

RIPON FORUM

SEPTEMBER, 1970

VOL. VI No. 9

ONE DOLLAR



Hard Hats, Students and GOP Moderates: A Political Opportunity



Reform in the Army By Edward L. King

**ALSO: Massachusetts v. Melvin R. Laird, Medical Care:
The Manpower Crisis, John C. Danforth on Justice,
Howard L. Reiter Reviews Lubell**

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL POINTS —3

WASHINGTON VIEWPOINT

How "Strom's Ploy," Senator Thurmond's bitter attack on President Nixon, may affect federal school desegregation policy and serve as an indicator of Administration independence from hard-line conservatives and Southern strategists. By Howard F. Gillette, Jr. —5

POLITICAL NOTES —6

HARD HATS AND GOP MODERATES: A POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY

There is something outrageous about a very Republican President meeting with a delegation of labor leaders whose members only a week before had assaulted a peaceful group of anti-war protestors. Labor, at least construction workers and longshoremen, has a new image that tends to stick in a liberal's throat. The political opportunity lies in the mortgage held by organized labor on the Democratic Party. The lack of such a bond with the GOP, and its resultant freedom to take a more responsible stand on labor-connected issues like housing costs may be a potent magnet to the present college generation. —8

REFORM IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army is badly led and badly organized, paunchy in Europe, glory-seeking in Southeast Asia and spendthrift everywhere. It is a dragon with a huge tail and tiny teeth. Edward L. King, a retired Lieutenant Colonel who fought in Korea and served on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, proposes a slew of changes (in the service academies, military justice, the promotion system, force levels, civilian surveillance, etc.) that could not only shake up but revitalize the Armed Forces. —10

DISSENTING MOTHER GOOSE —12

COURT TEST FOR THE ANTI-WAR BILL

The establishment view on the Massachusetts anti-war bill and the ensuing Supreme Court case (Massachusetts v. Melvin R. Laird) is that though the war is decidedly unconstitutional, this Massachusetts statute is a heck of a silly and misguided way to go about proving it legally. Why? Because it's a "political question?" Because of some obscure precedent back in 1923? Professor Anthony D'Amato clears away all these caviling objections and shows that if the Court will stick to its new strict-constructionist bent, the Vietnam War may yet have its day in court. —13

MEDICAL CARE: THE MANPOWER CRISIS

How can optimum delivery of medical care be best achieved? Dr. Francis W. Parnell believes that the medical manpower shortage must be alleviated before one can evaluate methods of delivery or various payment plans. Unfortunately, this fact has been overlooked by the Congress, and the whole medical care problem slighted by the Administration. Dr. Parnell proceeds to outline steps federal, state and local governments, not to mention industry and individual physicians, can take to turn things around. —16

GUEST EDITORIAL

Missouri's Attorney General and U.S. Senate candidate, John C. Danforth, comments on how to achieve justice in America. —20

BOOK REVIEW

In an era of bloodless data-manipulators, Samuel Lubell stands out as the most human and astute public opinion analyst we have today. Howard L. Reiter reviews his latest book, *The Hidden Crisis of American Politics*. *Hidden Crisis* attempts to elucidate the fabric of American society, ragged from the effects of rapid change — polarized, vociferous and uncompromising. —21

LETTERS —22

14A ELIOT STREET —23

PUBLICATIONS PAGE —24

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 Cambridge, Massachusetts, chapters in eleven 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 Society offers the following options for annual contribution: Contributor \$25 or more; Sustainer \$100 or more; Founder \$1000 or more. Inquiries about membership and chapter organization should be addressed to the National Executive Director.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BOARD

Officers

- *Josiah Lee Auspitz, President
- *Howard F. Gillette, Jr., Chairman of the Board
- *Bruce K. Chapman, Chairman of the Executive Committee
- *Michael F. Brewer, Vice-President
- *Robert L. Beal, Treasurer
- *Richard E. Beeman, Secretary

Boston

- *Robert Gulick
- Martin A. Linsky
- Michael W. Christian

Cambridge

- *Robert Davidson
- David A. Reif
- Rhea Kembrie

Chicago

- *Harold S. Russell
- John A. Bross, Jr.
- Benjamin C. Duster

Dallas

- *Neil D. Anderson
- Howard L. Abramson
- Robert A. Wilson

Hartford

- *Nicholas Norton
- Robert G. Smith
- William J. McKinney, Jr.

Los Angeles

- New Haven
- *Hayward L. Draper
- Deke Karzon
- Paul C. Capra

New York

- *Richard Zimmer
- Werner Kuhn
- Marianne Magocsi

Philadelphia

- *Richard R. Block
- Charles Dey
- Roger Whittlesey

Seattle

- *Thomas A. Alberg
- Camden Hall
- William Rodgers

Washington

- *Patricia A. Goldman
- Stephen Herbits
- Linda K. Lee

At Large

- *Christopher T. Bayley
- Thomas A. Brown
- Richard M. Conley
- Christopher DeMuth
- Bruce D. Fraser
- Emil H. Frankel
- Ralph J. Heikkinen
- Paul Leach
- **Lee W. Huebner
- Philip C. Johnston
- William J. Kilberg
- **J. Eugene Marans
- Thomas E. Petri
- **John R. Price, Jr.
- Clair W. Rodgers, Jr.
- **John S. Saloma III
- Frank E. Samuel, Jr.

Ex-Officio At Large

- *Robert D. Behn, National Executive Director
- Howard L. Reiter, Editor of the Ripon FORUM
- William G. Rogers, Research Director
- Terry A. Barnett, Political Director
- Christopher W. Beal, Policy Chairman
- **Peter J. Wallison, Finance Chairman
- *National Executive Committee Member
- **Past President, Chairman of the Board, or Chairman of the Executive Committee

THE RIPON FORUM is published monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Second class postage rates paid at Boston Massachusetts. Contents are copyrighted © 1970 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the Editor is welcomed.

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 \$10 a year, \$5 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$10 extra. Advertising rates on request.

Editor: Howard L. Reiter
 Managing Editor: Evelyn F. Ellis
 Consulting Editor: Michael S. Lottman
 Technical Editor: John Woodman

Contributors: Christopher W. Beal, Duncan K. Foley, Philip C. Johnson, Douglas Matthews, William D. Phelan, Jr., David Omar White.

Circulation Dept.: Hope Fellows

Correspondents
 Mrs. Barbara Mooney, Conn.
 Maggie Nichols, California
 Alex M. Helmeyer, No. Calif.
 James F. McCollum, Jr., Florida
 Cullen Hammond, Georgia
 Michael McCrery, Idaho
 Ben Violetta, Illinois
 J. Kenneth Doka, Indiana
 Terrence Dwyer, Iowa
 Eric Karnes, Kentucky
 Henry Bernstein, Louisiana
 William A. Merrill, Mass.
 Don Fowler, Maine
 Terrence Dwyer, Michigan

Arthur F. McClure, II, Missouri
 William Harding, Nebraska
 Charles O. Ingraham, New York
 Deryl Howard, North Carolina
 Henri Paul Junod, Ohio
 William K. Woods, Ohio
 Stephan Jones, Oklahoma
 Eric R. Blackledge, Oregon
 Richard Ober, Jr., Pennsylvania
 Donato Andre D'Andrea, R. I.
 Bruce M. Salya, Rhode Island
 Harris Beach, Jr., So. Carolina
 Stanford M. Adelstein, S. D.
 Robert R. Murdoch, Virginia
 W. Stuart Parsons, Wisconsin

EDITORIAL POINTS

September is the month of back-to-school, and in this age of turmoil, back-to-school is the occasion of great apprehension on the part of school administrators, faculties, parents, politicians and the public at large.

For a brief but hopeful period in the late spring, the Nixon administration appeared to take a serious interest in improving the official climate vis-a-vis student unrest. College presidents and students suddenly had the President's ear; Alexander Heard was appointed to advise him on these matters; eight young White House aides were sent around the country to ascertain the causes of discontent; Open Presidency Task Forces were announced for young people interested in governmental reform; the Attorney General issued tolerant guidelines for handling demonstrations; and the Scranton Commission was appointed (and its most outspoken member protected against Vice President Agnew's assault).

But there are signs that the period of grace has passed. The Vice President, in an article in the August 15 issue of *Human Events*, has praised the patriotic motives of workers who beat up youthful demonstrators. The President and his top aides have reacted to Chancellor Heard's perceptive memorandum on student views with the self-serving and defensive cry that they are doing all they can, and that the rest of the blame lies within the universities themselves.

But government has two inputs into the frustrations of youth. One is the war. Perhaps the role of the war in student discontent can best be summed up by saying that the war serves to escalate student anger, but that the protests will continue if and when the war ends. (Recall that the first Berkeley upheaval occurred in 1964, before the war threatened many students.) Dr. Heard's memorandum clearly indicates that the President is not reaching most students when he justifies his policies with jingoistic rhetoric. Above and beyond rapid withdrawal, the President may reduce some of the tensions by ordering that henceforth only volunteers will be sent to Southeast Asia. The volunteer army should also alleviate some of the strain on campus.

The other, perhaps more far-reaching, input

of the Administration is in fostering a national climate with respect to students. Does its stance suggest a climate of toleration or of repression? After the tragedy at Kent State, many recalled that in the previous weeks, the President had called young protesters "bums," the Vice President had continued his vicious assaults, and the governor of our most populous state had welcomed a "bloodbath."

Too many other people were and are encouraged by such statements to believe that all long-haired, liberal young people are violent anarchists or worse. Manifestations of this include: the assault by hard hats on peace demonstrators on Wall Street, the refusal of officials in Connecticut to permit a Woodstock-type rock festival, and the inordinate amount of press coverage given to the Charles Manson trial. Such events serve only to confuse the issue, and neglect the fact that most young dissenters are peaceful, patriotic, and sincerely committed to progressive change. These activists resent the stereotype of the long-haired criminal just as Italian-Americans resent being typecast as Mafiosi and policemen resent the identification of policemen with brutality.

Therefore, we are surely in for another long, hot winter if the Administration continues to believe that showplace appointments are a substitute for a genuine concern and action to stem the explosive generational cleavages that have already claimed the lives of too many college students. The President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General may be sorely tempted this campaign fall to play up these tensions, but what the country needs is reconciliation, not vilification.

WHAT AGNEW CAN DO

Mr. Agnew, of course, has maintained all along that he is not anti-student. He is just against the wicked, violent minority. Ditto for blacks. Yet by some curious process his feelings have been misunderstood. 87 percent of college students in a recent Harris poll registered unfavorable feelings toward the Vice President, and among blacks he is surely one of the reasons for antipathy toward the Nixon administration.

Mr. Agnew can correct these uninformed judgments if he so desires. He can, for instance, meet with college students — the clean-cut sort — face-to-face. He can broaden his fundraising activities to assist the foundering black Action Centers that the Republican National Committee has been setting up around the country.

Certainly, the Vice President does not need to be reminded that the good-will of blacks and of the middle class and their young is essential to many Republicans. His own single state-wide electoral victory in Maryland was based on such constituencies, including 80 percent of the black vote. For Republicans around the country who don't want to write off these voting groups, Mr. Agnew could perform a useful service by moderating his image. Only pride, a misguided opportunism, or a cynical use of him by a faction in the Administration can explain his failure to do so.

GARLAND AND GOODELL

Last year, the Republican mayor of the nation's largest city was defeated in the Republican primary and ran as an independent. The President and the Vice President lost little time in endorsing the regular Republican nominee, on the grounds that they always support the official candidate of the party.

In two key Senatorial races this year, there are indications that conservatives within the Administration are urging the President to withhold endorsements from official party candidates. In Virginia they are arguing on behalf of the incumbent, Harry Byrd, Jr., as opposed to the Republican candidate, Ray Garland, and in New York, they want the White House nod to go to Conservative James Buckley, rather than GOP incumbent Charles Goodell.

New York is the great white hope of right-wingers, because conservatives see Buckley as having a real chance for electoral victory as Goodell and Democrat Richard Ottinger split the "liberal" vote. One of the developments most portentous for Republicans is the appearance of "Rockefeller-Buckley" buttons printed up by the so-called Silent Majority Committee. This is a feeble attempt by Conservative Party stalwarts to hitch their wagon to Rockefeller's star, while at the same time running their own candidate against Rockefeller.

If Governor Rockefeller is tempted to tolerate this phoney bipartisanship by failing to release State Committee and other funds promised to Goodell, he risks dragging down the entire GOP ticket. He might consider that as Buckley gains on Goodell, so will the Conservatives' gubernatorial nominee in-

crease his vote. And if Buckley should substantially improve over his 1968 showing, Rockefeller will have passively aided a party whose sole purpose is to cause the defeat of Republican candidates. In the process he may force protesting liberal Republicans to vote only for those Republicans (Goodell and Lefkowitz) on the Liberal Party line.

As for Goodell, he is in the same doldrums in which Rockefeller found himself in early 1966, but not for long. For one thing, third-party candidates have a habit of peaking long before election day. Ottinger will have a difficult time holding together the Democratic coalition; he is likely to lose the liberals to Goodell or the conservatives to Buckley as he comes into clearer focus. And as Ottinger slips, Goodell should pick up several hundred thousand votes on the Liberal Party line, as well as the votes of New Yorkers who admire independent judgment and integrity in their Senators.

The course for the White House is unmistakable: in the best interests of the party in Virginia and New York, and for the sake of consistency, the President should make it unequivocally clear that he supports all official Republican nominees — including Garland and Goodell.

ONE PERCENT CLUB

Last month's FORUM included an appeal to readers to join the One Percent Club, an organization recently formed by Republicans sympathetic to Ripon Society ideals in order to raise campaign money for young, progressive GOP candidates, many of whom face right-wing primary opposition heavily financed from afar. Members of the Club donate one percent of their annual income or \$1,000 and may earmark their contribution for particular candidates. Non-earmarked contributions go into a revolving loan fund that will grow from year to year.

As the Club states, "Right wingers in the Republican Party have exerted control disproportionate to their number because they have been willing to make a commitment to action and follow through. We should have learned their lesson by now . . . It is time to separate the talkers from the doers."

Those who are interested in contributing more than verbal support to progressive Republicanism can use the attached green envelope. Their contribution will entitle them to vote for the Club's board of directors after the November elections.



Washington Viewpoint

Strom's Ploy

Senator Strom Thurmond's bitter attack on the Nixon Administration July 17 should have come as no surprise in the White House. Thurmond claimed to have reacted spontaneously to an article in that morning's *Washington Post* which reported that the Justice Department planned to send 100 lawyers into the South to enforce school desegregation. In fact, Thurmond's attack was well orchestrated in advance to salvage his brand of Southern strategy for the party.

Thurmond's speech followed a week of open revolt among some Southern Republicans over Internal Revenue Commissioner Randolph Thrower's decision revoking tax exemption for whites-only private schools. Southern Republican chairmen holding a reception at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington were openly hostile to Nixon Administration officials in attendance. Only hours before Thurmond took the Senate floor to launch his attack, Southern strategist Kevin Phillips' nationally-syndicated column appeared, warning of an imminent revolt among Southern Republicans. (Phillips had been spotted at the Mayflower by Baltimore *Sun* reporters John S. Carroll and Adam Clymer.)

Thurmond aptly fulfilled Phillips' prophecy. Calling the recent Administration efforts to enforce school desegregation "arbitrary and discriminatory actions by the executive branch, calculated to appease the anti-South elements of the Nation," Thurmond threatened the President with possible electoral reprisal.

In response the Administration denied the report in the *Post*, while skirting the issue of enforcing the IRS ruling. Picking up Thurmond's own rhetoric, President Nixon told a news conference July 20, "As far as the South is concerned, the statement that Senator Thurmond made partially objected to an action we have not taken and have no intention of taking, and that is of sending vigilante squads, in effect, from the Justice Department, lawyers, in to coerce the Southern school districts to integrate. We have not done that; we are not going to do that."

Far from indicating an open breach between Thurmond and the President, the incident served largely to enforce the image in the South of Thurmond's power in the Administration. In a newsletter to his constituents dated July 27, Thurmond claimed that the President had reversed his own announced policy:

"Two days after I spoke, the Internal Revenue Service announced that it had granted tax exemptions to six Southern private schools, exemptions which had been delayed for months. IRS also announced that in the future such schools need only submit a

letter of declaration of an open admissions policy to secure tax exemption."

The effect of all this was to call into question the independence of the Administration from hard-line conservatives in the Republican Party. Either the President retracted policies after Thurmond's pressures, or he had never intended to desegregate Southern schools with the full force of the law. Either way, he leaves himself open to charges of undue influence by the Strom Thurmonds of the party.

But the Thurmond incident must be seen in a broader context, for party conservatives are now seeking to salvage the old Southern strategy by mounting a full-scale attack on liberals within the Administration.

Barry Goldwater set the tone for the new conservative offensive three days before Thurmond's outburst. After delivering a long attack on government bureaucracy quite in line with Ripon thinking, Goldwater singled out middle management advisors to the President as the source of this Administration's political difficulties. "I believe President Nixon makes a mistake in administration every time he names a Democrat or a leftist Republican affiliated or not with the so-called Ripon Society." Thurmond adopted Goldwater's theme in his July 17 speech, accusing President Nixon of surrounding himself with "liberal and ultraliberal advisors" who espouse a sectional philosophy of the Northeast. The American Conservative Union's newsletter, *Battle Line*, repeated the theme in its July issue, praising Goldwater's speech and complaining that conservative advisors to the President "have finally come to the realization that they have been outflanked on every side by Ripon liberals and dedicated 'moderate' Republicans of the Rockefeller-Javits variety."

The new conservative offensive coincided closely with Ripon's report on Southern Republicanism. Whether or not the timing was intentional, Thurmond helped focus attention on the internal party struggle over shaping national political strategy. He served notice in his speech that unless the Administration purges itself of Northeastern liberal influences it could not count on the Deep South in 1972. But he may well have spoken from a position of weakness. With George Wallace assured a platform for the Presidency, the Administration will be tempted to make a more moderate appeal to the peripheral South and industrial Midwest. Despite Kevin Phillips' latest claim that the President must pre-empt Wallace on the right just to hold the peripheral South, an Administration decision to pursue school desegregation in good faith could signal the end of Thurmond's divisive deep Southern strategy.

—HOWARD F. GILLETTE, JR.

Political Notes

THE NATION: rga poll portends ill

Several weeks ago, urging recipients to "please keep the information confidential," the Republican Governors Association circulated to all its members a poll of Americans that had been taken last March and April, before the Cambodia invasion. With such a broad circulation, it is small wonder that the "confidential" status of the poll was soon terminated, and some of its highly provocative results became known:

—The Nixon Administration received a spotty verdict from the American people. A slight majority approved its record on pollution, welfare, decentralization, and poverty; only a third approved of its performance on the key issues of crime, drugs, and inflation.

—Only thirty-eight percent of the population approved of the record of the 91st Congress; thirty-seven percent disapproved.

—Before Cambodia, the President was developing a sizable and growing credibility gap on Indochina: only 16% thought they were being given most of the facts on Vietnam, while 37% believed they were only getting some of the facts, and 31% felt they were getting very few of the facts.

—The number of people who believed that the President had a "plan" to end the war was declining rapidly, and among those who believed that such a plan existed, only half thought it would work.

—To control inflation, 72% wanted to cut spending in Vietnam, 56% wanted to increase Federal corporate taxes, 51% wanted higher Federal excise taxes, and exactly half the respondents favored price controls! (Of course, they opposed higher personal income taxes, higher unemployment, high interest rates, wage controls, and less overtime.) Over two-thirds rejected cuts in education expenditures as an anti-inflation device.

—As for the objectivity of the mass media, while only 7% saw the media as fair and objective all the time, 41% said most of the time and 37% said part of the time. Only 8% said seldom.

—Twenty-three percent of the American people wanted George Wallace to run for President in 1972 (this was before the Alabama primary). Wallace netted 13% of the vote in 1968.

—Although the President is often characterized as a middle-of-the-roader, only 12% see his Administration as such. On the other hand, 33% see it as conservative, while 22% see it as "leaning conservative." Only 18% see it as liberal or "leaning liberal."

KANSAS: yr falling star

Two political stars that began rising with the right-wing takeover of the Young Republicans several years ago have taken meteoric plunges in primaries this year. In May, Representative Donald (Buz) Lukens lost the Ohio Republican gubernatorial primary to State Auditor Roger Cloud. And in August, State Senator Tom S. Van Sickle lost the Kansas Republican attorney general's primary. His victor was assistant state attorney general Richard H. Seaton.

MAINE: Erwin's many obstacles

This fall, the once-dominant Maine Republican Party is again demonstrating its weakness at the top of the ticket so typical in the past few elections. On primary day, June 15, it nominated three virtual political unknowns to contest the state's Democratic incumbents in Washington. In doing so, the otherwise excellent chances of Attorney General James S. Erwin upsetting the vulnerable Democratic incumbent Governor Kenneth M. Curtis are seriously in question.

The Republicans' standard bearer against Senator Edmund S. Muskie is Neil S. Bishop, a colorful 66-year-old party maverick who conducted various unsuccessful political campaigns in the 1940's and 1950's. Bishop was formerly a self-proclaimed "dirt farmer," and currently teaches high school in Augusta. For the past year the Nixon administration had been anxious to find a viable candidate to run against Muskie, if only to keep him at home this fall rather than campaigning around the country on behalf of other Democrats and his own presidential ambitions. The Republican establishment in Maine could find nobody of prominence who was willing to take on the job, and they finally settled on Abbott O. Greene, a young commercial airline pilot. At the last minute Bishop came out of the political wilderness to enter the primary against Greene. Greene ran a quiet, under-financed but very earnest campaign, during which he obviously failed to overcome his political obscurity. Bishop, who ironically supported Muskie for Governor in 1954, consistently attacked Muskie for ignoring his Maine constituency in favor of advancing his own national political ambitions. On primary day, Bishop won over Greene and an even more obscure write-in candidate, Elwin A. Sharpe. It remains to be seen how much of a political embarrassment Bishop's long-winded tirades and Birchist associates will be to the Maine GOP. He can be expected to support the Nixon administration pretty generally, and to continue to attack Muskie with great vehemence.

In the First Congressional District, incumbent Peter N. Kyros will be challenged by Ronald T. Speers. Speers, until recently Fish & Game Commissioner, is best known and qualified for being Fish & Game Commissioner. He

easily defeated Republican State Senator Robert L. Stuart, a Brunswick dentist, and former county officeholder and State Senator Robert L. Cram. Speers' campaign was assisted immeasurably by a two-month effort by Governor Curtis to unseat him as Fish & Game Commissioner, on the grounds that his running for Congress was inconsistent with his position as a member of Curtis' administration. Finally, when the Federal Civil Service Commission announced they would investigate the situation because of Speers' position as an administrator of Federal funds, Speers stepped down. In the meantime, Curtis provided Speers with the greatest publicity accorded any candidate in an otherwise dull primary campaign. Speers, who will undoubtedly emphasize the conservation issue and back the Nixon administration's policies, will be a decided underdog against the politically skillful Kyros.

If Ronald T. Speers is best known as Fish & Game Commissioner, the Republican candidate in the Second District, Maynard G. Conners, is not known at all. He jumped into the race at the last minute after frantic efforts by conservative former state Goldwater chairman and present Republican State Chairman Cyril M. Joly, Jr. to find a candidate to oppose incumbent William D. Hathaway failed dismally. Conners, who did no campaigning for the primary, is at present a complete political non-entity. That State Republican leaders could not find anyone of higher caliber to run in a predominantly Republican district in Northern Maine is something of a disgrace.

The Republican candidate with the best chance of being elected to a major office in Maine this year is Attorney General James S. Erwin. Erwin fought a very creditable losing primary battle against incumbent Governor John H. Reed in 1966, and has since been elected to two terms as Attorney General by the Maine Legislature. Early last fall a group of legislative leaders and liberal Republicans made a clumsy attempt to derail Erwin's bid for the gubernatorial nomination. The effort failed miserably when their chosen candidate for Governor, former State Senate President Robert A. Marden, refused to run. Erwin thus won easily in the primary over an anti-income tax candidate named Calvin Grass.

Prior to Erwin's becoming a candidate for Governor and Attor. General, he served a term each in the Maine State Senate and House of Representatives. He is a good speaker and looks well on television. He will probably conduct a campaign concentrating on law and order, governmental efficiency, careful industrial development, and conservation. Erwin might best be classified as a moderate. He will be running against Governor Kenneth M. Curtis, whose lack of charisma and indifferent performance as Governor reinforces the enmity he has incurred by presiding over the adoption of Maine's first income tax. Curtis' opposition in the Democratic primary was businessman Plato Truman, who got more than a third of the vote in the primary after a campaign consisting entirely of a series of billboards bearing the short but pointed message: "Stop Curtis Taxes." Now Truman is threatening to run for Governor as an independent. However, Curtis has the benefit of Ed Muskie's presence on the ballot this year, as well as that of the two incumbent Congressmen. These assets are even more valuable when contrasted with the unimpressive ticket Erwin is saddled with, and it may well determine the outcome this fall.

LOUISIANA: the lone republican congressional candidate

The only challenge made this year by the Louisiana GOP will be against Representative Hale Boggs. The Democratic Whip, one of two Congressmen with no primary opposition, will face an attorney and political unknown by the name of Robert E. Lee. Lee, 43 is a political moderate and long-time enthusiastic supporter of Richard Nixon. It appears that Lee will make a significant effort to campaign for black votes. His task will be made more difficult by recent redistricting, which has cut some of New Orleans' traditionally Republican suburbs from the District and thereby strengthened Boggs, who is most popular in lower-class white areas. But, New Orleans is currently suffering from 12 percent unemployment and Lee expects economic issues to dominate the campaign. He will try to blame the economic slump on Boggs' neglect of the District. Unfortunately, this moderate Republican may find himself inundated by the tendency of the electorate to pin the blame on Mr. Nixon instead.

One added twist to the election is the candidacy of Ben Smith, a New Orleans civil libertarian, who is running as an independent peace candidate.

Following his dramatic showing last April, GOP mayoralty candidate Ben C. Toledano was named chairman of the Orleans Parish Republican Political Action Council. The new chairman strangely remarked that Republicans would have little reason for opposing the reelection of Louisiana's Democratic Congressmen, other than Boggs.

A former States' Righter, Tolendano exemplifies the breed of Republican so proselytized by the proponents of the Southern strategy. As such, he possibly illustrates the major flaw implicit in this new Republican strength in the South: the transitory nature of the convert who seeks to use the GOP more as a vehicle for right-wing causes than as an effective long-range political force in the area.

Though regrettable, Toledano's remarks do reveal the man. In a similar fashion, the retort given these comments by Rep. James R. Sutterfield sounds an encouraging note for the GOP. The lone Republican member of the state House of Representatives stated that he "continue(s) to be amazed that certain appointed leaders of the Louisiana Republican Party consider as part of their official duties the job of public relations coordinator for the other incumbent Democratic congressmen." Sutterfield expressed the view that his job included the furtherance of Republicanism and the two-party system and that his "political endeavors are concerned only with electing Republicans."

Mr. Sutterfield's remarks and his appreciation for his new post provide another (besides Lee) optimistic note for the Louisiana GOP. One can only hope that Representative Sutterfield serves well and puts forth new ideas and programs on which the Republican Party can expand.

Hard Hats, Students and GOP Moderates

An American who fell asleep in the spring of 1950 and, like Rip Van Winkle, woke up 20 years later without knowledge of what had happened in the meantime, would have found much that he expected, but a few developments that he could not have foreseen by any stretch of the imagination. He would not be surprised to learn that a bitter debate was still raging over the role of the United States in Eastern Asia, cutting across party lines but with most Republicans favoring a more bellicose policy than most Democrats. ("Who lost China?") Racial tensions might be higher than he anticipated; still, the migration of blacks to Northern cities was well under way by 1950, and the civil rights question had already figured in a national election two years earlier. But when he heard that a decidedly right-wing Republican President had held a cordial meeting with a delegation of labor leaders, whose members only the week before had assaulted a peaceful crowd of middle-class citizens, he would rub his eyes and wonder if he were still asleep.

MARX UPSIDE DOWN

Few if any persons believe that the so-called Hard Hat demonstrations, in which construction workers have beaten up students and others whom they thought to be opponents of the war, are spontaneous; and a majority of the workers in the trade do not appear to have participated in them. But they could not have been organized at all if the overwhelmingly dominant climate of opinion among these workers had not been hawkish on Vietnam and bitterly hostile to dissident students. (Their passion about the war must indeed be strong to overcome their economic self-interest, for no branch of the American economy is more obviously suffering from the diversion of our resources to the military than the construction industry.) And in greater or less degree, this is true of blue-collar workers generally, who form the largest single reservoir of pro-war sentiment outside the South and stand to the right of the broader public on most of the really divisive issues of American politics today.

Bewildered at this display of hostility from men to whom they have done no harm, anti-war youth have responded with pathetic and entirely futile gestures of

THE AUTHOR

This piece was submitted anonymously to the Ripon FORUM. The author identified himself only as "a union man who was deeply moved by your kind words about Brother Reuther in the June FORUM."

conciliation. Especially among the SDS radicals, Marx's faith in the workers as the chief force for social progress dies hard. If only the truth were patiently explained to the Hard Hats, they too would turn against the war, etc., etc. (For a sample of this kind of wishful thinking, see Jimmy Breslin's article in *New York*, June 22, 1970.) In the postal strike this spring, a spectator who approached the pickets in front of the New York Post Office to offer his sympathy to the strikers was driven away with curses and threats when he observed that the money being wasted in Vietnam would have paid for all they were demanding and more. In the months and years ahead, that scene will be repeated in strike after strike across the country. Eventually the goon squads will convince even the most trusting among the students of the burning and implacable hatred that much of the blue-collar world feels toward them.

We may then expect — as the present college generation reaches voting age — the growth of something that has hitherto been non-existent in America: a fear and mistrust of Big Labor among persons whose views on everything else lie on the liberal side of the political spectrum. It is unlikely to take the form of a blanket hostility to all unions à la Pegler. For many years middle-class liberals, old and young, will remember how often the late Walter P. Reuther put into eloquent words what they themselves had been thinking. And Chavez's California grape-pickers are such obvious underdogs that no one can possibly confuse them with the insolent and overpaid constituents of Peter Brennan. The resentment will center on, and may be confined to, those unions (such as the building trades and the longshoremen) which have made themselves most



conspicuous in the persecution of dissenters. But one thing is certain: in the next few years, legislation to curtail the economic power of the craft unions would receive enthusiastic support in some quarters that were hostile to Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin.

The first signs of disillusionment may be visible in a press release issued a few days after the New York incident by a liberal Democrat running for the State Senate. Using terms like "paying ransom," "featherbedding," and "intimidation" which are seldom applied to organized labor in any place to the left of the *Reader's Digest*, he called for legislative investigation of how much building costs were increased by union restrictions on the tools employed and the use of prefabricated materials — and then for laws to prohibit these restrictions altogether. His most interesting proposal was that all cost estimates for municipal construction should include computation of what it would cost if the use of the most efficient materials and methods had been permitted. His statement also had much to say about the impact of union rules on the cost of private residential construction.

But the actual chances of any such laws being enacted are another story. The candidate who issued the statement was running against a Republican incumbent in a Manhattan district where few if any working-class whites live. Your typical Democratic congressman or state legislator would not dare to vote for, much less to initiate, anything of the kind. Labor support is so indispensable to the Democrats at election time that it would be political suicide. It is widely believed that Gilligan lost the Ohio Senate race in 1968 because the AFL-CIO stopped working for him in the middle of the campaign when they found out where he stood on Vietnam. With his blue-collar supporters already grumbling about his soft attitude to the war, the blacks and the campuses, no Democrat who wants to be reelected will risk a further affront to them on any question of labor legislation.

FREEDOM TO ACT

No such consideration ties the hands of the liberal Republicans. They often seek, and sometimes get, endorsements from labor groups. (Usually this comes when they are sure of winning anyway: thus Case of New Jersey had been in the Senate a dozen years before the AFL-CIO endorsed him for the first time.) But little of their money and still less of their manpower comes from labor sources, and the withdrawal of union support cannot cripple their campaigns. And when you talk about the votes of individual members, influenced by the recommendation of their leaders, it is doubtful that Lindsay-type Republicans ever had so many of these that their loss can be very painful.

This lack of ties to a selfish and overbearing pressure group, which is rapidly making new enemies for

itself, may be an asset to the Republican moderates in more ways than one. They are free — as neither the Administration nor the Democrats are free — to offer solutions for the housing problem without worrying about what vested interests get hurt. And there is some reason to think that once they have broken the ground, they will find much backing for their position from individuals on their right in their own party. Whatever may have been the quid pro quo for the building trades unions' ringing declaration in favor of President Nixon's foreign policy, the ordinary rank-and-file conservative — in Congress or in the press — cannot be ordered to unsay what he has been saying all these years about the evils of union monopoly. (Remember how Lindsay's firm stand on the garbage strike made him a hero to the Old Guard for the first and only time in his career.) In short, an attack on this problem would tap several layers of resentment, old and new, among different groups that have little else in common.

POCKETBOOK ISSUES

The saliency of the housing issue in politics will grow as long as the situation continues to get worse. At the moment it may seem as if no one can ever replace the student protester in the role of national whipping boy, whom it is safe and indeed profitable for Administration spokesmen to denounce. Yet as Clayton Fritchie pointed out, the hatred of students is an artificial thing that "has been carefully cultivated for political advantage" and it may not be possible indefinitely to keep the people's minds off their real problems with diversions of this kind. If the cost of a new house rises to where the ordinary citizen can never hope to own one — and if his tax bill is inflated by waste and featherbedding in the construction of public buildings — that is a far more serious obstacle to his well-being and happiness than the sight of young people with unconventional hair styles on his television screen.

If this issue is indeed an opportunity for the liberal Republicans, it comes at a time when they desperately need some such asset. Treated like stepchildren by a President of their own party, they are losing ground at the other end as so many of their natural constituency pick the Democratic Party as a more congenial home for independent thinkers. Not only has Agnew's hymn of hate driven thousands of young people away from the GOP, but the minority whom it does not bother tend to be disproportionately right-wing in their thinking. Once inside the party they strengthen its most backward elements.

The consequences can be seen in the defeat of Lindsay in the primary in 1969 and the near-defeat of Ogden Reid in 1970. The Republican moderates could ultimately be destroyed if they fail — as Lindsay con-

— continued on page 19

Reform in the Army

The United States Army needs reform. One aspect of this need has been examined by the President's Commission to establish an All-Volunteer Armed Force, and public debate about reform has focused almost exclusively on the volunteer army. Little critical thinking has been devoted to two other areas crying — so far in the wilderness — for public attention: the officer corps and the armed services' organization. If both of these are ignored, the United States Army will continue to be badly led and badly organized, regardless of whether the enlisted men are volunteers or draftees.

DETERIORATION IN LEADERSHIP

For roughly the last fifteen years, the quality of military leadership has been declining. The deterioration has been all too vividly revealed by the Vietnam war. The Army developed the concepts of "limited brushfire wars" and counter-insurgency to insure a military component for the international political realities of the late 1950's and early 1960's. These doctrines found natural application in Vietnam. That conflict began as a counter-insurgency situation that quickly grew into a "brushfire" war with the Green Berets as the limited warriors. But they couldn't win, and the Army was forced into a crash program in 1964 to form an Air Mobile Division — the First Air Cavalry Division — which was essentially a forerunner for large-scale conventional war. The Air

Cavalry was unable to stop the "brushfire," so the buildup of standard infantry divisions began and Vietnam became a small-scale replica of World War II — hardly what the limited war proponents had sold to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

A further deception in Army thinking is the oft-repeated assertion by high-ranking officers that political, not military, constraints have inhibited the Army's success in Vietnam. Yet the limited war concept itself is sharply restricted to achieving specific tactical objectives within a narrowly defined geographic area. It would not include offensive operations such as attacking across the DMZ, bombing Haiphong or invading Cambodia. Vietnam has revealed the limited war concept for what it really is — a mercenary expedient to assure military participation in international affairs — and the money to go with it — without any meaningful adjustment in large war force structures or any relationship to contemporary political priorities.

IT'S OUR BABY

In short, the Army first urged and now perpetuates the war for its own parochial internal purposes, with little sense of national responsibility. And from a purely military viewpoint, the command of our forces in southeast Asia has been egregiously mismanaged because it has been guided by the wish to maximize career opportunities for senior officers, rather than maximize the effectiveness of our forces. For example, a single combat command assignment is today an unwritten prerequisite for promotion from Colonel to Brig. General and additional such assignments are virtual guarantees of further rapid promotion. To accommodate the eagerness for promotion, combat command assignments are rotated every six months. This results in more promotions for career officers. It also means that combat in Vietnam is generally led by green officers inexperienced in local battlefield command, in the past tactics and characteristics of the enemy's troops, the experience and ability of their own troops and the cli-



THE AUTHOR

Edward L. King, 41, is a former Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army. He requested voluntary retirement last year because of his opposition to the Vietnam War. Lt. Col. King fought in the Korean War and most recently served with the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Future articles by Lt. Col. King will deal with U.S. force levels in Europe and the Fitzhugh Commission report on Pentagon reorganization.

mate and terrain over which they must fight. Under such circumstances, it is virtually inevitable that more promotions for eager commanders would be accompanied by more dead enlisted soldiers than would have been the case had the Army been given stable, experienced combat leadership at all levels as a matter of policy. But the casualties of such a policy would have been career improvements for hundreds of officers. In the eyes of today's general officers, such casualties are less tolerable than the lives of soldiers who died in superfluous agony.

The situation has grown unchecked because of complete *internal conformity* — deviating from the Army party line is discouraged and punished. Internal criticism and disagreement is non-existent. And needless to say, the reprisals against criticism in public are swift and vigorous. Consequently, the uniform face put on for the public and the Congress by the Army's officer corps is not that of healthy consensus but of strict and sterile convention.

TOE THE LINE

The futility of the war and the personal self-interest of most commanding officers have not been lost on lower-ranking junior officers and GI's. Many continue to serve and toe an undeviating line out of fear of court-martial and jail or because of a strong desire not to let their buddies down. Officers remain silent and seek promotions in the only way available because they, like other men, have home mortgages to pay, children to send to college and higher paid retirement to anticipate. Many rationalize their conformity by comparing it to that of other professionals in large corporations or other parts of government. Few recognize that the difference is in the end product — death for young Americans — rather than profit and success for the corporation or bureaucracy.

Yet the doubts are growing daily, particularly among younger officers. Among these young men, service to the nation and their subordinates, and dedication to justice, individual dignity and self-respect would be more appealing attributes of military life than service to their own careers first and to the existing system a close second. It is difficult to imagine the bitterness that is beginning to permeate the lower enlisted and officer ranks of the Army, or the creeping paranoia against the press, TV, politicians, and liberal segments of our society that afflicts the senior ranks. Such conditions, if left unattended, pose a serious danger to the future of the republic.

CONFUSION IN ORGANIZATION

Not only is the Army badly led, it is badly structured. For example, in Europe approximately 200,000 Army troops include only about 85,000 actual combat troops. There is no valid military reason why these 85,000 combat soldiers could not be

adequately commanded and supplied by an additional 65,000 men. Thus, either the total force of 200,000 could be cut by 50,000 troops or that total should contain a much higher proportion of combat elements. Furthermore, since the mid-50's, the proportion of non-combat manpower has been growing. In Vietnam it has required an Army force of over 400,000 men to provide 100,000 actual combat troops. The present "combat slice" (i.e., the percentage of troops available to actually fire on the enemy) is under 40 percent for all Army units. This compares unfavorably to the 60 percent combat slice of the Soviet Army and 70 percent combat slice of the North Vietnamese Army.

Only a fraction of the vastly increased support forces are required by the new military technology. Most are merely the baggage that go along with sending the Army "first-class" and with the proliferation of headquarters commands which do nothing more than pass orders to lower commands and provide slots for general officers and their retinues. The present U.S. Army is a dragon with a huge tail and tiny teeth.

The implications of this situation are several. First, economically, the U.S. Army is far too expensive compared to its combat potential. In Western Europe, for example, at least two and probably three senior command levels between the Pentagon and the combat commanders could be eliminated. These headquarters contribute little to military effectiveness; quite the contrary.

Second, tactically, the dragon is reasonably mobile and can travel in the luxury to which it has become accustomed only when it has absolute air superiority. Yet in Western Europe, it is not assumed that the Air Force will have absolute air superiority.

Third, strategically, when only limited conventional combat forces are available against superior conventional forces in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, greater motivation exists for U.S. forces to resort quickly to first use of nuclear weapons with the inherent danger of nuclear escalation rather than flexible response to aggression.

The foregoing implications are, of course, mere suggestions of the need for a hard look at the organization of the U.S. Army and the military unified and specified staff concepts. Resistance to that hard look comes from career officers who feel that they personally have nothing to gain from a restructuring of the Army, and considerable to protect by perpetuating the system that provides comfortably for professional advancement and retirement.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

Reforming the Army is not a contradiction in terms, but it does pose obvious obstacles of entrenched service and Congressional attitudes and habitual bureaucratic inertia, as well as the added problem that any criticism of the military is

characterized by some as patriotically suspect if not quasi-treasonable. Nevertheless, the obstacle course and the risk of obscurantist slander must be run.

To improve leadership:

—Better education. The service academies are in fact only engineering schools and on the basis of faculties and curricula second-rate ones at that. They and the career officer training schools need improved and broadened curricula and more civilian instructors. Now is the time to establish national priorities clearly and to emphasize that military service is a way of providing national service and not a personal end in itself.

—Internal dissent and debate must be encouraged; public comment by military men on matters of ordinary concern to citizens should be restrained only when *substantive* evidence exists that such comment *seriously* prejudices true order and discipline of the Army.

—The Uniform Code of Military Justice should be revised to bring it more in accord with accepted principles of justice. Court-martial should not be used in lieu of leadership as was the case at the Presidio. The rights of the soldier must be better protected.

—Non-discriminatory promotions. Promotions should be made solely because of demonstrated merit and ability, without regard to source of commission (e.g., West Point, ROTC, OCS), component of service (e.g. regular, reserve), family background, race or religion. Discrimination on all these grounds now exists.

—Less conformity-conscious rating system. Efficiency report ratings should be more oriented to demonstrated and potential ability and less weighted by the opinion of one individual on whether or not an officer was constantly conforming to the wishes of that individual.

—Civilian surveillance. Civilian leaders, especially in the Pentagon and White House, must unceasingly seek out and reward officers who lead by their personal example and performance of duty rather than by force of rank. The service secretaries should be men with experience in military affairs, but with unquestioned independence. (This requirement should not exclude former military men from serving in civilian capacities. Examples: General James Gavin could probably be a more effective civilian Secretary of the Army than most civilians. President Eisenhower probably better preserved civilian control over the armed services than any recent President.)

To improve organization:

—Tough civilian leadership. Even though many officers would welcome a more streamlined and austere Army, they will certainly not succeed in achieving it unless supported by vigorous Congressional and Executive action.

—Reduction in Non-Combat Forces. Western Europe provides obvious examples, but the continental U.S. command structure could be greatly reduced without the slightest reduction in preparedness or effectiveness.

Present top-heavy unified command structures and unproductive specified commands must be reduced in accord with changing national priorities.

To reform is to prosper. Yet the armed services show few signs of reform vitality. This state of affairs is beginning to be appreciated by the public through the dark glass of recent history: vast overspending on the C-5A, ill-fated defense systems such as the F-111 and the Cheyenne Helicopter, the cover-up of My-Lai, the Green Beret murder accusations, the sordid activities of Major General Turner and Army Sergeant Major Wooldridge, the legal "overkill" of court-martials at Fort Jackson, Fort Dix and the Presidio, and the apparent futility and questionable judgment of such bloody incidents as the Hamburger Hill assault (for which the combat commander was rewarded with a third star and a choice job with the Joint Chiefs of Staff). These are now in the public domain and have disillusioned and alienated much of the civilian community.

But what is not yet at public issue is the inflexibility, shortsightedness and selfishness within the armed services which have allowed these incidents to occur.

—EDWARD L. KING

THE DISSENTING MOTHER GOOSE

HOLLAR SCHOLAR

*A diller, a hollar,
A sign waving scholar,
What puts you in such gloom?
The troops are in combat,
And the National Guard's in my room.*

VOCAL VEEP

*Richard had a vocal veep,
His voice was never low;
And everywhere that Spiro went
The words were sure to flow.
He loved to bait the schools each day,
He called the students slobs,
And learned men who knocked the War,
He labelled effete snobs.
And Anger grew among us,
But still he spewed more dirt;
He was a polished Wallace
In a button-down shirt.
Why does he carry on so?
The angry students cry;
Why Richard has a Southern plan
On which he must rely.*

— more on page 15

The War's Day in Court

Ask any established constitutional law expert — that is, anyone who teaches the subject in law school and is over 50 years old — what he thinks of the Massachusetts anti-war bill of April 2, 1970, that has now led to a case in the Supreme Court entitled "Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Melvin R. Laird—Original Docket." You will get a reply like, "I think the war is unconstitutional, all right, but this Massachusetts statute is a hell of a silly and misguided way to go about proving it legally."

And that is the establishment view. It pervades the newspapers and magazines, and accounts for the remarkable lack of attention given to Massachusetts' effort. It may even account for the flippant Ripon article on how the bill came to be passed (surely *any* bill that's ever passed is the result of a rather unusual concatenation of circumstances). As a result, the whole nation may be in for a dramatic shock if Massachusetts actually wins in the Supreme Court in October or November. No one will have expected it — except a bunch of guys who teach constitutional law in law schools and who are decidedly under 50 years of age.

Let's start with a little bit of constitutional law. Is the Vietnam war unconstitutional because it hasn't been declared by Congress? The answer is plainly yes. There really is no doubt about this, though many people fool themselves by tortuous reasoning planted long ago and recently discarded by house counsel for the Pentagon. For instance, the Tonkin Gulf resolution was long cited as the "equivalent" of a Congressional declaration of war. Recently, however, as Congress set in motion the repeal of this particular resolution, the administration reversed itself and said that it does not rely for legality upon the Tonkin maneuver. All right, what about our SEATO commitments? For a while Dean Rusk got away with the position that we were only following treaties, which are the supreme law of the land, in getting involved in Vietnam. That argument prevailed as

long as no one bothered to read the SEATO treaty, which requires in Article 4 that any enforcement action under the treaty by any nation must be "in accordance with its constitutional processes." In other words, the treaty is absolutely no way to get around the constitutional necessity of declaring war. Today, the only people who mention SEATO are those who haven't yet heard of the Cambodian invasion, for Cambodia was not a member of SEATO.

Other people — and this gets into the law-professor category — mention all the Congressional appropriations for fighting the Vietnam war. Isn't this approval by Congress? Clearly, if it were, then there would be no need for the Constitutional provision that Congress has the power to declare war. In fact, being in on the decision whether to go to war, and later being called to finance an on-going war operation, are two entirely different things. Congress can't realistically deny funds for food and ammunition for boys in the field; that would be nearly impossible politically, as the Pentagon is well aware. Finally, we have the argument that in this day and age the power to declare war is anachronistic, a throw-back to the old pre-nuclear days when the world could not be destroyed in thirty minutes. If there is any force in this observation, it certainly does not apply to Vietnam. As the Massachusetts Complaint filed in the Supreme Court points out, there was at least ten years' time, between 1954 and 1964, as well as several years later, when the President, if he believed in the Constitution, could have asked Congress for its explicit consent, or a resolution of declaration of war, to his gradually escalating commitment in Southeast Asia.

FEW KINGLY POWERS

The words of the Constitution are plain enough, but if someone really wanted more in the way of clarity, he could go back to the writing of the Constitution. The framers were well aware of the catastrophic commitments of the old kings of England, plunging their country into wars and then going to Parliament to be bailed out. (Parliament reluctantly footed the bill — another reason why paying for a war isn't the same thing as the power to make it in the first place.) Our Articles of Confederation shied away entirely from a Chief Executive, when the Constitution came along it was apparent that the thirteen states would not suddenly give kingly powers to a new executive. The military power given to the President was that of Commander-in-Chief—the top general, carrying out the will of Con-

THE AUTHOR

Anthony D'Amato is associate professor of law at the Northwestern University School of Law. This article grew out of his experience as a consultant to the Office of the Attorney General of Massachusetts on drafting the complaint for the case of Massachusetts v. Laird. Professor D'Amato is also working on an amicus brief arguing that the Supreme Court should take on the case as a matter of original jurisdiction.

gress in terms of execution of the military effort in the field. Even there his power is not plenary, for in addition to the power given to Congress to declare war are other Congressional powers — the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the armed forces, to raise and support Armies, to provide for the common defense, and so on. The framers made their intent plain — that it would be Congress, and not the President, who would make the war decisions.

Even more explicit, in a way, was the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, in effect before the Articles of Confederation were established. The Massachusetts Governor could use Massachusetts soldiers to defend the Commonwealth against attack, but could not order any soldier to go outside the territory of the Commonwealth unless there was consent either by the Massachusetts legislature or by the soldier himself! It was quite clear in those days that as far as wars were concerned each human being's own decision would be respected. In ratifying the Constitution, Massachusetts and the other states did not lightly shift this basic right to a new Chief Executive surrounded by a small unelected group of military advisers.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

President Nixon, to his great credit, has changed his earlier views on the subject of constitutionality. In his TV conference with three newsmen of July 1, 1970, the President made no attempt to argue that the Vietnam war is constitutional; rather, he said that he inherited the problem from preceding administrations. Moreover, he did *not* argue that as Commander-in-Chief he could make war; he confined his constitutional power to that of *protecting* American soldiers already in Vietnam. (One might visualize the President as the White Queen saying to Alice: "The only way to protect our boys is to invade Cambodia to destroy the enemy there, and the second only way is to keep most of them in Vietnam to protect those that are not being withdrawn. As long as we have a slow withdrawal schedule, they have to stay there to protect the others who are not being withdrawn." And Alice says, "But your Majesty, wouldn't the best protection simply be to speed up the withdrawal schedule?" "Silly girl," the Queen replies, "you do not understand military logic. I could not fulfill my constitutional duties as commander-in-chief if I didn't do all I can to protect American lives in Vietnam. If I pulled the boys out, I wouldn't have anything left to protect, would I?")

The Massachusetts case could now change the calculus in the following way. A decision by the Supreme Court in favor of Massachusetts would mean that the President would have to get the explicit consent of Congress within 90 days (as this Complaint is framed) to a prolongation of American *fighting* in Vietnam — air attacks as well as ground troops; otherwise the *war*

would have to cease. This would put the ball back where it should have been in the first place. If Congress then decides that to withdraw precipitately would be inadvisable, it could still frame a withdrawal schedule that is much more accelerated than the President's. Moreover — and this is really at the heart of the matter — a Supreme Court ruling that the Constitution means which it says is a guarantee that a future President could not unilaterally involve us in any more Vietnams.

What is it, then, that the over-50 constitutionalists have against the Massachusetts case? The answer, I think, lies in what they have told their students each new year for the last thirty years — that there are certain kinds of "political questions" that the Supreme Court simply does not decide. These include extremely important cases, such as a case alleging the unconstitutionality of the entire Vietnam operation.

This political-question mentality was quite apparent to me when I was a student at Harvard Law School. The faculty thought Anthony Lewis (the New York *Times* reporter who spent a year at Harvard) was clearly wrong in arguing that the Supreme Court should reverse its former opinions and hold that malapportioned districts violate the Constitution. After all, this was the Frankfurterian "political thicket" *par excellence*, and courts should never get into thickets. Lewis's contention, on the other hand, was simply that *unless* the courts get in, nobody will, because existing legislatures are the creatures of their own malapportionment and thus will never remedy the situation. The year after I graduated from Harvard — too late to enjoy the shock, cries of alarm, and pronouncements that this time the Supreme Court had had it — the Court ruled that what was formerly a "political question" was now a clear case of needed judicial reform. Since then, the country has gone one-man-one-vote, and the Supreme Court has remained in sufficiently high esteem as to be inaccessible to a man like Carswell.

"POLITICAL QUESTION" ESCAPE ROUTE

Now one might ask: is the question of the constitutionality of Vietnam, and in particular the power of the President to act without a Congressional declaration of war — really a "political question"? Justice Burger thought so when he ruled that way in a case while he was still on the Court of Appeals. But hardly anyone else really buys this specific argument. In Justice Burger's case, the Supreme Court denied certiorari. It might have affirmed Burger's decision below, or written an opinion to the effect that a draft-resister cannot claim that the war is unconstitutional because that is a political question — but the Court did not choose to act that way. It probably did not because there would have been no precedent for so holding. Many cases in the Supreme Court have previously ruled on Congressional-Executive powers under the Constitution without

invoking a "political questions" escape route. A leading case was the Steel Seizure Case where President Truman was ordered to hand back the steel mills that he had seized for the (undeclared) Korean War. The Court in that case did not even raise the issue of "political questions" in deciding that the President had no Congressional authorization to seize the mills.

But it is not the precise doctrine of "political questions" that the constitutional experts have in mind when they dismiss the Massachusetts case. Rather it is a *mentality* that says, in effect: The Court should not risk its stature by deciding a case that is fraught with political overtones. The Vietnam War has gone on for many, many years, though it has been a military, economic, and political disaster; in short, it has become a sacred cow. The Court has too many important things to do than to decide whether this cow should hang around another dozen years. Really important things, like fine points of Congressional preemption of interstate use taxes, or whether ship captains should be held to a higher negligence standard than railroad conductors.

This mental bent reaches the level of moral certitude when the constitutional expert contemplates Massachusetts' standing to bring such a case. It is one thing for a draft resister to argue that the war he is going to die in is unconstitutional. Even if the lower court says his argument is a political question, and even if the Supreme Court refuses to grant certiorari to review his case, still he was the proper party to bring the case. But Massachusetts? What business is it of Massachusetts' if thousands of her young men are killed? After all, a 1923 case said, in passing, that as to federal issues it is to the national government, and not to the states, that the citizen must look for protection. And this old case has taken on an aura of infallibility over the years.

LOW PROBABILITY

The younger constitutional-law crowd, having less of an investment in the 1923 case, is inclined to re-read it and ask: how can a citizen realistically be required to look to the federal government for protection in a case where he alleges that the federal government is violating the law? Specifically, instead of Massachusetts suing Mr. Laird, should the citizen ask the U.S. Attorney General to sue Mr. Laird? Is there really a significant likelihood of a positive response by Mr. Mitchell when a citizen calls him up and politely asks him to sue the Secretary of Defense for conducting an illegal and unconstitutional war? About the only action that could result from such an approach would be to get a phone tap.

But maybe the over-50 group will prove to be right for a reason that has nothing to do with law, namely, that the Supreme Court justices belong to the

same age group and might see things the same way. This is something over which the young lawyers working on the Massachusetts case have no control. Yet the situation is by no means preordained. Justice Douglas is extremely young-minded. And Justice Stewart did dissent from the denial of certiorari that I have mentioned previously, saying in effect that the Court had no business ducking this issue. And then there are several "strict constructionists" on the Court, the two Nixon appointees being the latest. The Massachusetts case is, if anything, one of strict construction. What is requested is a strict, specific, and exact interpretation of the words of the Constitution, with no escape routes fashioned by previous "liberal" judges like Frankfurter who were more interested in preserving the Court than in preserving the rule of law. A strict-constructionist approach is needed not only on the merits of the issue — whether Congress must declare war — but also on whether Massachusetts has standing as a matter of original jurisdiction to bring such a case directly to the Supreme Court. The Constitution gives a state this right (to sue either another state or a citizen from another state; in this case, Mr. Laird is a citizen from another state), and it makes no exceptions according to the type of case involved. Massachusetts clearly has an interest — in the integrity of the wording of the Constitution (which, it may be remembered, took the place of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 where a soldier had certain rights with respect to foreign wars), in the integrity of its own state institutions (suffering from lack of morale and from public discontent in the wake of Vietnam), and in the health, welfare, and lives of its most precious asset — its own citizens. It is surely premature to dismiss the Massachusetts case as silly or misguided even if one honestly believes that the present justices of the Supreme Court probably will not allow jurisdiction in the case. For the Supreme Court has risen to great challenges before (witness the gerrymandering cases), and there is a hope, maybe even a "businessman's risk," that the Court in this coming term will give the Constitutional provision empowering Congress to declare war its day in court.

ANTHONY D'AMATO

— from page 12

HUSH SILENT MIDDLE

*Hush silent middle, don't say a word,
Nixon's going to let loose a big hawk bird.
If that hawk doesn't fare too well,
Nixon's going to nominate Judge Carswell.
If Judge Carswell can't get through,
Nixon's going to unleash Spiro Agnew.
If old Spiro makes critics roar,
Nixon is going to enlarge the war.
If Cambodia costs him votes,
Nixon's going to blame it on student scapegoats.*

another on page 19

Medical Care: The Manpower Crisis

Health can no longer be considered a privilege; it is a right demanded by our society. The aim of bringing expert medical care to all people, regardless of ability to pay, should be our goal. For the medical profession this constitutes giving the patient the best care available, regularly, personally, and respectfully.

How can optimum delivery of medical care be best achieved? Most of the discussion to date by government officials, legislators, hospital administrators and organized medicine has missed the point. To a physician who delivers medical care, it is apparent that certain factors must be considered; these factors include the medical manpower shortage, and the mechanics of achieving the best means of organizing and financing the delivery of health care.

SHORTAGE OF PHYSICIANS

The most pressing problem concerning adequate delivery of health care is the medical manpower shortage. The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recently granted 7.6 million dollars to twenty-five schools of medicine and two schools of osteopathy under the Physicians Augmentation Program. This program, developed by former HEW Secretary Robert Finch, will enable the schools to increase their freshmen enrollments by 395 students in the fall of 1970. The University of Minnesota was awarded the most money, receiving \$1,074,161 which will increase its freshman class enrollment by 60 students to a total of 227. Georgetown University received \$680,206, increasing its first year class by 30 to a total of 175 students. (The author's 1965 graduating class at Georgetown numbered only 95.)

The schools receiving these grants were selected on the basis of national competition conducted by the National Institute of Health's Bureau of Health Professions, Education and Manpower training. It must be stressed that this increase is inadequate. It is imperative that the Administration achieve its goal of raising enrollment by 1,000 medical students a year for four years. By 1975 there should be at least 12,000 medical school graduates per year, an increase from the 8,059 medical graduates in 1969. Although a number of new medical schools have begun functioning in recent years, the existing schools can, by increasing the size of their classes, achieve a more significant increase

THE AUTHOR

Francis W. Parnell, M.D. is staff physician in the Department of Otolaryngology (Ear, Nose and Throat) at Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco.

in the total number of physicians educated.

In addition, the administration must take steps to restore federal grants to medical schools. The need for this is obvious. Grants have been drastically reduced in the past few years. Medical schools, especially private ones, rely upon these funds to cut the prohibitive cost of running their schools. Now they are being forced to allocate medical school funds to pay expenses and salaries of faculty members and other personnel who had previously received research grants. In fact, a number of private medical schools are faced with the possibility of closing down due to increased operating costs and restricted budgets.

Furthermore, since medical research has outpaced the delivery of health care, new grants should be earmarked for community health programs designed to improve the delivery and utilization of health services.

THE STATES' RESPONSIBILITY

Individual states also bear a great deal of responsibility in coping with the growing medical manpower shortage. In California a \$246,300,000 bond issue was recently introduced to expand the health training facilities of the statewide campuses of the University of California. It would have made the university eligible to receive an estimated \$126,700,000 in matching federal construction funds. Of this \$187,600,000 was to be used for completion of three new medical schools



(Davis, Irvine, and San Diego) as well as expanding the existing schools in Los Angeles and San Francisco. A 125% increase in graduating physicians was expected.

This bond issue recently appeared as proposition I on California's June 2, 1970, primary ballot. Unfortunately it was rejected by a margin of 55% to 45% by the short-sighted California voters. Defeat was attributed to voter dissatisfaction with government spending as well as resentment directed directly at the University of California for student disturbances.

The State of California could have furnished an example to other states which can and must proceed in a similar manner to meet the manpower crisis. All states must take this type of initiative in training physicians and other health personnel.

Private groups also bear responsibility for helping solve this problem. The Virginia Council on Health and Medical Care is a voluntary, privately-supported organization which keeps listings of available medical-practice openings in general practice and the various medical and surgical specialties. This physician-referral service is kept up-to-date and provides a means of locating physicians in those areas of the state where they are most needed. The Sears Roebuck Foundation works with smaller communities and furnishes a service which attracts physicians to locate in isolated rural communities.

Thus the federal and state governments, as well as medical schools, private groups, and the medical profession, can and must work together to cope with the medical manpower shortage which is the basic problem in obtaining the optimal delivery of health care. Only then can the methods of delivery be evaluated. This fact has unfortunately been overlooked by the Congress. A variety of bills concerning the financing of health care have been proposed which neglect the significance of the medical manpower shortage.

THE DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 established Medicare (Title 18) for the aged and Medicaid (Title 19) for the indigent. The government's great financial involvement is related to the raising and distribution of funds in these programs. Major changes proposed by the Nixon administration have recently been approved by the House Ways and Means Committee. They include the so-called Medicare "Part C" or Health Maintenance Option, which would allow Social Security to negotiate with prepaid plans for providing Medicare Part A and B benefits to the aged who choose this plan. Dr. Paul Ellwood, Jr., developed this commendable plan over the past three years at the American Rehabilitation Foundation at the University of Minnesota. It involves financing health care for Medicare patients through government-paid contracts

with medical groups stressing preventive care. These groups, called "Health Maintenance Organizations," would guarantee to the federal government to provide all the prepaid health services already covered by Medicare for an annual charge per patient which would be less than 95 percent of the average Medicare bill in the same area. This is a major change since both the medical care and its financing are guaranteed once a contract is signed. Only the financing was guaranteed under the existing Medicare Program. Major alterations to the plan may occur in the Senate if it is passed by the House.

Prepaid group health insurance has worked well in many areas, the most notable being the Kaiser-Paramente Groups in California. However, the government must realize that prepaid group health insurance is only one means of delivering health care and will not entirely suffice in solving the problem. A number of other plans have been introduced or will shortly be introduced into the Congress in this election year. These include (1) "Medicredit," devised by the American Medical Association and introduced by Rep. Richard Fulton (D-Tenn.) and Senator Paul Fannin (R-Ariz.) which provides tax credit on a sliding scale based on income; (2) the Reuther Plan, which would include a payroll tax plus general revenue financing of national health insurance; (3) the Griffith Bill (HR 15779), endorsed by the AFL-CIO, which provides unlimited hospitalization and physician care for all citizens financed through Social Security; (4) the Javits Plan (S 3711) which extends Medicare to cover all ages — becoming essentially a national health insurance program. It is regrettable that none of these is significantly concerned with the major problem — the shortage of medical manpower. The Nixon administration is extremely short-sighted if it is content to have Medicare "Part C" as its only contribution to this perplexing problem.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

How can the Administration take a more significant approach to our health manpower needs? One way is to encourage the further development of community health centers and to provide adequate funding and facilities — especially in rural and urban areas having a high concentration of poverty and inadequate health services. These centers function best when they are closely allied with a university or teaching hospital which assures them of qualified staff and adequate hospital facilities. The support of other community health groups is also needed.

In areas where this association is not possible, the Regional Medical Program established under public Law 89-239 in 1965 could play a significant role if the Administration would supply the appropriate leadership. The initial function of the Regional Medical

Program was to reduce the morbidity and mortality rate due to heart disease, cancer and strokes, which are responsible for an estimated 70% of deaths in the United States. In addition, it now concerns itself with hypertension, renal disease, pulmonary disease, and diabetes mellitus. More adequate funding of the Regional Medical Program could provide the direction and financial backing for neighborhood health centers in underprivileged areas where malnutrition is a more important public health problem than cancer.

In addition, further responsibility in improving medical care rests with other levels of government. It is encouraging to note that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has recently announced the formation of a state-operated system of primary health care centers to provide complete medical services to communities of 15,000 to 25,000 persons now receiving little or no medical care. It will be operated as a non-profit corporation and will provide 24-hour neighborhood centers which will function as family physicians. In addition, it will provide nursing home, rehabilitation facilities, chronic care, home care, hospital ambulatory care and hospitalization. The federal government can take an active part in providing some of the funds required and in encouraging other states to set up similar groups. This decentralized approach would appear to be quite promising.

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

Individual communities also bear considerable responsibility in providing more efficient delivery of medical care by improving utilization of their facilities. Hospitals in these communities must stop the enormous waste of funds which further increases the cost of medical care. This waste generally is not realized by the general public and is best demonstrated by the incredible duplication of services in a single community. For example, in Madison, Wisconsin, a city of 180,000 people, there are six cardiac catheterization laboratories to evaluate cardiac disease. In addition, there are five heart-lung machines in the various hospitals, only one operating at its functioning capacity. It is a sheer waste of money to do two open-heart operations a year just to say you can do them in your local hospital. The same applies to the duplication of services in emergency room care and obstetric facilities. More centralized and efficient hospital services are necessary if any progress in health care delivery is to be made.

Individual physicians must accept more community health responsibility in addition to providing the medical care involved. This involves an attempt to control the cost of medical care more effectively. Although doctors' fees constitute only 20% of health care expenses, services initiated by the physician such as hospital admissions, prescriptions and drugs, nursing and related services, account for over 50% of the expenses.

Therefore, 70% of health care costs are directly due to or initiated by the physicians. One of the ways in which costs can be controlled is to avoid the over-care of the patient — such as ordering numerous unnecessary and expensive laboratory tests just because the patient has Medicare or private health insurance. In addition, unnecessary hospitalizations must be curtailed. Many patients are admitted to hospitals for diagnostic studies that could be performed less expensively on an ambulatory basis. Most medical insurance does not pay out-patient laboratory expenses, and that is a major source of this problem. Many minor surgical procedures, such as tonsillectomies, could be performed on an out-patient basis.

Physicians should also take an active part in regional and community health planning. Moreover, they can help educate the public about the costs involved in the delivery of health care. For example, the rising number of medical malpractice suits brought by the public is causing exorbitant rises in premiums for malpractice insurance. Presently, in some groups in California, \$7.00 of the initial visit charge for each new patient goes for malpractice protection. This has become such a problem that the American Medical Association has recently begun a study which would institute an A.M.A.-sponsored professional liability insurance program as well as conducting an educational campaign on claims prevention and patient safety. Obviously, if the legal and medical professions cannot solve this growing problem soon, the federal government must step in since it is ultimately paying much of the rising costs due to the malpractice problem.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There is considerable misunderstanding of science and medicine among the public, and, more importantly, among our public servants as well. Members of the executive and legislative branches of government are making judgments frequently regarding medicine, science, and the delivery of health care without full understanding of the various problems involved in the actual delivery of medical care.

There are no bills pending in Congress pertaining to the medical manpower shortage. The various bills already introduced, or about to be introduced, are concerned with various payment methods, including pre-paid group insurance and national health insurance. Certainly this is putting the proverbial cart before the horse.

Most health legislation is handled by four Congressional committees — two in the Senate and two in the House: the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. In addition, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate

play a significant role in appropriating federal funds for health care.

In the administrative branch, there is the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Office of the Surgeon General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of Health and Medical Affairs and the Director of the National Institute of Health.

Various recommendations are in order — with the caveat that there is no simple solution to obtaining optimum delivery of medical care.

1. Effective delivery of medical care must become a high priority item for the Administration.

2. A more unified organizational structure is needed. This could perhaps be best achieved on the executive level by the appointment of a council of medical advisors to the President numbering three to five physicians from various parts of the country, not necessarily representing organized medicine. In addition, it is recommended that better cooperation and coordination be obtained among the various administrators of health programs and the legislative committees which deal with the delivery of health care. The appointment of an Undersecretary of HEW for Health would provide sub-Cabinet status; this official must be given the power to coordinate federal health policy.

If that does not prove satisfactory, it will be necessary to set up a new Cabinet branch headed by a Secretary of Health. That aspect of the Department of Defense pertaining to biomedical affairs including the office of the Surgeon General, and military hospitals, would be brought into this new branch. Military hospitals would be expected to participate in the community to a greater extent.

3. The creation of a National Medical School would be an extension of the long-proposed Armed Forces Medical School upon which no action has ever been taken. This would alleviate the manpower shortage of physicians both in the Armed Forces as well as in public administration. The graduates from this medical school would have the choice of entering the Armed Forces or entering public administration of health. The students would be subsidized as they are in military academies, and would then be expected to provide four or five years' service.

Other physicians could then be expected to fulfill their two-year selective service obligation or two years of national service either in the Armed Forces, which is presently done, or more effectively by practicing family medicine in rural or urban community health services.

This proposed National Medical School would become a significant part of the proposed Department of Health.

4. State governments must be encouraged to formulate community health centers under the direction of medical schools and teaching hospitals. Utilization of the Regional Medical Program can provide direction and financing of community health centers in urban and rural areas which are medically underprivileged.

Before any comprehensive federal health program is considered, the medical manpower shortage must be alleviated by aggressive positive action by both legislators and administrators.

FRANCIS W. PARNELL

Hard Hats — from page 9

spicuously failed — to persuade their Election Day supporters to come into the party, where they can prevent the far right from purging every man who shows any trace of enlightenment.

The issue suggested in this article may at last put the forward-looking wing of the GOP on an even basis with the Democrats, in competing for the next generation of voters. The mortgage held by organized labor on the Democratic Party will hardly commend that party to a young man whose most intimate contact with unionism was to be beaten and kicked by half a dozen goons on the steps of the New York City Hall.

To sum up: the Democrats outside the South, like the British Labor Party, are an uneasy coalition of manual workers and the liberal portion of the educated middle classes. The group whom the Phillips strategy would woo are barely holding their own in absolute numbers and shrinking as a proportion of the American people; the other half of the alliance, whom Phillips would write off as the permanent enemy, will continue to grow as long as the developing economy requires a greater and ever greater portion of the labor force to pass through higher education. It is surprising that the Machiavelli of the Nixon Administration, who lays such stress on relative rates of growth when he discusses geographic sections of the United States, nowhere in his book suggests that he has ever thought of this fact.

— from page 15

JACK AND JILL

*Jack and Jill
Went on the Hill,
To test the legal process;
In suits and dresses,
And well-combed tresses,
They may convert the Congress.*

W. K. Woods

Justice For America

Today the concern created by our rising crime rate has forced nearly half of our people to alter their life-styles in one fashion or another. The watchdog and the double-latched door have become the signs of the times. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement has revealed that nearly half the population are afraid to set foot on the streets of their own communities after dark.

Loss of life and damage to property, tragic as these may be, are not the most disturbing aspect of crime in this country. Rather it is the terrible unease that the frequency and severity of crime brings to the hearts of many Americans. The contemporary legacy of crime in our nation has come to represent a real threat to the quality of American life. It has created divisiveness and hostility among our people, dividing rich and poor, white and black, urban and rural dwellers. At the same time, it has served to drain public confidence in the credibility of the law in our political system. Since the court has no armies, it is essential that we rebuild the public confidence in our systems of justice.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION

The question that many Americans ask most often is, "Why isn't something done about the crime situation?" Such a reaction is understandable but, in and of itself, doesn't lead to solutions. We should, instead, be asking ourselves, "What can we, as individual citizens, do about it?"

A bumper sticker which says, "Support Your Local Police," is not the answer. What is needed is money to pay for the kind of professional law enforcement this country needs and deserves. It is disgraceful that a man with the responsibility of a police officer is forced into a second job in order to live a decent life.

There are other important areas which we must become concerned about if the criminal justice system is going to work effectively. One of these is criminal rehabilitation. During a typical year, the U. S. correctional system deals with approximately three million people — half that number are under

its authority on any given day.

Unfortunately, today too many penal institutions around the country have become revolving doors for prisoners. A substantial section of the correctional population is being "corrected" for the third and fourth time. What does all this mean? It means that, for our safety, and theirs, we must insure that prisoners are in fact rehabilitated before returning them to society. To do this the public must become involved. Each of us must demonstrate our willingness to provide the funds to secure and maintain more and better qualified prison personnel, capable of administering the necessary rehabilitative programs.

There is, too, a great need for more meaningful vocational programs in our prisons and jails. A man who serves his time manufacturing license plates, or who merely sits and does nothing, will not learn a trade which will help him become a productive part of our society when he is released. This is the man who, more probably than not, will return to a life of crime.

LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY

Many other areas in our legal and correctional systems will require reform in order to reestablish the broad acceptance of the authority of our legal structure that is so fundamental to our government. For instance, our parole and probation systems are overburdened, and too many of our courts are understaffed and clogged with backlogs.

If we care enough, then we, as individuals, must be willing to engage in the kind of personal commitment necessary to create the changes that we seek. We must be willing, in addition, to assume the necessary collective financial burdens — though, in the end, we may be pleasantly surprised to find larger financial benefits from these programs. We must shift our individual and collective attention to devising new strategies of attack on crime, without allowing our emotions to lead us toward repression of constitutional rights.

I agree with the President's Crime Commission which has stated: "No system, however well-staffed or organized, no level of material well-being for all, will rid society of crime if there is not a widespread ethical motivation, and a widespread belief that by and large the government and the social order deserve credence, respect and loyalty."

THE AUTHOR

John C. Danforth is Attorney General of Missouri and the Republican nominee to oppose U.S. Senator Stuart Symington.

Polling the Polarized

The Hidden Crisis of American Politics, by Samuel Lubell, Norton, New York, 1970, 306 pages, \$5.95.

At a time when political analysis is largely in the hands of bloodless data-manipulators and armchair dilettantes, Samuel Lubell stands out as a rare combination of powerful intuition, skillful research, and a concern with the fate of the republic. Crisscrossing the country, interviewing and re-interviewing countless men and women of all backgrounds, and tapping a wealth of electoral statistics, he is probably the most astute public opinion analyst we have today.

His latest book can be seen as an up-dating of his classic, *The Future of American Politics*. That book chronicled the New Deal realignment and propounded Lubell's celebrated "sun-moon theory" of party competition. But *The Hidden Crisis of American Politics* sets out to be more than simply a continuation of the history of American voting behavior; it seeks to explain "our inability to reconcile these conflicts that divide us" — race, the urban crisis, the "generation gap," the war, and the battle over spending priorities. "We seem to be losing the ability to moderate and compromise the conflicts that divide us," as the impact of rapid change turns politics into turmoil. Why?

In the course of discussing these conflicts and crises, Lubell continually harks back to his real interest, party realignment. Cautioning that today's voters are unlikely to form lasting party allegiances, Lubell nevertheless recognizes how tempted Richard Nixon is to forge a new coalition by wooing the South with the lure of Supreme Court nominees (*Hidden Crisis* went to press as Carswell was defeated).

Indeed, much of the perspective and methodology of *The Future of American Politics* was used wholesale by Kevin Phillips in *The Emerging Republican Majority*. In his new book, Lubell points out the pitfalls of the Phillips analysis. His most direct refutation reads:

After the 1968 election returns were in, some observers pinned the "conservative" label on both the Nixon Republicans and the Wallaceites, as if the 5,073,409 Wallace votes in the South were Nixon's for the taking. Actually, though, the Wallaceites and the Nixon Republicans represent two clashing streams of Southern life, culturally, economically, and historically.

Basically, Lubell confirms that the Wallace voter was lower in income and higher in racial prejudice than the Southern Nixon voter. As long as the Republican Party remains the country-club set in the South, Wallaceites

will hardly be attracted to it. Furthermore, Lubell recognizes the fallacy of treating the South as an undifferentiated whole: he distinguishes between the cities and the so-called black belt (as Barry Goldwater recently did).

There are other assumptions of the polarizing strategy that are refuted by Lubell's data, including the unreliability of local election results as a barometer of Presidential trends. In particular, New York City assembly districts where Lindsay netted less than a third of the vote in 1969 had divided evenly for Nixon and Humphrey the year before; in those 26 districts, Nixon's share of the vote had ranged from 22 percent to 62 percent. And Lubell points out that liberal Republicans, who may form the cement of a business/black alliance in Northern cities, will not stand for a GOP that is soft on equal opportunity. And in this light, he raises the possibility of a bolt in 1972.

One service provided by *The Hidden Crisis* is to treat with subtlety and perception the sticky question of white racism. The Kerner Commission warned of, Kevin Phillips rejoices in, and Andrew Hacker (in *The End of the American Era*) treats as fait accompli, irreparable racial polarization. But what is needed is a better understanding of the backlash; if we regard backlash as intractable, there is no hope for racial progress.

Lubell points out that his white interviewees are neither liberals nor diehard racists. Rather, their goal is domestic peace. In the early 1960's, whites favored civil rights goals as a means of pacifying blacks; when demonstrations turned to riots, they sought greater police power in order to achieve peace. This interpretation of white attitudes leaves room for hope, as well as a warning to Nixon: if your white Southern allies are encouraged to continue oppressing blacks, Northern racial turmoil will increase and the voters will seek another leader to restore peace.

It is nuggets like these that make Lubell's book an asset for those seeking a grip on the kaleidoscopic political changes of the last few years. A few of his conclusions seem farfetched — e.g., that antiwar opinion results largely from one's draft status or the status of one's sons, and that therefore the volunteer army will solve much of the "youth crisis." But on the whole, he is perceptive and fairminded. My major disappointment was that he never analyzed in depth the long-term, underlying causes of the "hidden crisis" — why, today, are we so polarized, vociferous, and uncompromising? Why do we expect so much of our political system and leaders? Lubell has catalogued change, and catalogued it deftly. But the hidden crisis still has hidden roots.

HOWARD L. REITER

LETTERS

SUPPORT FOR JONAS

Dear Sir:

I would like to comment on an attack upon my colleague, The Honorable Charles R. Jonas, in Mr. Lottman's "The GOP and the South" (FORUM, July-August, 1970).

There are several statements in that article to which I take strong exception, but will limit myself to two of them. The first is to Congressman Jonas' support of the Republican Party locally, state-wide, and nationally. The second is as to his record as a Member of the House.

Charlie Jonas was first elected to Congress in 1952, and was the first Republican Member to be elected from that state since 1928 when his father won a seat in the House. Charlie is now in his ninth term and is facing a tough, professionally managed, well-financed opponent. It is admitted that Charlie Jonas is no bitter partisan. He could not be one and expect to be elected in a district that is still very heavily Democratic in registration. But the efforts he has made have borne fruit. He has been gerrymandered three times now and has represented ten counties in the past which are not now a part of his new district. Of those ten counties, nine are presently represented by other Republicans and the tenth is solidly Republican. Lottman's allusions to 1968 are incorrect both as to local candidates and the Nixon campaign. Jonas campaigned for both incumbent and non-incumbent GOP candidates in North Carolina. He also vigorously campaigned for Nixon; and his son, Charles, was Nixon's state-wide manager. The missionary work of Charlie Jonas, and the example of his leadership and character, has helped make it possible for the GOP to have four Representatives from North Carolina instead of just one. On the local level, it is worthy of note that today all four of his counties have Republican sheriffs and two have Republican-controlled Boards of County Commissioners. His campaigns have always been coordinated with local Republican campaigns. This man is a member of one of the greatest Republican families of the South and it is inconceivable to me that any one or any organization representing themselves as Republican would be so unfair as to accuse him of not supporting Republican candidates to the very limits of his ability.

Lottman says of Jonas, his "entire raison d'etre for the past eighteen years has been his crusade against the national debt, his fervent belief in pay-as-you-go at the national level." I deny that that is anything less than sound Republican doctrine. Jonas is one of the few who has always put up a fight for fiscal responsibility because he believes, correctly, that mounting federal deficits in times of peace can only lead to inflation, a cheaper dollar, and eventual economic ruin. Someone has to carry on the crusade for fiscal integrity, and I am glad that it is possible for so responsible a Representative as Charlie Jonas to be on the job day by day working for the cause.

But in his determined fight for what he truly believes is a sound fiscal policy, Charlie Jonas has not neglected his state or his district. His accomplishments along this line are too numerous to mention but could easily be documented if your reporter had sought the facts. I do not believe you could find a single Member of Congress in either party who would not say that Charlie Jonas' record shows him to be able, conscientious, hard-working, dedicated as a Member of Congress, no matter how they may feel regarding his votes on particular issues.

Your article's treatment of Congressman Jonas greatly disappoints me. He has a superb record of outstanding service to the nation, his state, his district, and to his individual constituents. I only wish that we had many more men like him in the House.

GERALD R. FORD
Member of Congress

TO END THE WAR

Dear Sir:

I read with great interest your editorial on "The Amendment to End the War" which appeared in the June issue of the Ripon FORUM. There is no question that the entire concept of waging military hostilities in the Cold

War era has greatly blurred the respective roles of the Executive and Legislative Branches of our Federal Government with respect to war and foreign policy decision-making.

Your observation pertaining to the flaw that exists in the "end the war" proposals is also definitely well taken. Congress does have powers in the arena of foreign affairs which go beyond simply declaring war. Our goal in Southeast Asia has never been a traditional military victory and we are now decreasing our involvement. Therefore, placing such an emphasis on a declaration of war seems ill-advised.

To provide a more flexible approach to extricating our men from South Vietnam and to express my deep concern over our prolonged involvement in that troubled part of the world, I have introduced a resolution, H. Res. 1096, which is similar to H. Res. 1000. It expresses the policy of the House of Representatives that in the absence of specific prior Congressional approval, by joint resolution, the fiscal year 1971 defense expenditures in South Vietnam should be limited to only that amount required to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American combat and support troops by June 30, 1971. However, if additional time is necessary, Congress could be called upon to grant an extension.

I believe this resolution can serve as a vehicle to clarify some fundamental constitutional issues which go to the very heart of our governmental structure and help to achieve a desired peace. The time is now at hand to have the fullest possible discussion over this issue. This type of constructive debate will be beneficial not only in defining more precisely the separation of powers but also in revitalizing the confidence of the people in their government and their leaders.

The Society's analysis and support of this legislative measure is to be commended.

JACK McDONALD
Member of Congress

Ed. Note: Resolution 1096 reads: "Resolved, That in the absence of prior approval by Congress, by joint resolution, for a stated period of time, it is the policy of the House of Representatives that fiscal year 1971 defense expenditures in South Vietnam should be limited to only that amount required to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American combat and support troops from South Vietnam by the end of fiscal year 1971 (June 30, 1971)." This resolution is consistent with Ripon editorial opinion as expressed in the June 1970 FORUM.

NO LIBERALS WANTED

Dear Sir:

I will not be renewing my subscription to the Ripon FORUM because I am taking a new job. I will be a political science instructor at a Midwestern junior college. The president of the college in hiring me said that he would not hire a liberal for the job. His two major reasons were the political views of the surrounding area and actions of some college students and faculty. I have always considered myself a moderate or liberal Republican. However, as this was the only job offer, and I want to teach in a junior college, I decided that I will try this position. I hope that I make too much out of a single interview and that I may soon resubscribe.

A former subscriber

LOST CAUSE?

Dear Sir:

I have always considered myself an independent with a close relationship to liberal Republicanism. I do not pretend to be a prophet, but I see in the future a shifting of the two parties, and I am afraid that the Republican Party is destined to become all white, rural, blue collar and conservative. Since this does not match my belief, I cannot in good conscience join them.

I very much enjoyed the Ripon Society's fight to prevent this, but I am afraid it is a lost cause. In the not too distant future, you will be joining me in the "new" Democratic Party.

GERALD N. WACHS, M.D.
Kenilworth, N.J.

14a ELIOT STREET

NEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The Ripon Society has a new National Executive Director. He is **Robert D. Behn**, former Ripon research director and editor of *The Lessons of Victory*. Bob has been working for Massachusetts Governor Francis Sargent's urban affairs advisor. In noting Behn's resignation from the Governor's staff, **Carol Liston** of the *Boston Globe* called him, "the most brilliant, agile-minded Sargent staffer." A native of New Jersey, Bob holds a Ph.D. in Engineering from Harvard.

• Press coverage of the July-August FORUM, featuring **Michael Lottman's** report on the GOP in the South, has received extensive and, as this goes to press, largely favorable press coverage. It was released to the press at the Senate in Washington on July 22, at a conference chaired by Chairman of the Board **Howard Gillette** and featuring **Lottman**, Atlanta member **Shelby Cullom** and FORUM Editor **Howard Reiter**.

Prior to the conference, the report was presented to Special Counsel to the President **Murray Chotiner**, Dr. **Richard Curry** of the Republican National Committee, and **Tom Lias** of **Harry Dent's** White House staff. All expressed interest in its findings and particularly in the strategic recommendations it contained.

One of the immediate consequences of the report was an intriguing statement by Senator **Barry Goldwater** in a radio interview. According to a news story by **Jerry T. Baulch** in the *Washington Post*, **Goldwater** said, "I don't think the Ripon Society knows a damn thing about what they're talking about. . . . The only place in the United States in the last 20 years where we have had a growing Republican crowd has been in the South. Not in the country South, this is where the diehard segregationist Democrat lives, this is where the **Strom Thurmonds** (sic) of the South live — get into the cities of the South and you find . . . a lot of progressive, forward-thinking people who have changed the picture of the South. . . ."

Some of the initial press reaction included a laudatory editorial in the *Baltimore Sun*, a column by **David S. Broder** of the *Washington Post*, coverage in both *Time* and *Newsweek*, and a request by the *St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times* to reprint the entire Florida chapter.

• Thirteen members of the Chicago Ripon Society sponsored a one-day meeting on Saturday, June 6 at the Illinois Circle Campus in Chicago. The meeting, called a "Conference on Chicago Government," drew approximately 150 Republicans, Independents and dissident Democrats to discussion groups on education, city budget, city council, patronage politics, environmental pollution-hunger, and crime and politics in Chicago. An attempt was made to identify the weak points of the Democratic machine and how they can be exploited in a campaign. The group met in the afternoon to begin forming a coalition for power in next year's mayoral election. A committee which will explore the possibility of finding candidates on which the coalition can agree was formed as well as steering and platform committees. Each committee met the week of July 27, and it appears there is a great deal of enthusiasm for an approach aimed at ending the "machine age in Chicago." **Harold Russell**, Chicago Ripon Society president, is Chairman of the CCG steering committee.

• The Boston chapter is holding a series of "Issue Seminars" for Republican legislative candidates who have never served in the Commonwealth's "Great and General Court." The purpose is to have experts from state government brief these non-incumbent candidates on the key issues they will face in the campaign — housing, welfare, crime, environment, transportation, taxes — so that they can answer voters' questions intelligently. Two dozen candidates have paid the \$10.00 fee the chapter is charging to cover administrative costs.

Initiated by Boston chapter member and State Rep. candidate **Martha Reardon** of Cambridge, the seminars were organized by **Robert Gulick**, **Nat Gorton**, Representative **Martin A. Linsky** and **Robert Behn**.

• The nascent Pittsburgh chapter issued its first newsletter in July. It announced that the chapter has held

two organizational meetings, formed a steering committee, and has already planned and initiated a wide range of activities.

With the Philadelphia chapter **Pittsburgh** will co-sponsor a statewide issues convention (modeled after the *Airlie Conference*) to be held in suburban **Harrisburg** the weekend of September 19-20. The chapters expect several key young leaders from each of Pennsylvania's 27 congressional districts to participate in discussions such as "Revenue for Pennsylvania," "The Criminal Justice System," "The Public School Mess in Pennsylvania," and "Census 70: Where Have All The People Gone?" Committed to participate at this time are **Philadelphia D. A. Arlen Specter**, U.S. Attorney **Richard Thornburg**, and Judge **Ralph Scalera**, GOP candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

Pittsburg chapter people have also met with Judge **Scalera** and are planning to work on his research staff.

• The New York chapter boasts of three members running for elective office this fall and many others contributing to various campaigns. Running for **Lindsay's** old House seat against Democrat **Ed Koch** is **Peter Sprague**; **Fred Carlin** is a candidate for the 44th Assembly District in **Brooklyn**; and **Martin Geduldig** is running for the 21st Assembly District in **Queens**.

Among the campaigners, **Michael C. Smith** is co-director of *The People for Goodell*, **Tanya Melich** is serving as research director for Senator **Goodell** and chapter president **Richard Zimmer** will be active in **Lowell Weicker's** senatorial campaign in **Connecticut**.

Chapter events have included meetings with **Robert Sweet**, former **Lindsay** deputy mayor and now **Goodell's** campaign manager, **Paul Davidoff** of *Suburban Action*, a group trying to get low cost housing started in the suburbs; and **Basil Paterson**, the Democratic nominee for Lieutenant Governor.

New chapter officers were recently elected. They are: **Richard Zimmer**, president; **Werner Kuhn**, vice president and community affairs chairman; **Robert Musser**, treasurer; **Pam Carson**, membership chairman; **Marianne Magocsi**, research chairman; **Peter Wallison**, finance chairman; **Jon Minikes**, political chairman; **Kit Wisdom**, publicity chairman; and **Don Christ** and **Berna Gorenstein**, program co-chairmen.

• The campus crisis was the topic of a well-attended meeting held by the **Portland** group August 5. A movie, "The Seventh Day," about local campus disturbances was shown, followed by a round-table discussion featuring student leaders and policemen. **Lee Huebner**, former Ripon president and **Nixon** speechwriter, was a guest at the meeting and provided a perspective of the campus crisis across the nation.

The group has sponsored ads in the **Portland Oregonian**, signed by hundreds of business and community leaders, supporting Senators **Packwood** and **Hatfield** in their anti-war efforts.

• **Michael F. Brewer**, Ripon vice president, is among those organizing and deciding on the distribution of funds raised from a series of rock and folk music festivals held around the country. The concerts are designed to aid senatorial and congressional candidates of both parties who have been strong opponents of the war in **Vietnam**. The first concert, held from noon to midnight at **Shea Stadium** in **New York**, featured **Steppenwolf**, **Judy Collins**, **Country Joe**, **Janis Joplin**, **Dionne Warwick**, the **Rascals** and many more. Another concert in the series is scheduled for **Philadelphia** on August 9.

• We have been receiving a considerable number of inquiries about new chapters here at 14a. Chapters are now budding or are well on their way in **Portland, Oregon**; **Detroit**; **Little Rock**; **Pomona, California**; **Cedar Rapids, Iowa**; **Nashville**; **Pittsburgh**; and **Providence**. We've also had interested parties write us from the **University of Alabama**; **Atlanta**; **Springfield, Illinois**; **Columbus, Indiana**; **Louisville**; **Minneapolis-St. Paul**; **Fisk, Missouri**; and the **University of Mississippi**; **Chapel Hill**; **Oberlin, Ohio**; **Syracuse, New York**; various locations in **New Jersey** and **Salt Lake City**. If you live in or near one of these cities we'd like to put you in touch with others interested in forming a Ripon group. Write to **Susan Tharaud** at the Ripon office.

