

Beyond the Marlboro Man

*By the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson**

Too many of the leaders of the Republican Party of the 1960's, instead of coming to grips with the problems of contemporary America, still speak the rhetoric of an "Old Frontier individualism" which has long ceased to be relevant to the realities of an increasingly urban and technological society. Theirs is the nostalgic ideal of the "Marlboro Man" whose impact on his environment — and control over it — was his most enviable attribute; they cannot bring themselves to accept an age of big government, giant corporations, and megalopolis in which the fate of every individual is inextricably bound up with the destiny of our whole society.

OLD FRONTIER INDIVIDUALISM

And so the battered bugles of "Old Frontier individualism" are today summoning the attack on current proposals in the field of general welfare in the same strident tones with which, more than thirty years ago, they sounded the charge against the New Deal. Thus medicare and rent supplements are portrayed as "undermining American values" and "destroying self-reliance"; federal aid to education is seen as synonymous with federal control of education. But the real social needs underlying such programs have gradually produced a broad-based and often bipartisan acceptance of the practical necessity for measures of this type. And, although the old rhetoric continues to attack these programs in terms of fundamental policy, most Americans both in and out of government see in them only issues of method and of administration.

The truth is, of course, that there remains little philosophical disagreement between the major parties on the old issue of governmental responsibility for the general welfare. Both parties seem to assume that those significant problems which still persist — problems such as crime, juvenile delinquency, structural unemployment, racial discrimination, and the urban ghetto — will ultimately yield to massive applications of techniques and resources we already know how to use. The blueprints for such programs are indeed at issue, but neither party really questions whether or not such blueprints should be drawn at all.

LOSS OF IDENTITY

But at the same time as the rhetoric of the Old Frontier is becoming less relevant, a new and potentially disastrous development threatens us: the growing loss, by millions of Americans of their sense of purpose and identity. Living in "little houses made of ticky-tacky" in densely subdivided tracts of sometime Marlboro country, overwhelmed by numbers and size, depressed by ugliness, besieged by advertising, they feel depersonalized and insignificant. While "success-

ful" and "secure" in material terms, they are plagued by a vague anxiety and lack of fulfillment.

Spokesmen for "Old Frontier individualism" do not have the answer, for we cannot go back; nor can we look back to the planners of the welfare state, for the remote bureaucracy which is an inevitable by-product of their plans is in itself a contributor to the crisis. No, the answer must be in a new emphasis on individualism, consciously directed toward so modifying and channeling the irreversible forces of contemporary society as to create new opportunities for individual self-expression and development. Let us call this "creative individualism."

CREATIVE INDIVIDUALISM

Not all the goals of "creative individualism," of course, can or should be made subjects of governmental policies and programs. Something from within must inspire the awareness that there is no greater satisfaction for any individual than in the development and exercise of a talent or skill. Only individuals can decide that these should be objects of their growing leisure. The demand for beauty and clean air and open space is, in the end, personal, not public. Nor is government action necessary to enable the individual, who so desires, to play a meaningful role in voluntary, fraternal, and community associations capable of exerting a significant impact on his social environment. And yet it should be our concern to identify and to invent ways in which government can contribute to the creation as well as to the fulfillment of these aspirations and opportunities.

Within the realm of government itself, one way to begin is by taking positive steps to bring about greater citizen participation in the shaping and administration of governmental programs. We can:

1. Put an end to the practice of assigning operating responsibility for a program to a higher level of government merely because funds are available at that level.
2. Assist lower levels of government to meet their responsibilities through outright revenue sharing, initiation of block grants, simplification of grant-in-aid conditions, and consolidation of project-grant programs.
3. Devise means whereby concerned citizens, as well as the recipients of services, are given a real, rather than a fictitious, role in the formulation of programs aimed at helping them.

*Mr. Richardson is Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has also served as Lieutenant Governor, U.S. Attorney for Massachusetts, and Assistant Secretary for Legislation for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

4. Involve voluntary agencies — hospitals, day care centers, sheltered workshops — in providing needed services through contractual and fee-for-service arrangements with government.

5. Create roles for individuals, some drawn from the community and some professionally expert in counselling and referral, whose function is to serve as points of contact between the people and their government.

6. Establish at each level of government a joint planning mechanism whose designated function is to plan for decentralization.

NEEDED: AN IDEA CORPS

But these are only partial answers. Fully to exploit the potential of "creative individualism"

will require a degree of sustained and concentrated

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

● A late April Harris poll shows that Governor Romney's showing against President Johnson is better than Mr. Nixon's in every geographical area, with every age group, and with Republicans, Democrats and independents.

● Senator Morton took the opportunity April 20 at a dinner party honoring freshman Senator Charles Percy to point out that Senator Percy's housing plan (the National Home Ownership Foundation) was the first bill of "real substance" to gain unanimous GOP backing in the Senate within at least a half-century. Republicans are, said Morton, "providing workable, imaginative solutions" for the nation.

● New evidence continues to confirm the FORUM's recent forecast of a growing Reagan presidential campaign. The California Governor has already scheduled a series of appearances in Oregon next fall and winter, after acknowledging that he plans to leave his name in the spring primary in that state.

"Reagan will have enough convention power to stop anyone and to secure the nomination for someone," an aide to the Governor is reported to have recently remarked. "What we are telling him every day is 'Why can't that someone be you?' Reagan's able and aggressive staff wants to flex its muscle in a presi-

FOCUS ON YOUTH

● In the first state-wide college mock convention in the nation, Massachusetts Y.R.'s meeting at Harvard nominated Senator Charles Percy for President and Senator Mark O. Hatfield for Vice-President. Reaganites stalked out of the convention after they saw that their candidate was being defeated.

● A one-ballot "poll" at the "National Student Leadership Conference" at Yale in April ended: Romney 116; Nixon 96 — an especially surprising result since the conference was organized by predominantly right-wing forces. Muttered Reagan backer John Meyer once termed "Yale's right-wing extremist in residence" and son of *National Review's* Frank Meyer: "When we run 'em honestly, we lose!"

● *Argus*, an independent magazine of the Pacific Northwest, is urging Washington Republicans to nomi-

thought seldom achieved by any active officeholder. And yet the opportunity is one which should particularly appeal to Republicans, since a concern for the individual has traditionally been central to our Party philosophy. The Republican Party's role should be actively to seek out and to support individuals and groups who are dedicated to exploring new and relevant ideas and who can be stimulated to think about the implications of "creative individualism" — and I know of no group more fitted for the purpose than the members and leadership of the Ripon Society.

The challenge is present and palpable. We have only to reach out and grasp it. And so urgent is the issue and so paramount is it sure to become that Republican political leadership can, in responding to it, deserve and win the broader base of public support our Party so earnestly seeks.

dential campaign and frankly expects to get the chance next year. One reason for the rush: its fear that the Governor will seem "too old" in 1972.

● While many reporters and editors are casting an increasingly favorable eye on Illinois Senator Charles Percy, their colleagues at the cartoonist desks are said to be worried about Percy's increasing prominence. The reason: he is so hard to draw, apparently having no facial characteristic which can be easily caricatured.

● April Gallup polls give evidence that the grueling work of seven years continues to pay rewards to Richard Nixon. He remains a three to one favorite of Republican County Chairmen. But those who read the polls in detail were stunned by two items: 1) the amazingly quick and high percentage return by the chairmen of the pollsters questionnaire; 2) the fact that a majority of the Nixon supporters listed Ronald Reagan as their second choice for the U.S. Presidency.

● George Romney has signed on Dr. William Prendergast as top research coordinator for the 1968 campaign. Prendergast worked for the National Committee under William Miller until the "pure" Goldwater men dumped him in 1964. Prendergast then went to work as research director for the House Republican Conference under Melvin Laird.

inate a bold young Republican to oppose aging Democratic Senator Warren Magnuson in '68. The Senator has hired a new staffer whose job it will be to present Magnuson to the youthful electorate as a real "swinger," but *Argus* doubts if the leopard can change his spots at this late stage. One possible candidate for the Republicans: Governor Dan Evans.

● The Democratic National Committee is running into trouble in its attempt to send Congressmen to college campuses to win over young voters. Former Georgia Congressman Charles Weltner, who is in charge of the program, met resistance on Capitol Hill when he tried to recruit Congressional Democrats for the program. Fearful Congressmen told him, "The war is unpopular enough in my district now. The last thing I need is to have a college debate reported in the local paper."

CALIFORNIA: Can Reagan Control His Rightists?

Political cannibalism among the Republicans is a frontrunner for headlines once again in California, and the ramifications of present intra-party struggles extend all the way to the approaching Presidential convention.

Governor Ronald Reagan seems to be trying to avert a storm of right-wing attacks upon incumbent Senator Thomas Kuchel prior to the 1968 primary. State Superintendent of Instruction Max Rafferty, the strongest right-wing Senatorial hopeful and a vociferous backer of Reagan, seems equally determined upon a tempest. Kuchel, however, has strengthened his position somewhat by "peace talks" with the Governor, whom he did not support because Reagan refused to repudiate the John Birch Society.

POLLS SHOW A recent state poll showed Kuchel with 50% of the vote, **KUCHEL LEAD** as opposed to Rafferty's 35%, with 15% undecided. The polls also placed the progressive Senator well in front of his potential Democratic challengers, including Los Angeles' Democratic Mayor Sam Yorty, who quietly backed Reagan in 1966. Other Republicans being mentioned for the Senate nomination are retired Air Force General Curtis LeMay and businessman William Penn Patrick. Among registered Republicans, LeMay drew 10% of the vote and Patrick 3% when pitted against Kuchel's 44% and Rafferty's 27% in a four-way contest.

Kuchel has undoubtedly profited from Reagan's stern admonitions to the right wing, but at least one grass roots target of the Governor's remonstrance, the California Republican Assembly, has served public notice it plans to ignore the Republicans' famous "Eleventh Commandment" of 1966 — "Thou shalt not speak evil of any Republican." California's then State Party Chairman Gailore Parkinson, now in the Nixon camp, propounded the Commandment early in the gubernatorial primary race, ostensibly to avoid bloodletting. Moderates originally chafed under its restrictions but observed them, and are now quick to point out that right-wingers are apparently planning to jump the traces in 1967 to vilify Kuchel.

CRA IGNORES After Reagan's warning to the CRA convention of "It's not your **REAGAN PLEA** duty, responsibility or privilege to tear down or attempt to destroy others in the tent," the 12,000 member group adopted a resolution committing CRA to search for an opponent for Kuchel "in the interest of cooperation and unity." The day before, William Penn Patrick, a cosmetics manufacturer and unsuccessful candidate in the 1966 gubernatorial primary, received resounding applause from the CRA delegates when he called Kuchel's vote for the U.S.-Soviet consular treaty "a vote of treason." CRA's immediate past president Dick Darling, interpreted Reagan's admonition as meaning "we had a right to do this [oppose Kuchel] if we did not slander Mr. Kuchel and if we did not say anything that was not factual."

A look at the long term, however, confirms that Reagan does have high stakes in at least curtailing the mudslinging. He won the governorship of the nation's most populous state with a carefully centered campaign that stressed his personality. Involvement in an old fashioned California Kuchel-chase just prior to the 1968 Presidential convention would give his opposition across the country ammunition to use against him in any move

he may make for the presidency or the vice-presidency. Further, the Governor's well-publicized plans to lead a favorite son delegation to the convention are obviously predicated upon a relatively well meshed Republican Party in California.

REPUBLICAN RESISTENCE As things now stand, Reagan has his hands full in simply trying to stay on top of his new job, fulfill his speaking engagements and learn the ropes of the legislative process. He has already planned a significant and extensive speaking tour into numerous states in late summer with business and Chamber of Commerce leaders to "encourage new industry for California." He has already encountered resistance enough from within his own fellow Republican ranks to disturb his staunch supporters.

Disgruntled Republican leaders, at least two of whom are statewide officeholders elected on the Reagan ticket, are concerned over the Governor's inaccessibility and his apparent resistance to keeping them informed of Administration moves. One legislative veteran, for example, told a group of State employees that the Reagan administration did not intend to jeopardize their jobs. Within days, the Governor's office announced 3,700 job cuts and the closing of fourteen mental health facilities.

Notwithstanding Reagan's ambitions, the political tone of the coming months for the right-wing has been ominously set. Max Rafferty was the keynote speaker at the California Republican Assembly convention this year, and he was introduced by another keynoter of a few years ago, State Senator John Schmitz, an acknowledged John Birch Society member. Rafferty's caustic address was applauded 49 times and he received one standing ovation. He called the Johnson Administration "the most secretive, the most devious and the most untrustworthy" in America's history.

But what was perhaps the most startling was Schmitz's introduction of Rafferty, in which the Orange County Senator said that during the 1962 campaign the State Superintendent of Instruction was "shielded against smears of the ADL by that first name 'Max'." ADL represents the Anti-Defamation League of the B'Nai B'Rith, an organization which has anti-Semitism as its target. Schmitz's little joke got a big laugh.

California Congressman Alphonzo Bell has nimbly illuminated the paradoxical situation now existing regarding Kuchel's nomination. Bell says that since Californians are deliberately trying to retain and further their new-found party harmony by offering their incumbent Governor as a favorite son candidate at the Presidential convention, then why shouldn't they also support their incumbent senior Senator for the same reasons? It is a question the rightists should ponder more carefully.

—MAGGIE NICHOLS
California Correspondent

FOR THE RECORD

The front page article on "Creeping Reaganism" in the March issue of the FORUM attracted national attention. As the first intelligence report on Ronald Reagan's maneuverings for the Republican presidential nomination, it received headline coverage by 87 metropolitan newspapers and was reprinted in full by the *New York Times* and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

GOP INITIATIVES I: The Case of Congressional Reform

Except when a Powell or Dodd episode highlights obvious abuses, many otherwise politically-aware persons tend to consider Congressional reform too dull, intricate, or unimportant to merit close attention. To the party's credit, however, Republican members of the 89th and 90th Congresses have pushed strongly for a series of constructive changes. As a result, an omnibus Congressional reorganization bill — containing major Republican proposals — has now passed the Senate. And in the House, Republicans are now leading an effort to provide real power to the proposed Committee on Standards and Conduct.

The current Republican drive began over four years ago when Congressman Gerald Ford, then Chairman of the House Republican Conference, appointed Iowa Congressman Fred Schwengel head of the Republican Task Force on Minority Staffing. Schwengel, with the aid of news columnists, such as Roscoe Drummond, succeeded in bringing the staffing problem at least to the dim fringes of the national spotlight.

In 1964 Schwengel was defeated in his Congressional race, and Congressman James Cleveland of New Hampshire was appointed chairman of the committee, now renamed the Committee of Congressional Reorganization and Minority Staffing. The combined proposals of the task force were published last fall by McGraw-Hill under the title *We Propose: A Modern Congress*. Some of the major innovations suggested were incorporated into the Joint Committee's recommendations of July 28, 1966.

DEMOCRATIC RESISTANCE

The most important provision of the Joint Committee's bill is the guarantee of adequate staffing for the minority party on Congressional committees. But the Democrats proved their reluctance to accept this basic reform again last month when they defeated a motion by House Republicans that two minority staff members be added to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, a committee which authorizes five billion dollars annually but has only five technical staff advisors and the only major committee whose chairman has denied requests (for four consecutive years) for minority staff representation. The Democrats' action casts doubts on the future of the whole Committee Bill.

In addition to its provisions for minority staffing, the bill, if passed, would give the minority the right to schedule witnesses of its own choice during at least one day of hearings, equal time in the debate on conference reports, and the opportunity to file minority supplemental views with committee reports.

The bill also attempts to limit the power of committee chairmen by restricting the use of proxy votes, by giving a majority of the committee the right to call meetings and to compel the filing of a report or bill, and by requiring hearings and committee meetings to be open to the public more frequently.

Furthermore, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, as the bill is called, seeks to improve the consideration of the budget and the review of the administration of existing laws and techniques of information gathering by Congress. It also broadens the provisions of the Lobbying Regulation Act and establishes standing committees on Standards and Conduct and on Congressional Operation.

Republicans are giving strong support to the bill.

The House Republican Policy Committee publicly endorsed the measure last October; Minority Leader Gerald Ford supported it on nationwide television in his 1967 "State of the Union" message, and Republican members of the Joint Committee have privately urged their colleagues to actively support the measure.

FURTHER ACTION

Moreover, Republicans have gone beyond the Act and have continued to offer suggestions for further reform. Currently Republicans are fighting to give more authority to the proposed Committee on Standards and Conduct. A strong ethics committee has been urged by Ford and a group of forty-three freshmen Republicans, and is embodied in the substitute bill (H.R. 2595) of Congressman Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, ranking House Republican on the Joint Committee.

Other Republican proposals have been voiced in *We Propose*, in Ford's "State of the Union" message, and in the supplemental views of the report of the Joint Committee. Senator Clifford Case has proposed that members of Congress be required to disclose their financial interests; Congressman Ford has urged the passage of a "clean elections" law before 1968, requiring full and accurate reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures.

Congressmen Curtis, Durward Hall, and James Cleveland have urged greater protection of the rights of witnesses appearing before Congressional committees. The three have also proposed a new Committee on Procedures and Policies, to be chaired by a member of the party other than the President's, which would insure that appropriated funds are spent in accordance with law. Many other Republicans have urged a fundamental re-examination of the seniority system.

TWO-FOLD REWARD

Republican initiatives toward Congressional reform could reap a two-fold reward in coming months. The party's efforts exemplify the progressive steps members are capable of taking on important issues, even when not hounded by public opinion. Republicans can point proudly to the results during the coming campaigns. Furthermore, if the Reorganization Act is passed, its provisions guaranteeing minority rights should provide the Republican Congressional delegation many more opportunities to build a forward-looking program for 1968.

—J.R.E.

Recent Publications on Congressional Reform

- Galloway, George B., *The Legislative Process in Congress*, N.Y.: Crowell, 6th Printing, 1964.
- House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, *We Propose: A Modern Congress*, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Morgan, Donald G., *Congress and the Constitution: A Study of Responsibility*, Cambridge, 1966.
- Saloma, John S., III, *The Responsible Use of Power: A Critical Analysis of the Congressional Budgetary Process*, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1964.
- Truman, David B., ed., *The Congress and America's Future*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- U.S., Congress, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, S. Report 1414, 89th Congress, 2nd session, July 28, 1966.

GOP INITIATIVES II: The All-Volunteer Army

The draft is becoming a partisan issue in American politics, and as the Ripon Society predicted, the Democrats are lining up on the wrong side. Following the Administration's lead, Democrats are supporting a program of continued compulsion which sees no hope of ever ending monthly draft calls. Republicans, to their credit, are now calling for a voluntary army.

This political division was not inevitable. The year-long Department of Defense draft study, the seven-month Marshall Commission examination, and the eight-month Clark Commission study could have explored the many ways of increasing the number of volunteers to the armed forces. But each failed this fundamental duty.

COMMISSION FAILURES

The Marshall Commission typifies this failure. The Commission invited not a single advocate of the volunteer army to testify before its closed door sessions. And of the fifty-odd papers prepared for the Commission, only one dealt with voluntary manpower procurement, and that paper was written by an economist who worked on the 1964-65 Defense Department draft study and who does not personally advocate the voluntary approach.

With this inadequate background, it is little wonder that the volunteer system discussed in the Commission's report is not the system proposed by any advocates of voluntarism. The Commission's report assumes that a volunteer approach would eliminate the draft mechanism entirely and provide no replacement to cover emergencies. On the contrary, many voluntarism proponents accept the necessity for a continually updated back-up draft, while others would rely instead on professional and truly ready Reserve units. Either of these alternatives would meet the "overriding" objection of the Commission — that "the sudden need for greater numbers of men would find the nation without the machinery to meet it." Combined they would provide far greater manpower flexibility in emergencies than the lottery alone or the clogged pipeline of selective service.

Most Congressional Democrats have, however, quietly accepted the Commission's proposal for a lottery draft, although some, such as House Armed Services chairman L. Mendel Rivers, still long for universal military training. With minor revisions, the lottery could be acceptable as a transition to the all-volunteer force or as a back-up draft. But the Democrats have not suggested it be a transition in any way. Instead they seem to have accepted the acronym tacked onto the program by President Johnson — FAIR (for Fair And Impartial Random System) — as an accurate description of its procedures.

REPUBLICAN ACTION

Yet the lottery is fundamentally unfair. And Republicans are beginning to unite behind the volunteer substitute. In his maiden speech, Senator Mark Hatfield pointed out that the lottery "does not remedy the basic inequity of the draft: the injustice of forcing one man to serve while another is allowed his liberty. . . . The lottery just makes this denial of liberty a little more arbitrary." Senator Hatfield then introduced a bill calling for the establishment of an all-volunteer military. He quickly gained public support from Senator Brooke and private expressions of active interest from many colleagues, including the other freshman Republican Senators.

On the House side, Republicans Curtis and Rumsfeld have called for the release of all the working papers of the Marshall Commission (now in the hands of President Johnson) so Congressmen can come to their own conclusions. A "Dear Colleague" letter from the two criticizing the Commission's procedures received unsolicited responses favorable to the volunteer approach from both Senators and Congressmen. And the Wednesday Club is conducting an exhaustive study of the feasibility of the all-voluntary military.

Furthermore, Governor Romney has outlined a volunteer approach to the procurement problem, and one of his staff aides, Bruce Chapman, has written the only current book about the draft issue (*The Wrong Man in Uniform*) which also endorses voluntarism.

INCENTIVES TO STAY

Republican support for a volunteer army is not merely a response to the basic injustice of the lottery or any other draft at a time when America can afford to abolish conscription. An equally important consideration is the needs of modern armed forces. As the Cordiner Defense Commission under President Eisenhower stated ten years ago: "It is foolish for the Armed Services to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and then not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate and maintain such equipment. . . . The solution here, of course, is not to draft more men to stand and look hopelessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives required to make them want to stay in the service long enough and try hard enough to take these higher responsibilities, gain the skill and experience levels we need and then remain to give the services the full benefit of their skills."

Thus, at a time when youths most value their freedom and individuality, when they increasingly oppose being regimented into a system of nameless numbers, the Democrats have proposed a new draft — Computerized Compulsion — which merely dispenses old injustices more efficiently. Republicans should continue to push for a volunteer army — a true reform that will build an effective, efficient, professional military while extending the most fundamental freedom of choice to those under twenty-five.

—T.A.B.

On November 30, 1966, the Ripon society released its research paper, "Politics and Conscription" calling for a gradual phasing-out of the draft and for its replacement by an all-volunteer military (see December FORUM). The paper received nationwide coverage and editorial support. In his "Letter from Washington" in the December 17 NEW YORKER, Richard Rovere described it as "a report that is not only bold, partisan, and specific in its recommendations but at the same time uncommonly lucid and vigorous . . . an unpromising document." Ripon's proposal was presented at the University of Chicago's Conference on the Draft in December, at MODERATOR magazine's Leadership Conference on Voluntary National Service in February, and was read into the Congressional Record by Congressman Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois. Chicago economist Milton Friedman gave it favorable mention in a NEWSWEEK article (December 19, 1966), and Bruce Chapman, an author of Ripon's proposal, has written about it for NATIONAL REVIEW (March 21, 1967). Copies of "Politics & Conscription" may be purchased from the Society for 50 cents per single copy, 30 cents each for orders of ten or more, or ten cents each for orders of 100 or more.

Opportunity in Connecticut

The fall of Connecticut's Senator Thomas Dodd is only the surface indication of the growing division and weakness in the Democratic Party that eight months ago administered a stunning defeat to the GOP. A startling reversal is possible if Connecticut Republicans, who were then both factionalized and fratricidal, can take advantage of the opportunity.

The Democrats' battle lines for their own intra-party contests have been hardened for some time, but they became plainly visible in the aftermath of the Senate Ethics Committee's recommendation of censure of Dodd.

INDIGESTIBLE PROPOSAL

New Haven Democratic Town Chairman Arthur Barbieri, Dodd's chief political ally, announced that he would stage yet another of his famed \$100-a-plate testimonials, this time openly advertising that all proceeds would go directly to the Senator for his personal use and enjoyment, as a demonstration of "our faith and respect for Tom Dodd." When Dodd objected, Barbieri's modest response was, "I think my judgment is better than his at this time."

Reaction from all sides was swift. The New Haven Ripon Chapter issued a strong attack on Barbieri; an ad hoc group, "Citizens for Clean Government," picketed New Haven City Hall and Barbieri's office; and Democratic Governor John Dempsey, state and national party chairman John Bailey, and New Haven Mayor Richard C. Lee — all arch-enemies of the Dodd-Barbieri axis — announced they would not attend such a testimonial. And Democratic Senator Abraham Ribicoff branded the whole scheme as "outrageous."

Republican Achievements

● Noted: a recent flood of columns and stories on Republican successes in the states — too often ignored by the narrow focus of the national spotlight. For example, in a number of recent *New York Times* columns, Tom Wicker has advised a Republican campaign based on the successful performance of Republican Governors. Wicker cites the strong records of Maryland's Spiro Agnew and New Mexico's David Cargo as new additions in an increasingly impressive line-up.

Wrote Wicker: "If [Republicans] . . . seize the moment to develop effective state approaches to what seems no longer manageable at the national level, they can go to the people for the first time since Theodore Roosevelt's day as the party of innovation and action, new vision and new blood.

"In that case, it might no longer be enough for the Democrats to stand pat against Herbert Hoover while putting one more coat of paint on the program of Franklin Roosevelt."

● The staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee took a first step towards developing a Republican consensus on Vietnam by releasing a well-documented white paper early this month. The paper raised fundamental questions of national interest and Republican responsibility. If the party is to meet that responsibility, then calm, reasoned, and structured discussion among party leaders must soon be carried much further.

● Colorado Governor John Love signed the nation's most progressive abortion law last month. The law liberalizes the requirements for abortion but guards

DEMOCRATS SPLIT

Amidst the clamor, Barbieri withdrew his plan. But the damage was already done. The Democratic split was in the open and available for Republican exploitation. The feud between Barbieri and Lee could give the Republicans several of New Haven's Alderman positions this fall.

But the big prize could be Senator Ribicoff's seat in 1968. If the GOP fields an attractive Presidential candidate and retains its fragile "era of good feelings" among factions, Ribicoff could be replaced. In 1962 Ribicoff garnered only 52% of the vote. His vote on the resolution of censure costs him dearly — for it alienates one faction without gaining promises of support from the other.

GOP HARMONY ESSENTIAL

Yet for Republicans to capitalize on these openings, one condition is absolutely essential — a continuation of their uneasy party harmony. The new state chairman, Howard Hausman, was elected with the backing of a coalition united primarily by a bitter opposition to former chairman A. Searle Pinney. Hausman has repeatedly pledged that he will conduct no purges and that former Pinney backers, mostly moderates and liberals, are welcome in the Party.

If Hausman is successful in promoting cooperation and communication between liberals and conservatives, the Connecticut GOP can look ahead to a bright future. Ray Bliss has shown that peace between factions is possible with a non-partisan chairman. Hausman has at least a fighting chance — the smell of victory is in the air.

against abuses by requiring that a three-doctor board in an accredited hospital agree unanimously that legal conditions are met.

One of the chief sponsors of the bill, Republican State Senator John R. Birmingham, said the new law would help prevent the estimated five thousand deaths a year in the U.S. from illegal abortions.

● New York City's Democrats recently gutted the Johnson Administration's model city programs for their town by drastically cutting Mayor Lindsay's suggested matching appropriation for the projects. As a result, the Lindsay-led GOP is again on the side of urban progress, which is where the votes are.

● In his first address on the floor of the Senate Tennessee's Howard H. Baker, Jr. introduced a bill to begin immediately federal revenue sharing with the states. Co-sponsored by 15 Republicans, the proposal would commit to tax-sharing one per cent of the amount remaining of the total federal revenues after defense spending and debt service costs are subtracted. To date, pressure by the administration to kill any tax sharing bill in this Congress has prevented any Democratic Senators from co-sponsoring the bill, although all were invited.

Fellow freshman Mark O. Hatfield from Oregon in his maiden speech introduced a bill to provide for an early transition to a fully volunteer military. Noting that "reduced to its simplest terms, the personnel problem appears to be a matter of quality as opposed to quantity," the Senator challenged the myth that the draft is inevitable.

A Conservative Speaks Out About China

Conservative Congressman Paul Findley (ninety per cent ACA rating) chose a Ripon Society audience for launching his new position in favor of seeking immediate diplomatic relations with Communist China.

Quoting Winston Churchill, Findley declared, "The reason for having diplomatic relations [with China] is not to confer a compliment but to secure a convenience."

Findley, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Chairman of the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community, emphasized three points:

(1) Diplomatic relations would not imply approval; only recognition that the government is in effective control of the country. Moral condemnation of Chinese policies is one thing; diplomatic representation is something entirely different.

(2) Our commitment to Formosa would not be weakened. Our posture in Formosa is a purely defensive one, and because it is a symbol of our resistance

to Communism we cannot and will not abandon in any way that posture and commitment. Recognition of China is not such an abandonment.

(3) Diplomatic exchanges will not strengthen China. China is already strong, and our policy of isolation has kept us from first-hand knowledge of the men and the processes that in seventeen years have turned a sleeping giant into a nuclear power. Nor would recognition weaken other Asia nations, most of whom already have diplomatic contact with China.

On the other hand, stated Congressman Findley, a realistic policy toward China might bring about, however slowly, desirable results — an especially urgent consideration in view of the Vietnam war. Mr. Findley indicated that among these benefits would be better sources of information about China's policies and attitudes; better communication that might prevent or diminish prospects of war, and a chance that diplomatic relations might cause a moderation of Chinese conduct (which our isolationist attitude has not).

Across the Spectrum

● A lawsuit by Linus Pauling is seriously draining the financial resources of NATIONAL REVIEW. In a letter to potential contributors dated April 18, 1967, William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote: "I bring news that is the worst in the history of the magazine. Our publishing deficit in 1966 exceeded \$250,000 and the result is that NATIONAL REVIEW is in danger of discontinuing, indeed must do so on May 15, unless you decide otherwise."

● The American Conservative Union has updated its study of the Ripon Society. Updated, to the ACU, means the report is now only one year behind the times in most areas. But the garbled version of Ripon history, activities, and personnel — entitled "The Ripon Society Report: The Influence of Liberals Within the Republican Party" — now runs thirty-nine pages instead of thirty. The ACU concludes that Ripon is the "tip of the iceberg" of Republican liberal action.

In a later fund-raising letter, the ACU opens its financial pitch by styling the Ripon Society as "the Liberals' intellectual shock troops" who have a "winning strategy" and "are making alarming progress."

● About the middle of March word came out that the Indiana Senate (controlled by Democrats) passed a resolution to abolish the Indiana House (controlled by Republicans). It is our understanding that no affirmative action was taken by the House on this and that it has been suggested recently that more efficiency would result and more money would be saved if the Senate were to substitute itself for the House in the resolution.

● Barry Goldwater has written a "Dear Fellow Conservative" letter to raise money for yet another right-wing magazine, a new monthly edited by "my old and dear friend," Brent Bozell, "the man most instrumental in helping me with my book *Conscience of a Conservative*." Bozell may also have been instrumental in helping Goldwater with the letter. It argues, for example, that "Secularism, Materialism and Liberalism" are threatening to replace "God and the traditional Christian and conservative values." The new magazine, says the letter,

is a voice in defense of "the Christian West."

Bozell, incidentally, is an active Roman Catholic layman who has written that America must vanquish Communism by taking full advantage of the Christian's readiness to die. The nation can do this by provoking a showdown with Russia and sending American bombers over Moscow with a quick, sudden "stroke in the night."

Our Readers Write

ON THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Gentlemen:

I find your *Negative Income Tax Proposal* both lucid and well-reasoned.

Please accept an additional contribution for your work. It is difficult for a man with at least some minimum of compassion and love of liberty to be a Republican. You help.

HERBERT JOHN BLITZ
New York City

Gentlemen:

I hope I read this column right. Does it mean people such as myself can get funds to live on without red tape, and that welfare will be discontinued? I sure hope so, since I don't have any kind of income to live on now. It would be a big blessing and a relief to get rid of Welfare. It just throws the taxpayers' money down the drain — giving it to people who are healthy and able to work while people that need it cannot get it. Even if you're on the list you have to wait six to eight weeks, or maybe longer, before you get aid, and they will not permit you to have any money to live for that length of time. You get along the best way you can or go without. That is why I really hope and pray to God I am right about the report in the newspaper. I am a widow. There are more like me that need help now. I am not able to work.

MRS. M. DROAF
St. Louis, Missouri

1430 MASS. AVE.: Changing of the Guard

The Ripon National Governing Board convened in New York April 8-9 for its semi-annual meeting and the election of new officers. Lee W. Huebner of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, and Cambridge, Massachusetts, was elected national president. Huebner, a Teaching Fellow in American History at Harvard University, heads the Boston Chapter and has been a member of the Governing Board since the Society's founding in 1962. Past president John S. Saloma III, who is retiring in order to devote more time to his professional research responsibilities, remains in close touch with the Society as a member-at-large on the Board. Other officers selected for the coming year were:

Vice-President: John Price, New York, a former Rhodes Scholar now with the law firm of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf.

Secretary: Michael Smith, New Haven, a second-year student at Yale Law School.

Treasurer: Christopher Beal, Boston, a Ph.D. candidate in International Finance at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Medford, Massachusetts.

Chapter representatives on the Board will include:

Southern California: Melvin Bernstein, Robert Fagley, Edward McAniff

New York: Edward Cabot, Eugene Marans, Peter Wallison

New Haven: Howard Gillette, Michael Smith, Richard Zimmer

Boston: Lee Auspitz, Robert Beal, Robert Behn
Members-at-Large: Thomas Brown, Stuart Parsons, Thomas Petri, Quincy Rogers, John Saloma.

The Executive Committee of the Board will consist of Huebner, Price, C. Beal, Smith, Behn, and McAniff.

The major topics discussed at the meeting included national expansion, budget and finance, FORUM policy, research and political affairs. Dr. Saloma addressed the Board on trends in the American two-party system and on Republican prospects for 1968 and beyond.

NEW YORK

The New York Chapter also held its local elections this month, selecting the following officers: John Price (President), Peter Wallison (Vice-President), Edward Cabot (Treasurer), Berna Goldstein (Secretary), Eugene Marans (Research Director). Members-at-large for the Executive Board are: Jim Clark, Donald Crist, Frits Dulles, Arch Gillies, Stanley Stillman, and Jason Gettinger. Mr. Gettinger was also named FORUM correspondent.

Deputy Mayor of New York Robert Sweet met with the Chapter on April 13 to discuss the political problems of a fusion administration in its relationship to the regular party organization and other problems currently facing the Lindsay Administration. The Chapter also engaged in an informal discussion of Viet Nam with several members of the Columbia University faculty including Professor Reese who serves as the Ripon faculty sponsor at the Law School.

NEW HAVEN

Doug Bailey, of Republican Research Associates, was guest speaker at a New Haven Chapter dinner on April 18 which preceded their installation of the following new officers: Michael Smith (President), Richard Zimmer (Executive Director), and Marfy Zimmer (Secretary). Executive Board members for the Chapter will include Bill Craig, Warren Deras, Larry DeNardis, Howard Gillette, Bobbie Greene, David Martin, and Walter Rockenstein.

The New Haven Chapter also met during the month with Arlen Specter, Republican candidate for mayor of Philadelphia, and with Senator Mark Hatfield. Chapter president Michael Smith represented Ripon at a panel discussion at Yale on "Selective Service and the Pursuit of Equity." Other panel members included Burke Marshall, Chairman of the President's Advisory Commission on Selective Service; Kingman Brewster, President of Yale and a member of the Commission; and Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army.

SAN FRANCISCO

Three San Francisco Ripon associate-members attended the Dorchester Conference in Gearhart, Oregon, during March. The conference brought together 350 of Oregon's leading Republicans to discuss a series of long-range issues including state tax reform, Federal-state tax sharing, pollution controls, and space exploration priorities. In his keynote address, Clay Myers, Oregon's new Secretary of State, called for more party effort to recruit younger members.

BOSTON

The progressive new Congressman from Dayton, Ohio, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., visited Boston Ripon recently to discuss the Negative Income Tax proposal. Congressman Whalen then advocated the system before a large audience at Ohio State University during a panel discussion with Harvard Professors John Kenneth Galbraith and Seymour Martin Lipset and Minnesota Senator Walter Mondale. The Chapter, together with the Harvard Business School Republicans, met with Massachusetts' Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson, whose article appears on page 1 of this FORUM.

FUN ON THE TELEPHONE

"I never knew you could have so much fun on the telephone." So spoke MIT economist and Ripon member Duncan Foley at the conclusion of a telephonic discussion with students and professors at Grinnell College in Iowa on Ripon's proposal for a Negative Income Tax. The one hour and fifteen minute session included both a brief lecture and a lengthy question and answer period. The program was sponsored by the Grinnell College Young Republican Club headed by George Wittgraf, and linked Foley and Christopher Beal in Ripon's Cambridge office with 70 listeners on the Iowa campus.

P.O. BOX 138, a worthy column for the past nine months, was forced to restyle itself this month as 1430 MASS. AVE. Its switch reflects the change of our mailing address to our office location.

THE RIPON SOCIETY is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic, and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, with chapters in Boston, Los Angeles, New Haven, and New York, and National Associate members in all the fifty states. The Society speaks through its monthly newsletter, The Ripon FORUM, published since 1965. The Society offers the following options to those who wish to subscribe to its publications and support its programs:

FORUM: \$10 annually
FORUM (student): \$5 annually
Contributor: \$25 or more annually
Sustainer: \$100 or more annually
Founder: \$1000 or more annually

THE RIPON SOCIETY

1430 Mass. Ave., Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
(Acting editor: Terry A. Barnett)