

THE RIPON FORUM

THE NEW
POLITICS
CONVENTION

pp. 3-5

OCTOBER, 1967

©Copyright 1967 by
The Ripon Society, Inc.

VOL. III, NO. 10

Republicans and Redistricting

Had any one of those masters of political compromise who drafted the U. S. Constitution visited the Congress during this session, he would have heard some familiar sounds. Voices were once more raised in debate regarding division of power between the Legislative and Judicial branches of the government. Under pressure from the practical portent of the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" rule, Congress toyed for a time with legislation which would affirm its belief in its privilege of self-rule.

H. R. 2508 was designed to postpone the reform indicated by the *Wesberry v. Saunders*, 376 U. S. (1964) decision and to permit present inequities in congressional districts to remain virtually unchanged until 1972. Quietly (no hearings were held in either the House or the Senate) the House approved the bill. In the Senate, unaffected by districting, debate was less guarded. Senator Howard Baker, Jr. (R.-Tenn.) led the debate against the House bill. The constitutionality of the law was repeatedly questioned and amendments were added which improved standards governing contiguity, compactness, and population variances in the districts. H.R. 2508 was then referred to a conference committee which added two amendments, one to prohibit at-large elections for Representative and one which provided that no state shall be required to redistrict unless a special federal census is held. Because the former amendment avoided the prohibition of gerrymandering and the latter could be construed to allow states to refuse to request the federal census, Senator Baker led the fight to resubmit the bill to conference and thereby postpone final action until next year.

H. R. 2508 was undesirable legislation. Based on the assumption that the power of Congress is not subject to a constitutional requirement of equality, it was viewed by many as a bold attempt to limit the jurisdiction of state and federal courts.

Constitutional considerations aside, the drawing of election districts is to politics what possession of the ball is to football. Issues of person, party, and principle are often in conflict and are very carefully balanced when the subject is being dealt with by elected officials. The courts have proved to be less sensitive to personal and political niceties, and more apt to make equal-representation theories a practical reality.

Personal considerations center around who will be affected and how, with each congressman hoping for a large safe district which will assure him all the pleasures of longevity under the seniority system. Political parties attempt to maneuver their opponents into a few large districts while carving numerous smaller areas for themselves. The public interest resides in the constitutional principle of equality in representation with districts that are contiguous, compact, and contain "as nearly as practicable" equal numbers of inhabitants.

In one of those rare instances when good politics and good government coincide, the Republican party is currently presented with an opportunity to help both itself and the public good. Independent surveys have revealed that redistricting could be a substantial factor in electing 10, and possibly 25, new Republicans from 22 states where the party would benefit from strictly equal redistricting. These states elect 234 Congressmen, or a majority of the House.

Political strategists further cite the fact that the present alignment of districts permitted the GOP to capture only 187, or 43 percent, of the House seats in 1966, although Republican congressional candidates polled 48.3 percent of the total vote. Party votes in the large districts are therefore wasted under malapportionment. Between 1964 and 1966, 158 congressional districts were reshaped. Republicans won 49 percent of those seats, compared with only 39 percent of the remaining districts.

These statistics tend to explode a long standing political myth that both redistricting for Congress and apportionment for state legislatures have favored rural areas at the expense of urban territory, and therefore the Republican rather than the Democratic party. Recent population shifts to the suburbs and exurbia have strengthened population centers around, not in, the cities and it is this portion of the country which will gain representation in future shifts of political boundaries. Election figures (1964 Presidential race always excluded) show that this is fertile territory for the Republican party.

Because there are more Democratic incumbents than Republican, any shift in congressional districts will affect more Democrats than Republicans. Reshuffling of district lines must move Republicans into Democratic marginal district, making the districts more competitive, if not actually shifting the balance of power immediately into GOP hands.

Further encouragement for the Republican party is the knowledge that of the twenty nine states which now have more than ten percent variation in population between their congressional districts, fourteen have Republican Governors and two other states have at least one house of the legislature under Republican control. Timing of action on redistricting is therefore very favorable for the Republican party.

In a letter to Senator Baker, Charles L. Black, Jr., Luce Professor of Jurisprudence at Yale Law School, called for "the defeat of this unreasoned attack on the principle that the House representing the people as such ought to represent them in proportion to their numbers."

It is easy to agree. Republicans, with the added incentive of party gain, should advance the cause.

—Georgia Ireland

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC.

National Governing Board

Josiah Lee Auspitz
Christopher W. Beal*
Robert L. Beal
Robert D. Behn
Melvin A. Bernstein
Thomas A. Brown
Edward S. Cabot
Robert D. Fagaly, Jr.
Howard F. Gillette, Jr.

Lee W. Huebner*
Edward J. McAniff
J. Eugene Marans
W. Stuart Parsons
Thomas E. Petri**
John R. Price
Peter J. Wallison
John S. Saloma III
Michael C. Smith

Richard A. Zimmer

* Officers

** National Executive Director

The Ripon FORUM

Editorial Board

Josiah Lee Auspitz
Thomas E. Petri
Lee W. Huebner
Editor
Ralph B. Earle, Jr.

Political Notes Editor

Robert S. Gulick

Technical Editor

Rusty Bellows

Economics Editor

Duncan K. Foley

Business Manager

Gerald E. Bellows

Correspondents

Mrs. Norman W. Osher, Arizona
Maggie Nichols, California
Stanley M. Pottinger, California
Robert R. Jaspersen, Connecticut
Mrs. Anna C. Johns, Delaware
Harold Schmittinger, Delaware
Cullen Hammond, Georgia
Michael McCrary, Idaho
John A. Bross, Jr., Illinois
Burton Southard, Indiana
Terrence Dwyer, Iowa
J. T. Moore, Kansas
Gary Scott Nunley, Kansas
Don Fowler, Maine
Richard Olson, Massachusetts
James R. Anderson, Michigan
Terrence Dwyer, Michigan

James L. Robertson, Mississippi
John Evans, Missouri
Dr. Arthur F. McClure, II, Missouri
William Harding, Nebraska
Johnson Howard, North Carolina
Charles O. Ingraham, North Carolina
Phillip M. Purgess, Ohio
William K. Woods, Ohio
Eric R. Blackledge, Oregon
William H. Linder, South Carolina
Stanford M. Adelstein, South Dakota
Robert B. Campbell, Texas
Terrence Ellsworth, Texas
Robert R. Murdoch, Virginia
Christopher T. Bayley, Washington
W. Stuart Parsons, Wisconsin
John R. Lazarek, Southern States

THE RIPON SOCIETY is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic, and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, with chapters in Boston, Los Angeles, New Haven, and New York, and National Associate members throughout the fifty states. The Ripon FORUM is published monthly by the Society; application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at Boston, Massachusetts. To those who wish to subscribe to its publications and support its programs the Society offers the following options for annual contribution: FORUM, \$10; FORUM (student), \$5; Contributor, \$25 or more; Sustainer, \$100; Founder, \$1000. Correspondence addressed to the Editor is welcomed.

THE RIPON SOCIETY
1430 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

1430 MASS. AVE.: Vietnam

In early October Ripon National Governing Board members spent a few days in Washington publicizing and explaining the Society's Vietnam paper. Immediate response to the Society's press conference at the National Press Club was satisfactory, with coverage by all three networks, syndicated stories by David Broder and Peter Lisagor, a minute of prime T.V. commentary by Eric Sevareid, and in-depth coverage by the Washington bureaus of the *Boston Globe*, *Milwaukee Journal*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Philadelphia Bulletin*, and *Washington Star*.

Columnists and editorial writers have given the proposal serious attention. James Doyle of the *Boston Globe*, for instance, called it "one of the most thoughtful and scholarly proposals yet injected into the Vietnam debate." An editorial in the *Providence Journal* said that the Ripon proposal "warrants thorough public hearing by the appropriate House and Senate Committees."

The entire paper has been read into the Congressional record by Senator Hatfield, and has received praise on the floor by Senators Case and Scott. General James M. Gavin called it "a brilliant analysis" and said, "I intend to discuss the Ripon paper with General Westmoreland when I visit Vietnam."

Congressman John Ashbrook, Chairman of the American Conservative Union called the Ripon study "the verbal wanderings of a brainwashed expert on Southeast Asia." The proposal, he said, was "worthless." Judicious commentary came also from the Democratic National Committee who called the paper "arrogant and ignorant" and criticized the Young Republicans (*sic*) for having dared to present it to public debate.

In private meetings with a number of legislators, Ripon found broad agreement on the four major policy recommendations emerging from its analysis: 1) a confederal approach to unify fragmented non-Communist political groups in South Vietnam; 2) piecemeal negotiations with non-ideological Viet Cong cadres as a means of deescalating the conflict and splitting the Communist movement from within; 3) a firm decision not to send American counter-insurgency to replace ineffective ARVN forces South of the Mekong River; 4) cessation of punitive bombing of North Vietnam above the 18.5° parallel.

The Ripon proposal and additional Vietnam papers will be published by Random House in hard and paperback editions later this year.

Friends from military headquarters near Saigon report that over thirty copies of the Ripon book *From Disaster to Distinction* have been sold at the Long Binh PX.

The volunteer army program endorsed by The Ripon Society in a major research report last December continues to attract adherents. At a public seminar on the draft conducted in Wisconsin's Sixth District by GOP Congressman William Steiger the volunteer army proposal received considerably more support than any other program. An impressive 51.4% endorsed the volunteer army concept, with 31.4% opposed and 17.2% having no opinion.

LETTERS: Vietnam

Dear Sirs:

The Ripon Society should be commended for its penetrating study on the course of developments in Vietnam. "The Realities of Vietnam" is a highly perceptive job and contains several creative ideas about elements essential to any true solution of the conflict. I have long held the view that our limited objectives make impossible purely military solutions and that a satisfactory outcome must be based on fundamental effort within the South Vietnamese society itself, and on finding a way to deal with the Viet Cong infrastructures. An alternative to resent policies is clearly necessary, and the Ripon Paper not only identifies, through its sharp and impartial analysis, the need, but also proposes for examination some of the possibilities that may lead to a solution of the conflict.

GEORGE ROMNEY, Governor
Lansing, Michigan

Dear Sirs:

A short note to offer my personal congratulations to Mr. Auspitz and Mr. Beal for a lucid and penetrating analysis of the situation in Vietnam. It is by far the best of its type I've seen.

Having spent a good deal of time in Vietnam (I just returned a few weeks ago from a summer-long study of the pacification program) I am not sure that a confederal approach would work; I am sure, however, that it makes much more sense than our present policy of attempting to foster allegiance to the central government.

TREVOR ARMBRISTER
Washington, D.C.

(The writer is the Washington Bureau Manager of *The Saturday Evening Post*.)

The National Conference for New Politics Convention

To have followed the pre-convention publicity and planning for the National Conference on New Politics was to anticipate a new thrust in American politics. To have observed the actual convention proceedings was to watch a frightened capitulation to a fanatic rejection of American political reality, a rejection which confronts and denies America's ability to govern responsibly.

The 2,117-plus delegates who registered at the Palmer House in Chicago for the Labor Day weekend convention gathered to attempt a radical departure in American politics. Some wished to begin the organization of a national third party to implement the presidential and vice-presidential candidacies of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Dr. Benjamin Spock, or of others. Some wanted to build third-party alternatives on the state level. Others sought to lay the local groundwork for a complete parallel political structure across the country, in precincts, wards, labor organizations, Congressional district parties, which would eventually culminate in the election of Congressmen. All of them were disaffected former members of the Democratic coalition who had found no alternative in the Republican party and had turned to each other in their desperate search for a voice in national affairs. But the small voice their gathering could have had was drowned out by the strident cries of the call for black nationalism from the "Black Caucus."

INTIMIDATION AND CONTROL Most of the news media reported the take-over of the convention by the Black Caucus; what they did not fully report was the atmosphere of intimidation and control in which the seizure was effected. The Johnson Administration attempted to control or at least prevent the success of the convention. For had the convention succeeded, it might well have fielded or begun to set up an organization leading to a third party of liberals. These liberals would be against the War in Vietnam, for poverty programs, and for the legitimate aspirations of the Negro. And since most of their votes would have to come from the Democrats, specifically from President Johnson, the Administration dispatched staff people to ride herd on the convention. Another scuttling attempt was launched by liberal Democrats who wanted to control the dissident left: Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., on behalf of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, the Americans for Democratic Action, and some doctrinaire Democrats, had prepared and widely circulated a 15-page memorandum, endorsed by John Kenneth Galbraith, President of the A. D. A., which claimed that the way to fight against the War and against President Johnson was to remain in the party, to file minority views with the Democratic Platform Committee, to get on television, and to have a platform fight. Many of the delegates were potentially receptive to such a strategy, which would allow them to remain in the good graces of the Democratic party and at the same time serve their liberal and anti-War constituencies.

In these efforts the Administration and the liberal Democrats had as allies certain Negroes who wanted to cut Dr. King down to size, Negroes such as Roy Wilkins of the N.A.A.C.P. and Whitney Young of the Urban League (a member of the President's Commission to observe the Vietnamese elections), who have wanted to

silence King because he, being a clergyman, anti Vietnam War, and not controllable by the Administration, could not be compromised through personal federal grants or the placement of relatives on the federal payroll. Ironically, the anti-King elements need not have been concerned. For, before the convention assembled, King himself had had a survey taken by his staff and allies which showed that he did not have the power to sway the general electorate; in the face of this, the clergy wished to save him for more important causes. And on Thursday evening, August 31, Dr. King gave a speech that was a climax to his influence; it was clear that he and Dr. Spock would at best receive a polite reception and that he could not control the Black Caucus because he was not privy to it. Thus, from the official opening of the convention King was not to be a participant in the end result.

"Point of order."

"There are no points of order."

"Is this a dictatorship?"

"Yes, and I'm the dictator . . . Jesus Christ, can't we have a little fun?"

—James Forman, international affairs director of the Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee, on the rostrum and members of the convention.

"Would America systematically destroy 22 million Blacks? My answer is: Look at the record! More specifically, I believe they can. I believe they will."

—Floyd B. McKissick, Executive Director of the Congress of Racial Equality, to the National Conference on Black Power at Newark, New Jersey.

Despite their resources, however, neither of these groups were able to achieve all their aims. Instead, the convention was commandeered by a small Negro minority. Never, in the entire convention, were as many as five hundred Negroes to be seen. Often no more than two hundred Negroes were present; of these no more than fifty held leadership positions. Out of these fifty, fifteen actually controlled the caucus, and these fifteen took orders from a top echelon of five. Many of these Negro leaders were new to their adherents and especially to the convention delegates. They were people unknown to the established civil rights leadership, white or black; the federal agents who covered the meeting had to fly people in from the new leaders' cities to attempt identification of these new Negroes in leadership positions. The relative obscurity of these new leaders pointed up one of the most important lessons for the Republican Party, for Louis Martin, the deputy chairman of the Democratic Party in charge of relations with the Negro community, was in constant and effective touch with the Black Caucus through certain of his own people who had infiltrated the Caucus. But neither Clarence Townes nor any other high-ranking member of the Republican National Committee was there.

The Negroes who were at the Palmer House represented a new breed. Because we must understand them, the FORUM interviewed many of them. According to these new militants, the American Negro has more identification with the Arabs than with the Jews, their

assumed staunch allies in the fight for civil rights and liberal causes, generally. The American Negro resents the closer relationship of the American Jew to his fellow American white. This is how the tie among the Marxists and the Arabs and the Negroes is formed. The Communists were there openly, speaking on the floor and encouraging the Negroes' anti-Jewish sentiments. Although the anti-Semitism of the convention stemmed principally from the position of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and similar organizations, even the more moderate Negroes insisted that the problems of the American Negro would be worked out by secular organizations, not religious organizations nor even the usual political party organizations.

BLACK CAUCUS TAKE-OVER

The actual take-over of the convention by the Black Caucus was a classic example of the use of intimidation, and indeed violence. Armed guards barred the entrances. The caucuses were absolutely closed. The only information came from the listening posts the federal agents had set up or from Negro participants willing to give briefings on the moods, power plays, and orders being passed down by leaders heretofore unknown. When one of Dr. King's lieutenants, the Rev. James Bevel, let it be known that out of a concern for the reaction of Jewish members of the New Politics, the press, and the country in general he intended to speak against the Thirteen Points, the black power militants took him outside and stood him against a wall, *a la* gangsterland Chicago, and made it clear that if he spoke he would be pummelled. This incident was witnessed by delegates of both races and by the federal agents, who were ready to make an arrest if he were pummelled. The Rev. Mr. Bevel never spoke and took little part

in the convention thereafter. Black power militants leaving a closed meeting addressed by H. Rap Brown, chairman of SNCC, attacked a news photographer for the Chicago *Tribune*, Ray Foster, and a white delegate, Richard Malkowski. David Hatrack, the parliamentarian of the conference, was bound, gagged, and robbed. Other delegates were robbed and one delegate who opposed the take-over definitely had his throat cut, according to federal agents.

The Thirteen Demands were presented to the convention early on Saturday morning. They were presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis; there was to be no debate, the convention had to accept the document unamended by 1 P.M. Essentially no one on the floor knew what was included under Demand 12, requiring support for all the resolutions emanating from the National Conference on Black Power in Newark, New Jersey, earlier in the summer, but there was to be no debate, no explanation. The Black Caucus did not trust an open vote, nor did they trust a secret vote. The only vote they trusted was a motion — everyone stand up or sit down — which offered the maximum opportunity for intimidation. The capitulation was almost complete: For, 17,029; Against, 6,834; Abstaining, 2,028.

The acceptance of the Thirteen Demands was not sufficient for the Black Caucus. They partitioned the convention floor and forced otherwise friendly whites out of the now Negro section. From their isolation, the black militants then argued that because half of the fight for Negro rights was being conducted by black people, the Black Caucus deserved half the total votes of the convention. This motion too passed; the at most 200-member Black Caucus was now entitled to cast 28,498 votes.

We, as black people, believe that a United States system that is committed to the practice of genocide, social degradation, the denial of political and cultural self-determination of black people, cannot reform itself: there must be revolutionary change. Revolutionary change does not mean systematic exclusion of blacks from the decision-making process as was done here in this convention. This exclusion raises serious doubts that white people are serious about revolutionary change. Therefore, responding to our revolutionary consciousness, we demand that this conference:

1. Respond to the importance of black participation by regrouping all committees, giving fifty percent representation to black people.
2. Make the conference slogan not Peace and Freedom, but Freedom and Peace.
3. Support the concept of self-determination for black people.
4. Give total and unquestionable support to all national people's liberation wars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, particularly Viet Nam, Mozambique, Angola, South Africa, and Venezuela.
5. Condemn the imperialistic Zionist war; this condemnation does not imply anti-Semitism.
6. Condemn the further disenfranchisement of the people of Harlem and demand the immediate reseating of Adam C. Powell, the duly elected representative of the Harlem. Powell must immediately be restored to his former chairman-

ship of the House Committee on Health, Education and Welfare.

7. Assist indigenous local freedom and political organizations in voter registration, political education, and the election of black candidates whom black people select.
8. Give support to black control of the political, economic, religious, and social institutions in black communities.
9. Call upon all "so-called" freedom-loving white people who wish to strike a blow for humanity to unshackle their minds from old conceptual structures and deal anew with the 20th century facts of black liberation efforts.
10. Make immediate reparation for the historical, physical, sexual, mental, and economic exploitation of black people.
11. We strongly suggest that white civilizing committees be established immediately in all white communities to civilize and humanize the savage and beast-like character that runs rampant throughout America, as exemplified by George Lincoln Rockwells and Lyndon Baines Johnsons.
12. Go on record as supporting all resolutions issuing from the recent National Conference on Black Power in Newark, New Jersey.
13. Support the Conyers bill to rebuild Detroit black communities destroyed by gestapo police tactics and army occupation.

—*The Thirteen Demands of the Black Caucus*

THE RIPON POLL

Below is a list of possible Republican Presidential nominees. All the leading contenders are listed, along with a number of dark horses for comparison. To help us determine our readers' order of preference, will you answer the following questions and return this poll to the editor?

1. How much do you feel you know about the candidates' qualifications for the Presidency? (Please check one column for each candidate listed.)

	Quite a bit	A fair amount	Very little	Nothing
General James M. Gavin
Senator Mark Hatfield
General Curtis LeMay
Mayor John Lindsay
Richard M. Nixon
Senator Charles Percy
Governor Ronald Reagan
Governor Nelson Rockefeller
Governor George Romney
William Scranton
(Other)

2. Where would you place them on the spectrum of Republican philosophy?

	Liberal	Moderate	Conservative	Far Right
Gavin
Hatfield
LeMay
Lindsay
Nixon
Percy
Reagan
Rockefeller
Romney
Scranton
(Other)

Order Form for Ripon Publications

- P64-1 A Call To Excellence in Leadership** — An Open Letter to the New Generation of Republicans; 9pp mimeograph. First Printing, January, 1964, Second printing, July, 1967. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P64-2 The Idea for the Ripon Society;** 3pp mimeograph. June 1964. Unit price: \$0.25.
- P64-3 A Declaration of Conscience** — A Call for Return to Basic Republican Principles; 4pp mimeograph. July 1964. Unit price: \$0.25.
- P64-4 A New Republican Mandate** — Preliminary Analysis of the 1964 Elections; 9pp mimeograph. November 1964. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P64-5 The Republican Governor's Association: the Case for a Third Force;** 20pp mimeograph. December 1964. Unit price: \$0.75.
- 65-1 Election '64** — Report on the Style, Strategy and Issues of the 1964 Campaign and State by State Analysis of the Results, with recommendations; 124pp. January 1965. Unit price: \$2.00.
- P65-1 A Republican Civil Rights Platform for 1965;** 9pp mimeograph. June 1965. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P65-2 A Second Mandate to Republicans** — An Anaysis of the 1965 Election; 10pp mimeograph. November 1965. Unit price: \$0.75.
- 66-1 From Disaster to Distinction: The Rebirth of the Republican Party;** Ripon Society paperback; 127pp. September 1966. Unit price: \$1.00 (quantity discounts available for more than ten copies).
- 66-2 Southern Republicanism and the New South** — Contemporary analysis of GOP strategy and structure in eleven Southern states; by John C. Topping, Jr., John R. Lazarek, and William A. Linder; co-sponsored by Republicans for Progress and the Ripon Society; 129pp. October 1966. Unit price: \$2.00.
- P66-1 China '66: Containment and Contact;** a Ripon Policy Statement. 7pp mimeograph. April 1966. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P66-2 Government for Tomorrow.** A Proposal for the Unconditional Sharing of Federal Tax Revenue with State and Local Government; jointly prepared by the Republican Governors' Association and the Ripon Society. 18pp mimeograph. First printing, July, 1965; Second printing November, 1966. Unit price: \$0.75.
- P66-3 The Potential to Govern:** Ripon statement on the 1966 Elections; 4pp printed. November 1966. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P66-4 Politics and Conscription:** A Ripon Proposal to Replace the Draft; 6pp printed. December 1966. Unit price: \$0.50. Bulk rate: \$0.30 each for ten or more or \$10.00 per hundred.
- P66-5 Citizenship for Cuban Refugees:** a Ripon legislative proposal; 2pp mimeograph. May 1966. Unit price: \$0.25.
- P67-1 The Rights of the Mentally Ill;** 6pp printed. February 1967. Unit price: \$0.50. Bulk rate: \$0.30 each for ten or more or \$10.00 per hundred.
- P67-2 The Negative Income Tax:** A Republican Proposal to Help the Poor; report and recommendations for Congressional action; 6pp printed. April 1967. Unit price: \$0.50. Bulk rate: \$0.30 each for ten or more or \$10.00 per hundred.
- P67-3 Overkill at Omaha,** analysis of the Young Republican National Federation 1967 Convention at Omaha, Nebraska; 8 pp mimeograph. June 1967. Unit price: \$0.50.
- P67-4 The Realities of Vietnam:** An Alternative for Republicans; 30 pp. printed. September 1967. Unit price: \$1.00. Bulk rate: \$60 per hundred.

- C66-1 Toward a Party of Excellence: The Republican Party of California;** 1966, 113pp. Price available on request from Ripon Society of Southern California, 433 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90013.
- C66-2 A Review of California's Regulation of Political Parties:** analysis and recommendations for change; 30pp mimeographed. September 1966. Price available on request from Ripon Society of Southern California.

number	quantity	price
P64-1
P64-2
P64-3
P64-4
P64-5
65-1
P65-1
P65-2
66-1
66-2
P66-3
P66-4
P66-5
P67-1
P67-2
P67-3
P67-4

Back Issues of the FORUM are available:

Single copies — \$0.75
Consecutive set: July '64 - July '67 — \$10.00
\$5.00 FORUM student subscription
\$10.00 FORUM subscription
Sub-total
3% Sales tax for Mass. residents only
Handling charge for orders under \$2.00	\$0.25
TOTAL

Name:

Address:

Zip code:

Check enclosed Please bill me

Make all checks payable to:

The Ripon Society
1430 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

The Ripon FORUM is considering expanding its coverage of Republican affairs, both in breadth and depth. To help us determine the most productive paths to follow, will you indicate your impressions of the FORUM by filling out the questionnaire below and returning it to the editor?

1. Please rank one through seven the following types of articles which appear in the FORUM according to their interest to you.

Official policy statements of the Society

Signed editorial opinions

Feature articles on Republican events, such as the national Young Republicans convention, the Republican Governors Conference, Congressional leadership statements

Research papers and special reports

Political notes

Letters to the editor

"1430 Mass. Ave."

2. Which of these categories should be expanded? Which left alone? Which should be cut down?

	Expand	Leave	Cut
Official policy statements
Signed editorial opinion
Feature articles
Research papers and special reports
Political notes
Letters to the editor
"1430 Mass. Ave."

3. Some of the features we are considering running on a regular basis are listed below. What should be the order of priority? (Please number one through nine.)

- Book reviews
- Classified advertisements
- Regional in-depth reports
- Guest articles by prominent Republicans
- Guest articles by prominent Democrats
- Guest articles by prominent issue experts
- Regular columns by Ripon contributors, such as Prof. Duncan Foley's column, "The Balance Sheet."
- Washington news column
- (Other)

Please return this questionnaire to
 The Editor
 The Ripon FORUM
 1430 Massachusetts Avenue
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

TO PARENTS AND FRIENDS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

The recent convention of Young Republicans at Omaha revealed how much the far-right "Syndicate" has influenced college-age Republicans with their extreme positions and views. In order to help young people acquire a balanced perspective of the issues and problems facing our Party and our nation, the Ripon FORUM is offering student subscriptions for \$5, half the normal price for twelve issues. Will you help present a moderate, responsible view of national and Republican politics to your sons, daughters and friends in college? They will soon have to face the complexities of our society and they will need our help.

Please send gift subscriptions of the FORUM to the following students (please indicate the student's college address):

Name	Name
College	College
Address	Address
City State Zip	City State Zip

Please indicate that this is a gift subscription from:

Name

College

Address

City State Zip

- I have enclosed payment.
- Please bill me.

4. What is your order of preference for the nomination for President? (Please number the candidates as far as you wish to.)

- Gavin
- Hatfield
- LeMay
- Lindsay
- Nixon
- Percy
- Reagan
- Rockefeller
- Romney
- Scranton
- (Other)

5. How do the candidates rank according to their chances of receiving the Republican Presidential nomination? (Please number in order, as far as you are able.)

- Gavin
- Hatfield
- LeMay
- Lindsay
- Nixon
- Percy
- Reagan
- Rockefeller
- Romney
- Scranton
- (Other)

6. How do the candidates rank according to their ability to defeat President Johnson in the general election? (Please number as far as you are able.)

- Gavin
- Hatfield
- LeMay
- Lindsay
- Nixon
- Percy
- Reagan
- Rockefeller
- Romney
- Scranton
- (Other)

7. Upon what basis should the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate be chosen? (Please number the five bases in order of the relative emphasis each should receive.)

He should be the second-best qualified man for the Presidency.

He should be of the same philosophy as the Presidential nominee.

He should balance the ticket philosophically.

He should balance the ticket geographically.

He should balance the ticket with respect to religious affiliation.

8. Which of the following statements most nearly expresses your position on the War in Vietnam? (Please check one.)

The U.S. should follow its present basic course in Vietnam.

The U.S. should substantially increase its military effort to achieve victory in the Vietnam War.

The U.S. should de-escalate the military approach in Vietnam and take new political initiatives to reach a negotiated settlement with the Viet Cong and North Vietnam.

9. Which of the following responses most nearly expresses your opinion of the statement: "United States withdrawal from Vietnam would be preferable to continuing the Vietnam War for another five years."?

Yes

No

Uncertain

Resolved, that the delegates of the New Politics Convention gathered in this room greet with deep respect and in full fraternity the resolutions passed by the delegates of the New Politics Convention assembled in another room. . . .

We believe that our Movement for Freedom and Peace will be far advanced if all work in it is done jointly by blacks and whites, and to that end we now double in size every committee of this convention, the new seats to remain empty until filled by delegates chosen by our brothers who met in another room, if they so choose.

And finally, we will welcome as the decision of free men and brothers the decision that our black brothers now make as to how they see best to carry on the radical Movement, whatever their decisions may be.

—from the resolution to adopt the Thirteen Demands of the Black Caucus.

The Black Caucus reconvened on Monday afternoon. From that meeting came the decision to try to continue to use the reputable white names attached to the convention in order to drain them of money or use them as a front, but not to give them power, to leave them as minorities on committees. The black power advocates will attempt to keep their white staff on for at least another six months while they try to bleed them dry of contacts and information. These staff men will very probably stay on in the hopes of moderating the militancy, of salvaging some respect for the movement. But, as the nature of extremism is the same on both sides of the aisle, they will in all likelihood be discarded when they are of no longer use.

Most of those who came to Chicago opposed both the President's personality and his policies in Vietnam. Some of these people should normally be converts to the Republican Party; they are at the very least searching for ways not to vote Democratic. Therefore, any realistic Republican program should try to attract from among these independent people those who would be willing to work for Republican Congressional, Senatorial, and Presidential candidates simply because they dislike the President and the Democratic Party and are disillusioned by both. This in no way means that one has to buy all of the theories or arguments of the delegates who came to Chicago; the simple fact of the matter is that two to five million voters can probably be swayed against the President on the basis of one or two issues, the War and civil rights.

Most of the white delegates would not have attended the Conference had it not been for the promise of action on the War in Vietnam. Vietnam was the catalyst, not the riots themselves, which alone could not have pulled this type of conference together. Yet these delegates were never allowed to work on the issue of the War, nor on how to challenge the President. The fact that the delegates were given no opportunity to voice their views on Vietnam and will have to turn elsewhere represents a Republican opportunity.

What is equally dangerous in the third party activity is that the Republicans may delude themselves into believing that the third party will siphon off enough Democratic votes to make victory possible even with their most favored candidate — Richard Nixon. Should the Republicans thus be deluded into thinking that the peace third party will hand them a victory with an all-out conservative, *this will end all chance of the Republicans nominating a moderate candidate offering some hope for peace.* The peace third party can only bring out the worst rather than the best in the Republican Party. Because of the dangers thus inherent in a third party, commitment thereto without exhausting every avenue for peace within the two major parties would seem in reckless disregard of the very goals cited by third party proponents.

—from A Proposal to Maximize Political Support for an End to the War in Vietnam, by Joseph L. Raub, Jr., circulated by the Administration to head-off the formation of a third party (*emphasis bis*).

COMMITTED TO AMERICAN POLITICS

The disaffected Americans represented at the National Conference for New Politics should not be dismissed as a band of radicals. Ultra-liberal in their views, they nevertheless are committed to the principles and processes of American political life. To confirm this one had only to witness the earnestness with which they spoke of establishing their own political structure to copy, to parallel, the existing structure of the Democratic and Republican Parties. These people are alienated only from the present two parties, not from the party system. Except for the Communists and black nationalists, whose psychology will not allow their easy reintegration into the existing political fabric, the delegates to the New Politics convention would welcome an opportunity to be heard within the existing parties, for they realize the short-term futility of their third-party efforts.

For too long the Democratic Party has held the initiative in American politics. It has aggressively and effectively defined the scope of the two-party system. It surveys the groups in American society, incorporates the ones it wants, and leaves the Republican Party to forage among the left-overs. It is long past time for the Republican Party to wrest that initiative away and begin building its own coalition. We could make no better start than to appreciate the meaning and challenge of the New Politics.

Wild Card in the Deck

Governor George Wallace's campaign seems so far underway that political pressures are not likely to persuade him to bow out as he did in 1964. The bantam Alabamian has a staff of 15 full-time campaign workers, soliciting funds, planning his speaking tours, and arranging to place his name on the ballot in fifty states. Already Wallace organizers are hard at work in a number of states, both North and South. A campaign organization of this magnitude could not be gracefully dismantled. Republican rightists who managed to pressure Wallace into abandoning his third-party candidacy in 1964 can do little today to keep him from running.

POLITICAL NOTES

Minnesota

The Minnesota Republican Workshop in the September issue of its bulletin criticizes the Vietnam war and says the U.S. should prepare to withdraw. "History," the Minnesota Republicans predict, "will look in amazement at our blind faith in our ability to create an instant democracy - or even an instant nation - for another people about whom we know so little." Discussing the argument that we must stay in Vietnam because our prestige is at stake the Republicans said, "We submit the proposition that American prestige is solid enough to weather a withdrawal and we should be formulating our plans to do so forthwith."

Tennessee

Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr. is planning a concerted effort to win Negro voters in Tennessee back to the Republican Party. The cornerstone of his plan is to give Negroes 11 or 12 of the 56 places on the Tennessee delegation to the national convention in Miami Beach next August. By giving Negroes a share in the delegation proportional to their percentage of the state's population (about one-sixth) Baker hopes to make amends for the insult of 1964 when Negroes were almost summarily dismissed from the Party and Tennessee sent an all-white delegation to San Francisco, the first all-white delegation from Tennessee Republicans in over half a century.

Talks versus Action

Republicans do a lot of talking about winning the Negro vote, but when the chips are down official party actions to attract Negro voters are often disappointing. One reason why Negroes will probably continue to vote Democratic in 1968 and for many years to come was demonstrated in two recent news items. One told of the Democratic National Committee program to insure integrated delegations at its national convention next year. Governor Richard Hughes of New Jersey is heading the aggressive effort which has received widespread favorable attention among Negroes. The other story reported that the Republican National Committee had no plans even to discuss the matter of integrated delegations. Chairman Bliss indicated a hope that the state parties would "consider" adequate Negro representation to the 1968 convention, but he also declared that the national Party would not become involved.

Bob Wilson's Neutrality

At the Jordan Pond House press conference (p. 7) Representative Bob Wilson was asked if, in view of the fact that two chairmen of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, himself and Senator George Murphy, are both conservatives from California, an unprecedented pairing, the committee could be neutral towards the campaign for the Presidential nomination by Governor Reagan. After saying "I'm a Nixon man," Wilson replied, "Just the other day I had George Romney in my office and in return for his pledge to help out with the congressional campaigns, I assured him of my complete neutrality." That's all very well and good, but should the Michigan Governor have had to barter for the Nixon man's neutrality?

Button on the Move

Since scoring his rousing upset victory in the 29th Congressional District of New York in November 1966, Daniel E. Button has continued to lead a local crusade. Button's district is dominated by Albany County, which for years has been in the iron grip of autocratic Democratic boss Daniel O'Connell.

Button, who as Editor of the *Albany Times Union* had long crusaded against O'Connell's rule, won the endorsement of the Republican Party, the Liberal Party, and the Albany Independent Movement. Author of a biography of John Lindsay, Button, like Lindsay, assembled a dedicated army of citizens intent on curbing machine rule. The result: a Button victory by a margin of nearly 18,000 votes in a district which had not even been classified as marginal by the Republican Congressional Committee. This year Button has thrown his prestige strongly behind the anti-machine slate in Albany County. Rena Posner, a long-time associate and staffer for Congressman Button, has the endorsement of the Republican Party and the Albany Independent Movement in her uphill bid for County Clerk. Button has campaigned tirelessly in behalf of the anti-machine reformers. Meanwhile the Conservative Party endorsed the entire Albany County *Democratic* ticket and stated somewhat incredibly:

"The Conservative Party views with alarm the complete capture of the Republican Party in Albany County by the liberal elements of New York City and it behooves the Republican Party to make known its position and to take a course of action that will insure the preservation of local government and prevent the ascendancy to power of the New York City-based liberal element dominated by the Button-Lindsay conspiracy aided and abetted by the Hearst press."

Bliss - YR Compromise

At its September meeting the Republican National Committee quickly adopted another Bliss-Young Republican compromise. You will recall that the last such compromise between Chairman Ray Bliss and outgoing YR President Tom Van Sickle was repudiated by the YRs at their Omaha convention. This time Bliss got tough, insisted that he be given the decisive vote in how the YRs conduct their affairs and had the new agreement with YR President Jack McDonald typed up and signed.

At the YR's own September meeting McDonald ruled out of order a motion endorsing his agreement with Bliss for fear that if it came to a vote he might be overridden on some points by his own board. But, for the time being, Bliss has gained the upper hand because the YRs face dissolution if they renege again.

Goldwater Vetoes Rockefeller

"I can't see how any Republican could support Governor Rockefeller for the presidency. There's such a thing as loyalty." Said Barry Goldwater recently to an Arizona reporter, "Rockefeller dumped Nixon and me, so I just frankly can't see how any Republican can support him."

Arizona

A group called the United Republicans of California recently asked that President Johnson be impeached for treason and fervently applauded when a speaker suggested that Chief Justice Earl Warren be hanged. Now a group called the United Republicans of Arizona has formed which its officers say is "patterned after" the California outfit. It asked Barry Goldwater to join; he turned them down with the observation that since their principles seemed so similar to those of the regular Republican organization, they should join its ranks rather than start a separate group.

Only three weeks later the URA group took over the important Maricopa County Republican Committee from Party regulars after a bitter battle with the forces of State Chairman Harry Rosenzweig.

Bar Harbor

The Jordan Pond House in Acadia National Park was the scene last August of one of the most pastoral press conferences anyone could have attended. The appearance of House Minority Leader Gerald Ford and Representatives Bob Wilson of California and Don Riegel of Michigan before the Maine press against a background of massive pine-covered headlands diving to the water was an excellent example of the ideal setting for a press conference, but it was also an excellent example of how not to win votes for the GOP.

The press conference was a sidelight to a private fund-raising appearance before vacationing fat cats by Representatives Ford, Wilson, and Riegel on behalf of the Congressional Boosters Club. This aspect of their visit was quite successful, but the public view of their activities was unfortunately unsatisfactory, due to a lack of concern and diligence on the part of the visitors.

One of the reporters, after noting the inadequacy of the federal weather services and the depressed state of the lobster industry, asked why the Congressional Boosters always came to Maine to raise money but never brought any constructive proposals to help Maine. Mr. Ford's answer was that if Maine had a Republican Congressman, the House leadership could be far more knowledgeable about Maine's problems. To this he added a note about how Michigan, which, would the reporters believe, has more miles of coastline than Maine, was having trouble with the weather service, too. He revealed that none of the three had consulted with former Republican Congressman Stanley Tupper, nor former Republican Governor John H. Reed, nor even with Senator Margaret Chase Smith, the Chairman of the Republican Senate Conference.

The major topic of the press conference was Mr. Ford's stand against the Dickey-Lincoln power project. The day of Ford's arrival, Democratic Representative William D. Hathaway had challenged Ford to explain to the Maine people just why Ford led the opposition to the appropriation. Ford's reply was reasonable enough; he did not challenge the House Appropriations Committee study which showed a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1 for the federal project on the St. John River, he merely asserted that in the face of a federal deficit of \$29 billion, many worthy projects would have to be cut back and that Dickey-Lincoln was one of them. Unfortunately, however, Ford added to his answer the

charge that Hathaway was seeking a scapegoat to cover up his own inability to sell the project to his Democratic colleagues. In view of the strong bipartisan support the project has in Maine (Maine consumers pay among the highest rates in the country for electric power), the press seized upon this headline and in the absence of any other positive, constructive proposal for any of Maine's ills and opportunities, Ford appeared in a wholly negative light to the voters of Maine. Although during the press conference they indicated that as targets for 1968 Maine's two congressional districts would receive the maximum amount of Party funds, nevertheless, by seeming to be interested only in Maine's potential to contribute to Party funds and not at all concerned with her problems, Ford and Wilson once again helped the Democrats at the expense of the GOP. While awaiting Hathaway's arrival at the Bangor airport, Norman Drew, his local representative, said, "If I could take the voters of this district to see Ford working day-in, day-out, I wouldn't have any trouble getting Hathaway reelected." After three years of raiding her coffers, new personnel and a new approach are needed to sell the Republican Party to Maine.

Harvard Law Poll

At the Harvard Law School over 50% of the student body recently responded to the question, "Who would you prefer to see as the Republican nominee for President in 1968?" By party affiliation the "voters" were 31% Republican, 44% Democratic, and 25% Independent. Governor Nelson Rockefeller was the clear choice of all three groups; he was the first choice of 55% of the Republicans and, impressively, of 71% of the Democrats and 66% of the Independents. With all three groups the New York governor received more than four times the percentage vote given to his nearest rival, Senator Charles Percy, whose percentages were 13%, 13%, and 15%, respectively. Former Vice-President Richard Nixon also received the support of 13% of the Republicans, but of only 2% of the Democrats and Independents. Of the remaining Republican vote Governor Romney received 8% and Governor Reagan, 7%, with their other totals about half as large. Mayor John Lindsay, Senator Mark Hatfield, and General James Gavin each won from one to three percent from each bloc, except that the General collected four percent of the Independent vote.

Ripon Power

Boston Executive Board member and long-time Riponer Martin A. Linsky was elected to the Massachusetts in a special election held October 3rd. The Linsky race was the focus of a concerted effort by both parties: Senator Edward Kennedy, State Representative Michael Dukakis, and State Senator Beryl Cohen spoke on behalf of Linsky's opponent; Senator Edward Brooke, Governor John Volpe, Attorney General Eliot Richardson and other Republicans endorsed Linsky's record of public service. Linsky's solid victory in a normally Democratic district was interpreted by the Boston press as a major sign of growing Republican success in the Bay State.

TAX REFORM

It appears as though the Congress, in a mood to be as cussed as it can be, may actually enact a tax reform bill before it passes the Administration's 10% income-tax surcharge.

The little guys around the country aren't happy about getting socked to pay for the War, and a little loophole-closing sweetens the deal for them. The 1968 election just might be decided by the votes of the little guys, and Congressional Republicans will do well to ride the tax reform issue as long and hard as they can.

Many people imagine that we have a very progressive, "soak-the-rich" income tax, since the nominal rates rise from 14% on low incomes to 70% on those who are euphemistically said to be "in the top bracket." In fact, only a very few unlucky individuals pay more than about 30% of their income in income taxes. The percentage of income paid in income taxes rises from zero for incomes below \$1,000 to about 7.5% for incomes of \$5,000, then rises only to about 15% for incomes of \$20,000. Between \$20,000 and \$100,000, where only a few successful executives and their widows and orphans find themselves, this percentage rises from 15% to 30%. If you're lucky enough to get over the \$100,000 hump, you can rest easy: the percentage of your income that goes to the I.R.S. actually will decline a little.

What happened to the satisfying sound of the millionaires groaning under the 70% top bracket rate? That's the loophole story. Of the 70% the millionaire might be paying, about 10% disappears in deductions, and almost 30% into that mysterious rathole called capital gains. The other important sources of relief for the higher brackets are income splitting for couples, the existence of tax-free municipal bonds, and the various depletion allowances, of which the 27½% allowance for oil is the most notorious.

The trouble is that the income tax is doing two jobs at once, one well, the other rather badly. It is an excellent system for raising the revenue we use to finance wars and other contributions to the general welfare. It does this by collecting about 10% from the great mass of us, on the whole in a humane and civilized, if somewhat inexorable manner. But we also expect it to re-distribute income by hitting the wealthy harder. The same system that deals the majority a kind of rough justice becomes capricious in its effect on the activities of the rich and powerful minority. It fails to soak the rich, but forces them, to avoid the soaking, to use their wealth in particular and sometimes peculiar ways.

A capital gain, for instance, is the difference between what you paid for some transferable property, like a piece of real estate or a common stock, and what you get for it when you sell. You pay only

25% on capital gains if you are in the upper brackets. This provision has a curious effect. A corporation can retain its earnings and use them to buy valuable assets, like other corporations. The price of its stock will naturally rise to reflect this increase in the corporation's value. If it pays out the earnings in dividends the price of the stock doesn't rise, but the stockholders get exactly the same gain from the dividends. Which method will the stockholders prefer? The first, naturally, since if their return comes in a form of a price rise, it is a capital gain and is taxed at the lower rate. But this means that corporate earnings are locked up in the successful corporations, which must use them to acquire more assets. One result has been the spiral of mergers which have concentrated over a third of our manufacturing assets in the fifty largest corporations, and over two-thirds in the five hundred largest.

Some of the worst inequities in the present system come from the special advantage married couples have in being allowed to split their income to find the rate they will pay on the whole. This provision does not extend to families whose head is for one reason or another unmarried. The difficulty in extending income-splitting to unmarried families is that the steep marginal rates would make it extremely rewarding for random individuals to file together as a family.

Still, do we have to have such steeply progressive rates since the loopholes make them ineffectual anyway? A substantial exemption can protect the very poor; except for that, why not tax all earned income at one rate and all income from property, capital gains included, at another, higher, rate? Since we're not soaking the rich who own property, why soak the occasional hardworking executive or lawyer who has no loophole to relieve the pressure of the 70% bracket?

The element of progressiveness would be very similar to that of the present system, since property income is heavily concentrated in the hands of the rich. They would in fact be paying taxes higher proportionately than those paid by less wealthy people because more of their income arises from ownership of property.

The advantages? 1) We could treat married people alike in assessing income tax on earned income. 2) The loopholes will disappear, with their irrational concentration of wealth in certain areas (like big corporations). 3) The incentive to work for earned income will not decrease with success. 4) It would be so much simpler for everybody.

I doubt that even this Congress is cussed enough to enact that much reform. But may it vent its abundant spleen on the oil depletion allowance, anyway.