

# RIPON FORUM

RIPON NATIONAL  
GOVERNING BOARD  
MEETING: MAY 12

MAY 1, 1977

VOL. XIII, No. 9

50 cents

## Commentary: Young Republicans

### THE TEAM PUTS ON A NEW UNIFORM

Most Republicans would prefer to forget Watergate. They do not invite Richard Nixon to give them endorsements nor do they hire persons involved in CREEP's dirty tricks to aid their efforts. Most Republicans would go to extreme lengths to disassociate themselves with the 19-72 Nixon campaign.

Not so the ruling elite of the Young Republican National Federation, known in recent years as "The Team." They have chosen as their candidate for YRNF president, Roger J. Stone, Jr., director of administration for the National Conservative Political Action Committee. At NCPAC, Stone joined a number of other conservatives prominently engaged in the Team in the past and more recently in the Reagan effort. J. David Nickels, former executive director of the YRNF, is a member of the board of directors, as is Frank Donatelli, executive director of the Young Americans for Freedom. Stone was a board member when he was employed as director of legislative services for the Public Service Research Council in 1974-75.

Briefly, in 1973-74, Stone was a staff aide to Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kansas). He was until columnist Jack Anderson revealed that he was the same guy who donated \$20,000 of CREEP's money to U.S. Rep. Paul McCloskey's New Hampshire primary campaign in 1972. Anderson said the money was given in the name of leftist organizations like the Young Marxist League. At the time, Stone said:

What I did was not illegal. I was 19 at the time. Remember that. It was a serious error in judgment. I regret it very much and I can assure you that I will weigh very carefully everything I do in politics in the future.

But this whole thing has been blown out of proportion. I did nothing il-

legal. And there was a precedent for everything I did. The Democrats did things like this for years and years and nobody screamed about it. This is a double standard.

In testimony before the Senate's Watergate Committee in June, 1973, CREEP's Bart Porter testified:

I paid a hundred dollars, I believe approximately a hundred dollars to Mr. Roger Stone on one occasion to go to New Hampshire to leave a leaflet, I believe at Senator McGovern's headquarters, and I paid another \$200 to Mr. Stone, the same Mr. Stone, to go a second time to New Hampshire to make a cash contribution to McCloskey's campaign. These were all at the direction of Mr. Magruder.

...I made total payment of about \$6000 over a 3-month period again to Mr. Stone that was passed on to a Mike, I cannot remember his last name again now, I believe it was McMinnaway from Louisville, Ky., who worked in



two or three of the primary campaigns as kind of an eyes and ears and kept the campaign, kept Mr. Stone informed of morale and this kind of movement and that sort of thing.

Michael W. McMinoway, known to CREEP as Sedan Chair II, was hired by one "Jason Ranier" to work as a volunteer in the Muskie, Humphrey, and McGovern campaigns in 1972 and provide information on these Democrats to Ranier. Ranier was identified in the Watergate Committee hearings as Roger Stone, though McMinoway never knew him by that name. McMinoway, who said he was introduced to Stone by Martin (sic) Blackwell, never participated in any active sabotage of the Democratic campaigns.

Stone, then head of the District of Columbia Young Republicans, also recommended the hiring of Theodore F. Brill as a CREEP spy on radical activists. Brill, then head of the College Republican organization at George Washington University, was hired by the CREEP youth division. Ken Rietz, who headed that effort, worked on the Ronald Reagan presidential campaign last year---as did Stone, who was Reagan's national youth director.

The Team, according to its former co-leader, Charles Black, has been effectively disbanded. It broke up, he says, in the aftermath of the 1975 Young Republican National Convention when its leadership split between the Ford and Reagan camps. Black became a regional chairman for Reagan and Peter MacPherson, the Team's other co-leader, had a similar job for Ford. The Team was a formal management setup which somewhat resembled a political party within the YRNF---complete with a regional leadership structure. MacPherson and Black, for example, controlled microphone access at the 1975 convention in Indianapolis from their campaign post at the rear of the convention hall.

The new organization is less formal and less structured, according to Black. It was initially organized in Albuquerque after last year's elections. "Instead of a Team, we have a Stone campaign," says Black. But the Team's co-leaders will still be calling the shots at the 1977 convention in Memphis, asserts Black, since that is, after all, the efficient way to run campaigns.

The Stone slate has brought regional and geographical distribution. It in-

cludes for co-chairman, Ann Quirk, a moderate conservative Ford backer from Texas and current assistant secretary; for vice chairman at large, Martha McCrery, a YR national committeewoman from Illinois and Cook County Ford backer; for secretary, Cheryl Gordon, a regional vice chairman from Utah and Ford backer; for assistant secretary, Linda Reed, a South Carolina Reagan backer; for Treasurer, Louis Barnett, a California Reagan activist; and for auditor, Ed Stanley, a Washington Reagan backer.

Black is confident that the Stone slate will be successful, saying, "I don't think there's any question about." Black, NCPAC chairman and so Stone's boss, claims backing from two-thirds the 824 delegates.

The Team ticket is opposed by one headed by Kentucky YR National Committeeman Rich Evans, a 1976 Reagan delegate. Dan Mintz, one of Evans' backers and the Maryland YR chairman, disputes the long lead claimed for Stone. Mintz thinks the Kentucky conservative is running close behind "sure thing" Stone.

Evans, a 28-year-old owner of an auto dealership, is older than Stone, now 25. But both are younger than the 35ish leaders the YRNF has chosen in the past. The Evans slate, however, contains what its backers feel is a broader cross-section of moderates and conservatives than does the team ticket. It includes for co-chairman, Margie Cook, a Michigan Ford backer and former YRNF officer; for treasurer, Clay Maitland, a New York State progressive and former state YR chairman; for secretary, Alexa Bennett, a moderate-conservative who is Texas YR national committeewoman; and for vice chairman at large, Mark Abernathy, former YR national committeeman from California. Still open are the designees for auditor and assistant secretary.

Evans backers hope to block a merger of the interests of NCPAC and the Young Republicans while promoting a stronger YR vehicle for party training and growth. The showdown will come in Memphis June 7-12.

Meanwhile, Black was the leading candidate for director of the Republican National Committee's political division. It would be the first real "Reagan" appointment on the committee since Bill Brock took over as chairman. Black is widely respected by both conservatives and moderates as a cool professional who elicits personal respect.■

## Commentary: Electoral College

IN DEFENSE OF AN IMPERFECT COLLEGE

by Michael C. Maibach.

The Electoral College met December 13, 1976 to ratify the election of Jimmy Carter. As is customary, Carter's election has prompted fresh calls for the elimination of the Electoral College. Before it is summarily abolished, however, the Electoral College rates another assessment of its effectiveness.

There are two major arguments against the current system. The first is that the Electoral College has permitted the election of three Presidents who trailed their opponents in the nation's popular vote (John Quincy Adams in 1824, Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, and Benjamin Harrison in 1888). Such results are considered unacceptable in our democratic republic.

Second, the foes of the Electoral College argue that it unfairly cancels out the votes in each state that are not cast for that state's presidential winner. It might be argued that if the second place candidate receives 45 percent of the popular vote in Illinois, then that candidate should receive 45 percent of our 26 electoral votes. The winner-take-all provision is also considered undemocratic.

The best way to consider the merits of the Electoral College is perhaps to consider the consequences of abolishing it. Without the Electoral College, for example, how would the winner of a presidential election be determined? The candidate who received over 50 percent of the vote might be declared the winner, but that would create a whole new set of problems. Very often, no single candidate receives a majority of the vote. In the 49 presidential elections since 1789, 15 "winners" failed to receive the magic 50 percent. Abraham Lincoln received only 39.8 percent of the popular vote in 1860; Woodrow Wilson, 41.8 in 1912; Harry Truman, 49.6 in 1948; and John F. Kennedy, 49.7 in 1960. These men did, however, assume the presidency because all of them received a majority of the Electoral College vote.

Critics of the Electoral College must first ask themselves: if 50 percent is not practical, what percentage of the vote would be an acceptable determinant---45 percent? 40 percent? Any plurality? An acceptable answer will be difficult to find, especially

since American presidential elections are traditionally tight contests.

Imagine a case where only the popular vote is counted. In 1912, Eugene Debs, the Socialist candidate, received 6 percent of the popular vote and no Electoral College votes. It is conceivable that he might have under other circumstances caused Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt to tie with 47 percent of the popular vote. Perhaps only 58,000 votes separated the two men and the loser legally demanded and received a national recount. Even excepting the possibility of corruption and lost ballots, the recount process in all 48 states would have taken days and even then perhaps never satisfactorily been resolved. The Electoral College system has rarely given rise to request a recount in even one state because such an action would seldom have made any difference in the final results. (The decisions by two Republicans---Richard Nixon in Illinois in 1960 and Gerald Ford in Hawaii and Ohio in 1976---are of course significant exceptions.)

If a plurality is unacceptable, would a runoff then be necessary with all its contingent problems and expenses. Imagine the chaos that might have ensued had Lincoln's 1960 election been referred instead to a runoff while the nation headed toward a civil war. That election is a perfect example of the beneficial effects of the Electoral College. In a sense, it creates a majority for each President regardless of his margin of victory. The system lends an aura of victory to the election of even a candidate with 39.8 percent of the vote---such as Lincoln. It legitimizes the winner's mandate no matter how close the election. Without the Electoral College, the people in 1860 might have dwelled on the fact that six of every ten Americans did not vote for Lincoln. Lincoln fashioned his victory in the Electoral College, receiving 180 votes compared to 72 for his closest rival, John Breckinridge.

The second criticism of the Electoral College is that it ignores the losing votes in each state. Yet, without the Electoral College, the same phenomenon would be observed on a national scale. If the second place candidate received 45 percent of the na-

tional vote, is it any less "unfair" to discount those votes in declaring the man with 55 percent the winner. Whether on statewide or national scale, it is still the concept of majority rule at work. Every election is won by the person with the most votes without any concrete return to those who voted in the minority.

If the Electoral College were abolished, it would be a blow against our federal system. Our whole legal and political system rests upon the idea of a nation composed of 50 socio-political communities called "states." Our 50 political communities, under the Electoral College plan, vote for the President, community by community.

The Founding Fathers built a remarkable and successful national government with three distinct branches. One, the Congress, is elected directly by the people. The second, the President, is elected by the people, state by state. The third, the Supreme Court, is appointed jointly by the two other branches. Because of their separate and distinct forms of selection from the same constituency, the three branches offer real balance and creative diversity found in no other government in the world.

The abolition of the Electoral College would put that great federal idea into question. It would undermine the role of our two-party system, which rests on the strengths of 50 individual state parties. Without the electoral vote scheme, presidential candidates would not campaign to win the votes of states as units. Rather, they would, more so than today, concentrate their efforts in urban, industrial regions.

Finally, the Electoral College ensures a truly national campaign. Regional and extremist parties cannot win nor make much impact unless they campaign across the entire nation. The Founding Fathers gave thought to the possibility that one large state, region, or group might control the Presidency. The Electoral College reduces that chance by spreading the electoral votes out more evenly among the states and regions. For example, Eugene Debs received 900,000 votes in 1912. Although that is six percent of the votes cast that year, he received no electoral votes because his support was not sufficiently broad. Without the Electoral College his Socialist candidacy's six percent could have been the deciding factor in a purely popular election. Instead, the Electoral

College brought balance and moderation to the election results, as well as a clear victor, Woodrow Wilson.

The Electoral College holds certain problems for our political system. So do the alternatives. The Electoral College has served the nation well. Only eight electors have not followed the wishes of the people of their states. That is only eight of 16,168 cast since 1820. And those eight never changed the election results.

Our Constitution is the world's oldest and most successful written political document. We have chosen to amend it only 26 times in 200 years. The Electoral College is an important part of that document. As Alexander Hamilton said of the Constitution, "...if the manner of it be not perfect, it is at least excellent." ■

---

**Contributor Note:** Michael Maibach was an alternate delegate to the 1976 Republican National Convention and is a member of the Ripon Society's National Governing Board. As in all signed commentary articles, the views expressed are those of the author.

## Ripon: Update

**CUBA** Writing radio commentaries is a tough life. You have to be constantly alert for potential subject matter in the most unlikely places. In a syndicated broadcast in April, it was reported, for example:

Last October the Castro regime in Cuba invited seven members of the Ripon Society to tour their country. Now, the Ripon Society is a liberal Republican organization whose membership might be a little less skeptical of the glories of Castroism than the ordinary Republican---or at least that's what the Cuban government must have thought. And, frankly it's what I would have thought. I'm delighted to find I was wrong. The report of the Ripon excursion has appeared, authored by Richard W. Rahn, and I'm afraid the Cubans have discovered their pesos were misspent. The Ripon visitors were, to be sure, appreciative of the hospitality shown them. But their reports of life in this socialist paradise are not very flattering for Castro's image.

And so went Ronald Reagan's commentary.

**RONALD REAGAN** A series of regional meetings convened this past winter have kept the Reagan presidential operation

in action, according to the Los Angeles Times' Richard Bergholz. The meetings have been only tangentially connected with Citizens for the Republic, the official offspring of Reagan's presidential drive. Writes Bergholz:

All the meetings have this in common.

-The participants comprise the heart and leadership of former Gov. Ronald Reagan's campaign for President last year.

-Virtually without exception, they want him to run again.

-Until that happens in 1980, or until he tells them he won't run again, they all want to keep the Reagan operation together, working for causes and candidates they believe to be compatible with the Reagan campaign."

Leaders in the "let's stay together" movement include Oklahoma's Clarence Warner and Charles Black of the National Conservative Political Action Committee.

**RICHARD SCHWEIKER** Pennsylvania's senior senator has agreed to become a member of the steering committee for Citizens for the Republic. Schweiker was quoted in the Philadelphia Observer as noting: "I got an invitation to rejoin forces with the governor [Reagan] and I accepted. We formed an association and friendship back in July that we both decided to continue... To some extent this obviously keeps me active in the national arena with some pretty good ties. I did make a conservative link, and I'm going to keep it. I have lots of options in terms of time and I intend to exercise them."

**GERALD FORD** Alone among the GOP's Big Four, Nelson Rockefeller has ruled himself out of elective office. Gerald Ford has made it clear that he considers another campaign for President in 1980 within the realm of political possibility. On a recent swing through the nation's capitol, reports columnist J.F. terHorst, Ford was "tougher, more assertive, less interested in small talk, more in charge of himself, and just possibly, his future." Commenting on the same Washington trip, columnist Charles Bartlett wrote: "But, strange to say, there is no sign that the prospects of a Ford candidacy evoke enthusiasm, even among some Ford loyalists... If Carter stumbles, the 1980 New Hampshire primary could become a cabinet reunion with added starters from the Senate and state houses. The array of moderate talent may threaten to split the moderate vote and leave the prize to a neanderthal. In this

scenario, Ford's most useful role would be outside the race, assisting the strongest moderate to emerge. The relentless fact is that a new generation of Republican leaders has emerged and the party needs Ford more as a symbol of its balance and dignity than as a candidate."

**NEW HAMPSHIRE** Gov. Meldrim Thomson may be trapped. He has been considering a 1978 campaign against Sen. Thomas McIntyre(D), but a recent independent poll shows McIntyre defeating the anti-tax governor by a 2-1 margin. Thomson has also talked of running for a fourth term, but the budget crunch that Thomson has so far avoided now appears inevitable. New Hampshire has avoided a broad-based tax through Yankee penny-pinching and sin taxes collected from residents of neighboring Massachusetts. There is a \$51 million budget gap this year, however. Thomson will have a difficult time finessing the next years and even a more difficult time seeking reelection on a taxes-as-usual platform. If Thomson does not want to run for the Senate, Senate president Alf Jacobson is the leading candidate with House Speaker George Roberts the GOP standin for governor. The difficulty in achieving GOP unity in New Hampshire was reflected recently by the Concord Monitor's Rod Paul:

Wherever moderate Republicans congregate these days---at least those who make state politics a topic of conversation---there is a common lament about the future of the party.

A few of the leaders in the moderate and progressive wing want to do something to improve the state's GOP fortunes---set goals, consider politics in New Hampshire apart from the rule of Thomson.

Others want to plot outright toward Thomson's political demise.

And some want to do anything that's required to keep Thomson at the helm of state party politics, capable of directing GOP policies along the conservative road he has tread for so many years.

Part of the GOP strategy is to encourage U.S. Rep. James Cleveland to become more active in internal GOP affairs.

**EQUAL RIGHTS** The recent defeats of the Equal Rights Amendment in Florida and North Carolina were encouraged by the active lobbying of the Conservative Caucus. Writing on behalf of Howard Phillips' group, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) told potential contributors:

This evil amendment to the U.S. Constitution would not only take away the

basic rights and protection women have under the laws of God and the laws of the states...

...it will allow federal bureaucrats to enter and dictate areas of your and my personal lives where they have never been able to intrude before.

\*\*\*\*\*

The effort the caucus made to reach North Carolina voters was so vitally important that Howard Phillips was forced to dig into the Caucus' last financial resources to pay for it.

And in fact, the Conservative Caucus is still facing unpaid bills for over \$20,000 incurred in the North Carolina effort.

So there just isn't any money left

in the caucus' bank account to pay the \$37,000-plus that is desperately needed to make the crucial effort to stop ERA in Florida.

Back in New Hampshire, the Conservative Caucus has had its troubles. According to the Concord Monitor's Tom Ferriter:

Gov. Meldrim Thomson's position as national chairman of the Conservative Caucus has brought little comfort to conservatives trying to organize the caucus within the borders of New Hampshire.

After two years of struggles and internal quarreling, conservatives in the state are no closer to becoming an organized political force than they were before the Conservative Caucus was created.

## Duly Noted: The GOP

### WHERE ARE THE VOTERS COMING FROM?

President Carter's proposal for "instant voting" on election day has raised a storm of Republican protest which contrasts with the relative unity with which Republicans have approached most issues in the new Carter Administration.

The GOP's first months out of national power have been marked by restraint and realism. As the Washington Star's James R. Dickenson wrote recently: "Republican congressmen and senators are now talking about the party getting on the right side of issues, of presenting alternatives in ways that will make the middle class working man think the GOP cares about him at least as much as the Democrats do."

Rationality has been a mark of the rhetoric and actions of GOP National Chairman Bill Brock, Senate Minority Leader Howard Baker, and House Minority Leader John Rhodes. The three even agreed recently to support President Carter's instant voter plan that would have allowed citizens to register at the time they vote. Later, Brock and Baker backed away from the plan---which has been criticized by former President Gerald Ford and knocked as an invitation to voter fraud.

One element is the Big Three's thinking, noted the Washington Post's David Broder was the necessity for the GOP to take risks if it expects to improve its standing with the electorate. "I think we [Republicans] have just as good an opportunity to earn that vote as they do," commented Brock.

In defending the proposed legislation Rhodes says, "After all, we are a minority. In order to become a majority we need more Americans to vote---and vote for our candidates. I know there are those who say that a majority of the eligible voters who stay home on election day lean toward the Democratic Party. But I don't believe it...there are millions of Americans---people who for one reason or another did not vote in the last election---who do not approve of the Democrat-run Congress. They should be receptive to our case for switching control of Congress."

For such opinions, Rhodes has been the subject of strong attacks. Five ultraconservative Republican congressmen wrote their colleagues to complain:

Aside from the very real possibility of massive voter fraud, the walk-in registration plan and using tax money to finance campaigns are both made to order for labor bosses and organized union groups to use as the final tools in obliterating the Republican Party in the House and Senate. At the very least, we might have expected that our 'leaders' would have called an appropriate party meeting to discuss their stand before it was trumpeted to the press. The five---U.S. Reps. John Ashbrook(Ohio), Phil Crane(Ill.), Steve Symms(Idaho), Robert Bauman(Md.), and Mickey Edwards(Okla.)---exemplify the problem some Republicans have in taking the risks necessary to expand the party's pitifully small base. It is a Custer mentality that insists on pulling the wagons into a circle. Somehow the mentality that in-

sists that businessmen should be trusted to operate without the interference of the Occupational, Health and Safety Administration does not see fit to place similar trust in voters. It is odd.

The registration question poses a problem for Republican leaders. Their own pollster, Robert Teeter, has told them that major political upheavals are accomplished not by shifting the allegiances of new voters but by bringing new blocs of voters into the electorate. Although it is argued that 60 percent of today's nonvoters are potential Democrats, it can be argued that this bloc is still ripe for GOP conversion--particularly in the younger, upwardly mobile middle class.

Writing in the Los Angeles Times last fall, Robert Samuelson noted:

Fully 40 percent of the voting-age population now falls between the ages of 18 and 34. According to a recent survey by the Washington polling firm of Hart Research Associates, 46 percent of the people in that age group are currently nonvoters but that percentage is likely to decline. As we age, we perceive ourselves as being more responsible and having better-defined interests.

It is this predictable change in our self-perceptions, coupled with the continuing influence of the baby-boom children, that may be the ultimate guarantor of the GOP's survival."

The key for Republicans is to enhance the party's image at the same time it appeals for these new voter's allegiance. It has to style itself as a maverick champion of the people's interests who owe no debts to Big Government, Big Business or Big Labor.

One of the GOP's problems is to avoid knee-jerk opposition while promoting distinctly Republican policy alternatives. House Republican Conference Chairman John B. Anderson addressed this problem in an article in the Washington Post earlier this year:

...superficially at least,...the American people want less government, less interference in their private lives. Yet, a closer examination shows that Americans are turning more, not less, to their government(at all levels) for solutions to the problems that frustrate them.

To wit, unemployment. The American people and their local leaders can hardly be said to have turned their backs on

the \$2 billion worth of aid provided in the Public Works Employment Act of 1976 (passed by Congress over President Ford's veto). By mid-December \$24 billion worth of applications for public works funds had flooded into Washington. We Republicans are correct in our assertion that the American people want less government interference. But it would be wrong to believe---or to build a party around the belief---that this is a rigid sentiment grounded in immutable political dogma. Regarding unemployment, for example, the American people in effect have said, "Public works funds? Now that's my kind of interference." Even in the good old days of the early Republic, citizens looked to their government to help them solve problems. It will continue to be so. Upon reflection, I think our job is to interfere where we can do the most good, and refrain from doing so when some other problem-solving mechanism is more effective.

In a recent speech in Minneapolis, Michigan Gov. William Milliken uttered similar thoughts:

The fundamental step is to stop a moment and look at the world through the eyes of those whose support we are seeking. We must understand their legitimate problems and concerns and address ourselves to those problems and concerns. We must show them that we care, not just with a few words, but with our actions.

We must look at the world through the eyes of an elderly person whose fixed income is steadily being eroded by rising prices and taxes. We must see the world through the eyes of the small businessman caught in the bind of rising costs, lowered profits and unfair taxes. We must look through the eyes of a young person with an idealistic desire to change the world immediately. We must have empathy, not sympathy, for people.

Now, I'm not talking about a cynical exploitation of their needs. I'm not talking about a "me-too" approach to things as some critics would have you believe.

I'm talking about a Republican Party that is truly open to everyone, a Republican Party that encourages internal debate and tries to apply our traditional commitment to individual freedom and self-help to these problems.

There may still be time for the GOP to heed the advice of Rhodes, Anderson, and Milliken. But not much. ■

## Politics: Wisconsin

AFTER THE AMBASSADOR

Republican fortunes in Wisconsin have dropped steadily in recent years. Last year, the GOP hoped to recapture two House seats lost in 1974, but both Adolph Gunderson (3rd C.D.) and Harold Froehlich (8th C.D.) failed in their attempts. The Republicans also lost two seats in the lower house and four in the State Senate to further deplete their minority.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the decision of Gov. Patrick J. Lucey to accept appointment as ambassador to Mexico has squelched or opened a GOP opportunity. One school of thought contends that Lucey would have been easier to beat than a new candidate such as Lt. Gov. Martin Schreiber (D), who will succeed Lucey. Lucey has increasingly alienated former supporters during his two terms as governor. He backed a losing transportation referendum in 1976 and has been criticized by organized labor. It was not altogether clear that Schreiber would not have challenged Lucey in a 1978 primary. Another school of guess-work maintained that Lucey remained a popular governor whose record and personality would be formidable obstacles to a GOP candidate.

The frontrunner is U.S. Rep. Robert Kasten, a conservative former state senator who defeated U.S. Rep. Glenn Davis (R) in a 1974 primary. Young and wealthy, Kasten has the winning image the GOP is so desperately searching for. With Lucey out of the race, Kasten has a chance to pick up the business community support---and money---that would have been Lucey's property had he stayed in.

If Kasten chooses to run for reelection rather than the governorship, the top two Republican contenders are the party's unsuccessful candidates for the Senate in 1974 and 1976: State Sen. Thomas E. Petri and former state energy director Stanley York. Both are progressives. Petri is a founder of the Ripon Society and York

was an organizer of the New Republican Conference, a group of moderate Wisconsin Republicans. Petri, however, got only 36 percent of the vote against Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D) in 1974 and York did even poorer against Sen. William Proxmire in 1976.

The state GOP must go on record this spring whether it will endorse at next year's convention. Petri backs an open primary. A closed system is scarcely consistent with Kasten's record. Should York and Petri not run for governor, they would be attractive candidates for other statewide offices. That would be particularly true if, for example, Attorney General Bronx LaFollette decided to challenge Schreiber for the governorship.

In addition to LaFollette and Schreiber, possible Democratic candidates include David Carley, president of the Medical College of Wisconsin, U.S. Rep. Les Aspin, and Secretary of State Douglas LaFollette. All would be formidable challengers to Schreiber, who now has a year and a half to demonstrate his gubernatorial capabilities. ■



**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., 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 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. Rehfuss, 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 0002426123199CP01  
DANIEL J SWILLINGER  
616 A ST ST  
WASHINGTON DC 20003

0198-NNZ