobbyist: An Unintended Result of Campaign Finance Reform

by John C. Topping, Jr.*

Thanks in large part to post-Watergate campaign finance reforms, our political system has begun to undergo a profound transformation that may involve:

1) *A dramatic shift of power from individual contributors scattered throughout the United States to a handful of Washington lawyers, lobbyists, union officials, trade association executives and corporate government relations directors, most of whom work between 15th and 21st Streets, N.W., in Washington, D.C.*

There has been a dramatic shift of power from individual campaign contributors scattered throughout the United States to a handful of Washington lawyers, lobbyists, union officials, trade association and corporate government relations executives, many of whom work in a six block area of downtown Washington.

2) *Accompanying this concentration of campaign financing power in those controlling corporate and labor political action committees, a further fractionation of our politics. Special interest PACs normally look at a very narrow sliver of a candidate's record e.g. his position on maritime subsidies, steel imports, etc. Individual contributors on the other hand are much more inclined to look at the candidate's overall record.*

3) *An enormous strengthening in the prospects that incumbent Members of Congress will be reelected. Special interest PACs are oriented toward buying access. This means that they normally are far more inclined to seek marginal improvement in their standing with a sitting Congressman than to support a challenger who stands at best a very outside chance of winning. Individual contributors are far more inclined to contribute to challengers. Ninety five percent of*

incumbent Representatives standing for reelection won this November; only a handful were beaten in primaries.

4) *A virtual freezing of insurgent candidacies unless they are personally bankrolled. The 1968 Presidential candidacy of Eugene McCarthy and the 1972 campaign of George McGovern could hardly have gotten off the launching pad had it not been for the generosity of such large contributors as Martin Peretz, Max Palevsky, and Stewart Mott. Today, these contributors would be hamstrung by the \$1 thousand per individual contribution limitation. Special interest PACs which can make contributions in lots of up to \$5 thousand, are quite unlikely to support insurgent candidacies either in the Presidential primaries or in Congressional races.*

5) *The development of a system in which many incumbent Congressmen can normally only be beaten by a millionaire or a celebrity. The enormous increase since 1974 in Congressional perquisites, e.g. staff, stationery and newsletter funds, etc. has by some estimates given incumbents the equivalent of about \$1.2 million in campaign expenditures in the two years of a Congressional term. Reinforcing this publicly-funded constituency advantage is the propensity of PACs to support incumbents. To gain equivalent name recognition, challengers must either have it in the first place (i.e. be professional athletes, entertainers, etc.) or be willing to spend freely to purchase it. Non-rich challengers are at a severe handicap. The \$1 thousand per individual contributor limitation severely hinders their ability to gather the seed money to mount a credible campaign. PACs meanwhile are a particularly unlikely source of startup funding. An incumbent who avoids personal scandal and tends to his constituency chores enjoys a huge headstart over any non-celebrity challenger of modest means.*

**This article was adapted from an address October 19, 1978 to the Daniel Webster Legal Society of Dartmouth College by John C. Topping, Jr., President of the Ripon Society.*

Of the fourteen incumbent Democratic Representatives defeated this November, seven were running in strongly Republican districts and three others were tarred with scandal. Of the five Republicans defeated, one—Burke (Fla.)—was a casualty of scandal, and two—Steers (Md.) and Cunningham (Wash.)—were running against strong Democrats in districts with either overwhelming Democratic registration or voting propensity. The two other defeated Republican incumbents—Brown and Cederberg (Mich.)—suffered from an impression of declining constituent services. The much greater vulnerability of Senators running for reelection seems due in substantial part to the relatively greater attractiveness of a Senate than a House seat to celebrity or millionaire challengers, to the greater media attention to such races which counteracts the need for money, and to the propensity of voters to use such races to vote the rascals out.

Campaign reformers should recognize the mischief that many post-Watergate remedies spawned.

6) *The solidification of Democratic hegemony in the House of Representatives.* The above mentioned factors that strengthen incumbency reinforce the lock the Democratic Party now holds on the House.

7) *The further weakening of party organization.* With their new and growing access to special interest PACs, Congressmen are far less dependent than in the past on local party organizations to raise essential campaign funds.

The cumulative effect of all of these developments has been detrimental from the viewpoint of nearly everyone except Congressional incumbents, the persons who write campaign finance laws.¹ The explosion in importance of the special interest PACs is a result of post-Watergate political reforms that hamstrung the so called fat cat, the large individual contributor, while leaving much more maneuvering room for more organized interests.

There are several potential cures for this disturbing turn of events. The most obvious possible cure is public campaign financing direct from the Federal Treasury. Yet, there seems a strong possibility that this cure might be even worse than the disease. Most public finance proposals are keyed to observance of a spending limit by those receiving Treasury funds.

¹A particularly instructive discussion of the reforms that ironically strengthened the power of the political action committees is provided in the October 1978 issue of *The Washington Monthly* as part of an examination of "The Politics of Selfishness" in an article by James North entitled "The Effect: The Growth of the Special Interests". Corporate and trade association PACs have sprung up this year at the rate of one a day and have become the source of tens of millions of dollars in campaign funds. As North points out, there is enormous potential for further growth of PACs.

Incumbents, the people who write campaign finance laws, would seem sorely tempted to set unnaturally low spending limits. Challengers normally require far greater expenditures than incumbents to neutralize the latter's considerable advantage of office. Many challengers might have to opt out of the system, while incumbents would add Federal Treasury financing to their already substantial perquisites of office.

Moreover, Treasury financing would even further reduce the dependence of Congressional candidates on party organizations and constituency based fundraising. At the same time, it would do little to neutralize the advantage of a wealthy candidate who was willing to spend huge sums to win election. A far better approach toward a more competitive political system might include a blend of the following features:

1) A lifting or elimination of the limit on individual political contributions together with the maintenance of existing limits on contributions by political action committees.

2) The enactment of legislation such as that sponsored by Senators Packwood and Moynihan to liberalize tax credits for small political contributions.

3) The enactment of legislation providing Federal funding for voter pamphlets to each registered voter to be prepared by the Secretary of State or chief elections official for each jurisdiction.

In the event Congress is unwilling to lift or eliminate the ceiling on individual contributions, it might consider two other variants that would partially neutralize the advantage of wealthy candidates. One innovation would lift ceilings on all contributions to opponents of any candidate whose contributions or loans to his own campaign exceeded the existing individual contributor limit. A second variant, proposed by columnist David Broder, would permit candidates only to contribute to their own campaigns and not to loan funds. Otherwise as Broder suggests, a wealthy candidate can spend freely to win an office and once having secured that office can use the power of incumbency to pay himself back. In such a situation the distinction between a campaign contribution and a bribe can become very blurred.

Tax credit legislation would be designed to broaden the base of political giving. Individuals might be given tax credits of, for example, 80 percent of the first \$100 contributed and 40 percent of the next \$100.

Oregon has a long and successful history of voter pamphlets setting forth information provided by candidates for many state and local offices. Federal funding could be provided for the institution of similar pamphlets for Federal offices in each state. The legislation could provide for the states to piggyback on this mailing by pro-rating costs of state and local offices.

Variants such as those listed above seem desirable if we are to diversify and decentralize the base of campaign finance and to restore competitiveness to Federal elections. However, passage of such election law changes will require first that campaign reformers recognize the mischief that many post-Watergate remedies spawned. ■

Don't Miss a Single Issue Subscribe to the Forum Today!



I am enclosing \$ _____

- for 1 year of the *Forum*—\$15.00
 2 years of the *Forum*—\$28.00
 3 years of the *Forum*—\$40.00
 1 year gift subscription each—\$12.00

the following policy papers at \$1.00 each
 _____ copies of Free Trade Zone paper
 _____ copies of Neighborhood Democracy paper
 _____ copies of Small Business paper

Make checks payable and mail to:

The Ripon Society, Inc.
 800 Eighteenth Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20006

Address to: _____

P.S. For additional subscription forms, feel free to make copies of this form.