

RIPON FORUM

THE RIPON SOCIETY HAS MOVED.
THE NEW ADDRESS IS:
1609 CONNECTICUT AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009

APRIL 15, 1975

VOL. XI, No. 8

50 CENTS

Commentary: The President

FORD VERSUS REAGAN: SEE THEM IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

by Dick Behn

There is less and less talk these days about Gerald Ford walking away from the 1976 presidential race, but there is more and more talk about a lively round of Republican primaries featuring a Republican incumbent. Given the deadly dynamics within the Democratic Party, the GOP contest could be relatively lively. It could also divert badly needed media attention away from Democrats seeking to boost their national recognition and charisma.

The possibilities for a new conservative party are not dead, but they are dormant and increasingly subservient to the political ambitions of leaders like Ronald Reagan and James Buckley who think they need the GOP in 1976. Conservatives have already out-organized Ford. In the past few months alone, they have set up the Conservative Caucus (to build a conservative network), the Committee on Conservative Alternatives (to evaluate the need for a third party), and an unnamed committee headed by Buckley "to watch the President with care over the next months." One participant in this watchdog group, U.S. Rep. Philip Crane, urged the Conservative Political Action Conference in February to prepare "for a knock-down, drag-out fight that will guarantee we've got the delegate strength at the Republican convention to nominate Ronald Reagan." Ford's weakness is additionally reflected in the views of a former Rocky Mountain state chairman, who says: "For one, I believe that the party will be best served by thanking, then excusing, the Ford-Rockefeller Administration, and looking elsewhere."

Ford will be helped by the recent positive turn of economic indicators, but he will undoubtedly be damaged by a continuation of the recent foreign policy disasters suffered by the Administration. Many of Ford's conservative critics are unreconcilable at this point. His best hope to quell the revolution on the Republican Right lies not in appeasing their political whims, but in strengthening his political popularity among the American electorate by forceful economic and international leadership. Events have not been kind to Gerald Ford in this regard, but conservatives have even less regard for kindness. Vice President Nelson Rockefeller's refusal to recognize Sen. James Allen (D-Ala.) in the Senate filibuster debates may have unalterably ruined the President's reputation among conservatives. The issue was an important one for conservatives like Mississippi GOP State Chairman Clarke Reed, who thinks a third party is "absolutely preposterous." For Reed, the filibuster issue was "symbolic" of the Administration's willingness to court southern conservatives. Says Reed: "It doesn't take a lot to go along in the South."

Some of the most prominent non-signers of the recent GOP loyalty oath circulated among Republican officials were hard-line conservatives like U.S. Reps. Robert Bauman (R-Md.) and John Ashbrook (R-Ohio). Ford's advocacy of a broadened Republican Party is particular galling to Republican conservatives. After the President's speech to the Republican Leadership Conference in March, columnist James J. Kilpatrick wrote: "With his challenge last Friday night, Mr. Ford asked for an intra-party fight. Former Governor Reagan is eager to give it to him... A Reagan candidacy would put some life in the moribund GOP; he could offer a choice, not an echo. It doesn't have to be an ugly collision, marked by blood and lacerations. Mr. Reagan has only to say to the President, in the friendliest possible way, See you in New Hampshire."

Reagan may not have to go to New Hampshire, however. Gov. Meldrim Thomson (R-N.H.), who heads Howard Phillips' Conservative Caucus, has indicated that it is "definitely a possibility" that he will enter the New Hampshire presidential primary—even though he would prefer to see Reagan make the race. Says New Hampshire GOP National Committeeman Robert Bass, Jr., who is not aligned with the Thomson wing of the party, "Reagan could do very well. He could win the darned thing." A Thomson candidacy, by contrast, could be a political plus for the President, despite the full support that Thomson would command from the Manchester Union-Leader. The erstwhile American Party member would provide a fitting contrast to Ford's statesmanship.

Ford's failure to organize his supporters has distressed some admirers. In one of his syndicated columns, former Ford Press Secretary Jerald F. terHorst criticized Ford's laissez-faire party leadership and said: "He refrains from leaning on party leaders and has empowered no agent to do it in his name. If he really is running, Republicans ask themselves, why doesn't he behave like other ambitious presidents and knock some heads together and strive to unify the party behind him?" According to the Washington Post's Lou Cannon, Ford has begun to make tentative steps to set up his campaign apparatus. Two former Wisconsin congressmen, John W. Byrnes and Melvin Laird, are likely picks to direct the organization.

Already, comparisons are being made between Eugene McCarthy in 1968 and Ronald Reagan in 1976. It's a distasteful comparison for some, but perhaps the challenge of a vigorous primary campaign is what the emaciated GOP needs. ■

Commentary: Social Security	PENALTY OF THE PROLIFIGATE PAST
	by James L. Monroe and Richard W. Rahn

The debates that preceded passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 and that accompanied the Social Security System's various crises in subsequent years have spawned millions of words in print, in bar-side conversation, in Congress, and in bureaucratic policy meetings. The headlines of 1975 are typical of every period: "Read Debt 170 Billion," "Social Security Defended; Attacks Called a Disservice," "Heading Toward a Socialist Society," "Economic Band-aids for Gaping Recessionary Wounds," "Social Security Deficit," "Social Security Panel Asks Aid"...

The rhetoric has been impassioned but superficial, sincere but confusing. Charges have been leveled in partisan politics and in dusty academic treatises with some accuracy, but the allegations have always been restricted to "the trouble" or "the problem." Rarely have critics addressed themselves to solutions. Mired in this rhetoric, the voters have encouraged a compliant Congress to worship the regressive payroll tax, to ignore prudent fiscal policies, and to bequeath to future generations the cancerous obligation of \$850 billion. That sum will be required to make past and future payments for services to contributors to the federal pension systems. (This total includes \$550 billion in unfunded obligations for social security, over \$100 billion in military retirement, more than \$84 billion for civil service retirement, and liabilities in excess of \$116 billion projected for congressional pensions, Foreign Service pensions, federal courts, Railroad Retirement, etc. The only federal system which is fully funded and viable is the Tennessee Valley Authority Retirement System.)

Originally, Social Security and other federal pension systems were designed to:

- assure that minimal financial needs were met for wage earners in the retirement years;
- protect wage earners against catastrophic disability;
- insure contributors' equities, thus meeting survivors' (widows' and orphans') basic monetary needs; and
- provide for voluntary participation of all citizens when private pension plans and savings failed to meet other needs.

The fact, however, is that we have perverted the original intent of establishing a voluntary insured pension system for all citizens. We have permitted it to become loaded with unsound pay-out procedures and damaging welfare measures which were not contemplated at the outset. Welfare needs can be met with crisis intervention techniques and short-term programs. Retirement systems can and must be prudently planned. Such planning might include the following five components:

1. Establish a National Pension Trust. The charter of a National Pension Trust as a Government Corporation similar to COMSAT, TVA, or the Highway Trust Fund will remove pension budgets

<p>THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in District of Columbia, chapters in fifteen cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of subchapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions and revenues from its publications and contract work.</p> <p>THE RIPON FORUM is published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices. Contents are copyrighted © 1975 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)</p> <p>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 labeled.</p>	<p>SUBSCRIPTION RATES are \$15 a year, \$7.50 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$6 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.</p> <p>Editor: Dick Behn</p> <p>Editorial Board: Robert D. Behn, Chairman Robert H. Donaldson James Manahan</p> <p>Tanya Melich Robert G. Stewart Ralph Thayer</p> <p>Contributing Editors: Clifford Brown, Glenn Gerstell, William A. Koelsch, Daniel J. Swillinger, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Richard W. Rahn, John A. Rehfuss, Thomas A. Sargent, Richard Cleveland, Mark Frazier, Peter Berg, Martin Sours, and William K. Woods.</p> <p>Technical Editor: Brian McCarthy</p>
---	--

and management from the various agencies which now manage the fifteen federal systems, simplify, and standardize their procedures, and introduce equity into what is now a quixotic national nightmare.

2. Through sale of interest-paying Treasury obligation to the Trust over a period of years, the initial steps toward sound funding of the Trust would be taken. Future contributions by earners and employers would be made directly to the fund on the basis of a percentage of total contributor income, instead of the present regressive payroll tax system. Investment of the Trust would be initially restricted to purchase of government debt obligations; this tactic would reduce the government debt burden on the capital market and provide a more equitable distribution of the interest benefits of the government debt among the nation's population. Most importantly, this device will provide the Trust with a growing source of income separate from direct tax contributions.

3. Assure equitable and actuarially sound payments based on contributions. Payout procedures and guidelines must be revised to accommodate the more flexible and broader base of the Trust and its earnings. Only the amount of money paid into the fund during the earning years by the earner and his employer will be permitted as criterion for benefits. All accrued contributions and earnings from their use will become the inviolable property of each participant or his survivors; the contributions will be held "on call" for flexible annuity payments determined in agreement with the contributor.

4. Allow individuals who are otherwise sufficiently protected to "opt out" of the system. As originally conceived, there is no reason why those citizens who have appropriate private retirement and disability plans at least equal to those of Social Security or other contributory plans should have to remain in the system. Specifications and regulations would be promulgated to define qualified plans whose benefits would be assured through portability, vesting, and sound management. Similarly, private-plan participants should be permitted to "opt into" the Trust through the transfer of their privately-vested funds into the federal Trust. The restoration of this voluntary provision will provide healthy competition among the private and public systems and reduce administrative costs.

5. Review national welfare needs in the light of improved pensions and a resulting invigorated economy. Introduction of equity and standardization of benefits as a result of the above-recommended adjustments may require some stand-by emergency measures for implementation by welfare agencies until the fiscal "slack" is removed from benefit payments by increased Trust fund earnings. For example, many recipients are now receiving benefits far above the total of their contributions plus interest; supplemental income payments may be necessary to these individuals. In addition, new bureaucratic independence must be provided for the administration of Medicare, Unemployment and Disability Insurance, which previously have been a part of the federal Trust systems.

Inauguration of a federally-guaranteed Investment Fund of the magnitude required to put Social Security and other federal pensions on a sound footing will require higher social security taxes in the short run, but will result in significantly lower social security taxes over the long run. Since the Investment Fund will purchase federal government debt obligations, it will lead to substantially lower federal demands on the capital market. Thus, more private investment capital will be available at lower interest rates. More capital availability at lower interest will serve to stimulate economic growth. Higher social security taxes will be deflationary and hence should only be implemented after the nation is well out of the recession and developing new inflationary pressures.

Financial security for the aging is a requirement in all societies. The more advanced industrial societies intrude more upon the traditional bases of family integrity and mutual support, and thus require bolder measures to achieve this goal. But the search for that goal must not abrogate the other elements which contribute to the strength of the social fabric. In America, much of our societal strength is in our economic "muscle," our capital. We cannot continue to systematically deplete that strength through unsound and capricious expenditures. ■

1975 RIPON SOCIETY ISSUES CONFERENCE

April 19, 9 a.m.-4 p.m.

University Club

76 East Monroe Street

Chicago, Illinois

Panels: Health Care, The Economy,
Foreign Relations, and Party Reform

1975 RIPON SOCIETY ANNUAL DINNER

April 19, 7:30 p.m.

Speakers: Sen. Charles Percy and
U.S.Rep. John Anderson

Cost: \$20; \$35/couple; \$15/student

University Club, 76 East Monroe Street,
Chicago, Illinois

For reservations: Ripon Society, Rm.640, 120 So. LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.60603

POLITICS: THE GOP

PROPOSED: A REPUBLICAN NATIONAL ISSUES CONFERENCE

by Larry Pressler

The Republican National Committee has recognized the need for correcting the GOP's deadly image problem with the American people, who perceive the 'GOP as an untrustworthy party favoring big business, the organized, and the wealthy. The RNC's solution is to embark on a major advertising campaign. While any new attempt to improve communication with the public is admirable, such efforts will be fruitless unless Republicans first tackle the more profound problems of finding solutions to the current troubles facing the country. Today's electorate cares little about our past achievements; it wants effective programs for today's problems.

In my opinion, Republicans need a major new effort to define and articulate our philosophy for dealing with the problems facing the country. The last attempt to do so was at the 1972 Republican National Convention in Miami Beach, when a platform was adopted which was largely dictated by an incumbent Nixon Administration whose policies were then supported by a majority of the American public. The myriad of unprecedented events and national crises which have arisen since that convention make it mandatory for the GOP to rethink and rearticulate its philosophy.

To their credit, a number of House GOP leaders are already working behind the scenes to formulate a package of fresh legislative proposals---as alternatives to those offered by the Democrats. While such activity is an encouraging sign of vitality, it is only a partial prescription for dealing with the ailments currently afflicting the entire party. What Republicans need is a new opportunity to meet on a grand scale for the purpose of hammering out a comprehensive program for the nation. We need a National Issues Conference on the order of the Democrats' miniconvention held last year in Kansas City. Comprised of Republicans from all states and all levels of government and of rank-and-file activists as well as interested members of the public, a National Issues Conference would be charged with the task of developing constructive Republican policies for our nation's economic dilemmas, energy needs, international goals, and other pressing problems.

Such a conference would provide Republicans with an institutional framework and a formal method of developing short- and long-range programs for the country. Equally important from the standpoint of preserving the two-party system, we would be forced to come to grips with who we are and where we want the nation to be headed. To be sure, such a conference would inevitably compete with some viewpoints being initiated from the White House. However, President Ford has demonstrated a refreshing willingness to listen to varying viewpoints within his own Cabinet; one would hope he would welcome fresh input from members of his party. Further, given the fact that President Ford was neither nominated by his party nor elected by the people, the Republican rank-and-file have an obligation to articulate their views on how to get America moving.

A mass meeting of Republican minds would also lead to some conservative-liberal conflicts. Some might suggest that it could end in a hopeless deadlock without tangible results. Such is the risk any political party must be willing to take. To avoid meeting together because of divergent opinions, would be to shrink from our responsibility to the American people. As Washington Post columnist David Broder recently wrote, "The citizens of this country in recent years have it a matter of faith---of passionate, buring conviction---that party labels don't amount to a hill of beans." Unless we make a major effort to inject revelance and substance behind the Republican name, the party itself will amount to less than that. ■

Politics: Massachusetts

THE LIBERAL SCHIZOPHRENIC AS GOVERNOR

by Peter Berg

The declining revenues and increasing costs facing new, liberal, Democratic governors like Jerry Brown in California, Hugh Carey in New York, and Michael Dukakis in Massachusetts threaten to breed a group of schizoid chief executives. Could the Marquis de Sade have been crueler than to assign former advocates of social programs to be those programs' future executioners?

In Massachusetts, Michael Dukakis, a 41-year-old attorney and former maverick state representative, holds the axe---or "meat cleaver," as he describes it. He is a curious phenomenon as a liberal cost-cutter who is all business---and maybe not so liberal. Massachusetts voters last fall believed his bumper strip slogan: "Mike Dukakis should be governor." And although six men, including Republican incumbent Frank Sargent, thought they too should be governor, probably none of them today envy Dukakis' tasks.

The Massachusetts budget deficit is enormous, but a tax increase could puncture the already-deflated state economy. Program cuts---big ones in sensitive areas like welfare and state colleges

---are unavoidable and Dukakis is determined to make them. The governor's reaction to his plight has been stoic, not conscience-stricken. He accurately portrays his job as a "Herculean task," but is publicly unemotional about his dilemmas. His zeal seems reserved for ridding Massachusetts government of waste. There is enough financial improvidence in state government to make the Augean stables seem hygienic.

Dukakis's personal constitution is predictably Spartan. He jogs at night, finds state cars in the driveways of naughty employees, and then takes the cars away. He commutes to work not by limousine, but on one of Boston's more erratic trolley routes. When his own, ancient, and unreliable sedan broke down on a recent speaking trip, the state public safety chief had to seek assistance for the governor at a nearby house. The governor himself stands in line at a snack bar to buy his own lunch---a carton of milk and a submarine sandwich---and asserts he has never spent more than a dollar on a sandwich in his life. And the governor is to be believed.

From the beginning, the Dukakis campaign strategy was to appeal to regular Democrats by downplaying his liberal image. The old "liberal" Dukakis has not been seen much in recent months--- leading to speculation that there never was such a creature. For example, Dukakis's controversial, neighborhood control position on Boston school problems was better received by conservatives than liberals. Since Dukakis takes his positions with evident sincerity, his unconventional (for liberals) stance cannot be interpreted as campaign hyperbole. Since taking office, Dukakis has denied welfare recipients a cost-of-living increase and has balked at deinstitutionalization of mental health and correctional programs. The governor's legislative program emphasizes white-hat, ethical changes and greater effectiveness in state agencies. No encouragement, meanwhile, has been given to Democratic liberals hoping to sabotage a conservative, old guard faction which is about to inherit the House speakership and its spoils.

Perhaps, it is a pragmatic streak that keeps Dukakis's liberalism under wraps in a severe austerity period. Or perhaps it is those strange forces exerted on leaders, moving them right or left, but always toward the middle. There may be some truth to both explanations. But it is also true that a liberal product of the 1950s and 1960s (like Dukakis) is moderate in comparison to the liberal Democratic standards of the 1970s. If anything, Dukakis seems more and more like the messiah that progressive Massachusetts Republicans have been waiting for since Elliot Richardson left the state in 1969. Unfortunately, the prospects of a reverse Lindsay Leap (sometimes known as a Connally Caper) are slim. Progressive Republicans will disagree with Dukakis, certainly, but there is a lot of progressive Republican in the governor.

Perhaps because of his assumed liberalism, Dukakis has not been afraid to talk about helping business out to create more jobs in the state. Nor has he been reluctant to dip into the business community for a talented manager of the State Welfare Department or for a new commissioner of the State Department of Public Utilities

The political fallout of Dukakis's actions may be heaviest on those who hope to elect Republican legislators in order to help Dukakis fight the tyranny of the old guard, Democratic legislative leadership. Such a strategy may seem perverse, but it may be possible if Dukakis fights his legislative adversaries. If well-publicized donnybrooks with the legislative leadership are not forthcoming, then Republicans may find it difficult to dramatize the need for a two-party legislature in next year's campaign. (The GOP is now a pitiful minority in the legislature.)

Of course, it is too early to know how effectively Dukakis will run state government. His most serious defect may stem from possession of the wide surface knowledge of government that legislators tend to develop. He may be too stubborn to recognize the expertise of others in their specialized fields and to seriously consider their advice. He may delegate too much of the decision-making power to the governor and not enough to his cabinet.

Dukakis is the first politician with a platform to have the guts to make the tough, fiscal decisions that have long been necessary in Massachusetts. The keys to his effectiveness are the same keys to political popularity which are being deftly used by him to open the doors of public approval. Since public approval and effectiveness have a way of supplementing each other, Dukakis as governor could well achieve both. ■

Contributor Notes: James L. Monroe is a retired Air Force colonel, president of the Monroe Corporation, and a consultant on retirement systems. Dr. Richard W. Rahn is a professor of managerial economics and an economic consultant. U.S.Rep.Larry Pressler served in the office of legal advisor to the Secretary of State prior to his election to the House from South Dakota in 1974. Peter Berg is president of Ripon's Boston-Cambridge Chapter and a contributing editor to the FORUM.

POLITICS: STATES

mittee. Paul A. Russo, the new appointee, was RNC chairman.

A former national political organizer for Ronald Reagan has been named executive assistant for political fundraising for the Republican National Finance Committee. Paul A. Russo, the new appointee, was a special assistant to Sen. Robert Dole when Dole was

ARIZONA

Sen. Paul Fannin(R-Ariz.), 68, is not expected to seek reelection in 1976, opening the way for one of the most devastating intraparty fights in the country. Even if Fannin does seek reelection, he is expected to be opposed by U.S.Rep. John B. Conlan(R-4th), a maverick ultraconservative who has long been estranged from the Arizona GOP establishment. The establishment's blessing would likely go to U.S.Rep. Sam Steiger(R-3rd), who has called Conlan unfit for public office in the past. The Arizona GOP is split into three groups: the party establishment represented by Fannin, GOP State Chairman Harry Rosenzweig, and Sen. Barry Goldwater; a group of younger party activists who have been frozen out of leadership positions; and the ideological conservative purists who are expected to rally behind Conlan. Rosenzweig recently caused a party furor by suggesting that the GOP needed to broaden its base in Arizona. Despite last fall's gubernatorial and legislative losses, Rosenzweig's suggestion was widely attacked by purists who advocate ideological exclusiveness. Although a Conlan win might effectively destroy the existing party structure in Arizona, Conlan's ideological chastity might convert Sen. Goldwater to his side. U.S.Rep. Morris Udall(D-2nd) is supposedly running for the Democratic presidential nomination, but failing in that goal, he may return to Arizona to seek the Senate nomination. Gov. Raul Castro(D) might also cut short his brief gubernatorial career to run for the seat.

ILLINOIS

"I should have learned when I saw him lie at press conferences," says a disillusioned former aide in the administration of Gov. Daniel Walker(D). According to the former Illinois official, Walker's frequent polling illustrated an interesting facet of the governor's support. Although the governor is allegedly as popular now as when he defeated former Gov. Richard Ogilvie(R) in 1972, only 20% of his original supporters would still vote for him. The defectors have been replaced by newly-enchanted conservatives.

KENTUCKY

Former Kentucky Commissioner of Parks Robert E. Gable, who was an unsuccessful candidate against Louie Nunn in the 1972 GOP Senate primary, is the likely GOP candidate for governor this year. Gable, who heads a family coal and lumber business, was one of three choices of a GOP candidate search committee headed by GOP National Committeeman Edwin Middleton. Gable will likely have a primary against Elmer Begley, Jr., son of a former state secretary of state, but a major contest was averted when State Sen. Eugene Stuart(R) decided not to make the race. GOP State Chairman Charles R. Coy cites the efforts of the search committee as symptomatic of the new openness of the party: "We believe that this effort to open the party to the input of all has had a healthy effect upon the party." Coy says: "We are determined that we cannot be accused of doing anything except that which we can do openly." Among those efforts are "amending or rewriting our rules to require regular meetings of the organization at every level. We also seek to begin to instill one person responsibility at every level; to eliminate the duality of leadership which requires a chairman and a chairwoman at every level of party organization; and to make it possible for women to be chairman at some level in addition to eligibility to become state chairman."

MISSOURI

There is a growing consensus in Missouri that Sen. Stuart Symington(D-Mo.) will not seek reelection; that portends a major reshuffling of top elected officials in the state. The consultations of Attorney General John C. Danforth(R) with the political consulting firm of Bailey, Deardourff & Eyre are seen as a commitment to the 1976 Senate campaign. The state's senior senator will have difficulty delivering the Senate nomination to his son, U.S.Rep. James Symington. Although former Gov. Warren Hearnes(D) may be seriously hurt by federal grand jury investigations in his administration, U.S.Rep. Jerry Litton is increasingly seen as the Democratic frontrunner to succeed Symington. Litton has not committed himself to the race, but he is saturating the state with news releases and media exposure. As the acknowledged leader of the GOP renaissance in Missouri, Danforth's presence on the ballot will undoubtedly help the reelection campaign of Gov. Christopher Bond(R) and Lt.Gov. John Phelps, also popular moderates. Former State Auditor John Ashcroft(R), who was defeated in 1974, is a possible candidate to succeed Danforth as attorney general. Republican unity, therefore, may contrast sharply with Democratic nominating fights. State Sen. William Cason(D), the Senate president pro tem, is only announced Democratic candidate for governor, but several other politicians are considering the race. Republican officials feel confident that Bond has a strong base of support, but there are no recent polls by which to measure the impact of Bond's vocal support for passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in the state. Note: Jewett Fulkerson, a rancher-farmer-auctioneer and chairman of the Clay County GOP, was elected GOP national committeeman as a February meeting of the GOP State Central Committee. Fulkerson defeated former State Sen. Bill Esely by a 31-29 vote.

UTAH

In 1972, Gov. Calvin Rampton(D) was reelected to a third term with 69% of the vote. Rampton was the first Utah chief executive to win three consecutive elections. A recent poll by the Salt Lake Tribune shows the state's voters are equally divided however, on whether Rampton should seek a fourth term. The poll, which showed a 46-46% split in the electorate, was taken before completion of the legislative session in which the state income tax was raised by Democratic legislative majorities. The immediate effect of the poll's publication was to heighten GOP interest in the 1976 gubernatorial race. The Republican frontrunner is Vernon B. Romney, the state's conservative attorney general and nephew of former HUD Secretary George Romney. The other active possibility is Davis County Commissioner Stanley Smoot, now president of the National League of Counties and a moderate by comparison with Romney. Although Democrats would like Rampton to seek a fourth term, his family would prefer that he stepped down. In his absence, leading Democratic contenders would be Salt Lake City attorney Donald B. Holbrook, who unsuccessfully sought the Democratic Senate designation in 1974; State Senate president Ernest Dean, who lost to Rampton in the 1964 Democratic primary; and U.S.Rep. Gunn McKay, now serving his third term in the 2nd C.D. slot. Former U.S.Rep. Wayne Owens, defeated in the 1974 Senate race, is out of consideration as a result of his acceptance of a Mormon missionary presidency for Eastern Canada; these posts traditionally last three years. Without similar celestial intervention, Sen. Frank E. Moss(D) is expected to seek reelection. No Republican has exhibited any enthusiasm about contesting him although there is constant private speculation by public sources that Moss is defeatable.

VIRGINIA

Both Democrats and Republicans appear to be lining up their major candidates for the next four years---with the major exception of the 1976 Senate race for Sen. Harry E. Byrd, Jr.'s seat. Byrd has been courted by both parties in an attempt to end his independent status and add him to their ticket; the best-publicized attempt was an invitation from Byrd from State Democratic Chairman Joseph Fitzpatrick to rejoin his old party. In response, GOP State Chairman George McMath suggested: "I think it is reasonable to assume that Republicans will run a candidate [for the Senate] in 1976, but a great many would want that candidate to be Sen. Byrd." Byrd himself maintains that he has "given little thought to 1976." Even if Byrd decides to rejoin the Democratic party, Fitzpatrick anticipates a primary. Former Gov. Linwood Holton(R) has been mentioned as a possible Senate candidate for the GOP, but he is considered more likely to wait until 1978 when both he and Attorney General Andrew Miller(D) are expected to seek the seat now held by Sen. William Scott(R). Miller's decision to wait until 1978 leaves a 1977 opening for former Lt. Gov. Henry Howell(D) in the gubernatorial race. He is expected to be opposed by the present Republican lieutenant governor, John Dalton, if the GOP's neanderthal wing does not designate Dalton as insufficiently conservative. The GOP's candidate to succeed Dalton may well be GOP Chairman McMath. Meanwhile, the immediate prospects of Republican improvements in the legislature are poor; eight former Democrats who ran as independents in 1973 have decided to run again as Democrats in 1975. Even the GOP Senate minority leader lacks the energy for the coming fall campaign and has decided to retire.

DULY NOTED: STATES

Bicentennial Note: When the Bunker Hill Monument in Charlestown, Massachusetts was operated by the Metropolitan District Commission (a branch of the state government), it cost 10¢ to climb the 292 steps to the monument's summit. Now the federal government has taken over the facility, and it costs 50¢ just to get in the door. Such are the costs of war.

● "Brock May Have Trouble in '76 Race," by Morris Cunningham. Memphis Commercial Appeal, March 9, 1975. The new unity of the Tennessee Democratic Party may bode ill for Sen. Bill Brock's reelection campaign in 1976. "It has become conventional wisdom to say that Tennesseans didn't vote for Brock in 1970, that they voted against his Democratic opponent, former Sen. Albert Gore. Next year, if he runs, Brock will have a chance to disprove this contention, and to show that he can win on his own," writes Cunningham. The Republican senator is aided by decisions of former Gov. Winfield Dunn (R) and 1974 GOP gubernatorial candidate Lamar Alexander not to enter the GOP Senate primary. Cunningham also suggests that Brock would be aided by the presence of Sen. Howard Baker(R-Tenn.) on the GOP presidential ticket. On the other hand, Democratic wins at the gubernatorial, congressional and legislative level last year will handicap Brock---as will the GOP's poor showing in its traditional stronghold of East Tennessee. Among the possible Democratic contenders against Brock are U.S.Rep. Richard Fulton and former Watergate Prosecutor James Neal.

● "Brooke Says He'll Ignore National Race in '76, Focus on State," by Martin F. Nolan. Boston Globe March 16, 1976. Massachusetts Sen. Edward W. Brooke(R) will make the rejuvenation of the Bay State GOP his primary concern in 1976, leaving presidential politics to other Republicans. "I'll be spending my time in Massachusetts on the Republican Party there. We will have candidates in all of the congressional districts in '76. I expect you to hold me to that promise." In 1974, there were no Republican candidates in half of the state's 12 congressional districts; Republicans now occupy only two seats from Massachusetts. Brooke said he doubted if he could accept a vice presidential

nomination on the same ticket with former California Gov. Ronald Reagan(R), but did not rule out the possibility of running as a favorite son in the 1976 Massachusetts presidential primary.

● "Winning And Losing With LBJr.," by Molly Ivins. Texas Observer, March 14, 1975. "It's always interesting to watch the [Texas] House of Representatives do something really awful, especially when they know it's awful and have a decent alternative. What they have done this time is give us a winner-take-all presidential primary so bad that it may touch off a 'bring back the unit rule' movement. If the whole bloody mess weren't [Sen.] Lloyd Bentsen, Jr.'s fault, one might almost feel sorry for him. No sooner does he announce for President than he goes and steps in the Texas legislature. Basically, he pulled a rank power play in the old Allan Shivers-John Connally mold, although one trusts neither of those two would have been stupid enough to use Tom Schieffer as a tool." Schieffer is a Fort Worth state representative who sponsored the bill which would require presidential aspirants to file full delegate slates in every state senatorial district and makes it extremely difficult to run slates of uncommitted delegates. In fact, the bill would make it extremely difficult for anyone except Bentsen to run in the Texas presidential primary. Ivins expressed some confusion as to why Bentsen would back such a patently bad bill: "One theory is that he's actually running for vice president and needs to prove he can carry this state if they put Karl Marx on the top of the ticket." His tactics, however, may backfire as a result of his heavyhandedness. Says Ivins: "One angry liberal was last heard threatening to personally field the finest Wallace slate for his district anyone has ever seen."

● "'Harassment' By Casey Is Seen Changing Attitude of Governor." (Philadelphia) Observer, March 17, 1975. Pennsylvania Auditor General Robert P. Casey(D) apparently has gotten under Gov. Milton Shapp's skin with his revelations of financial misconduct in state government. But rather than fight his fellow Democrat---as Shapp did successfully in two previous gubernatorial primaries---the governor has apparently decided to boost Casey for the 1976 race for Sen. Hugh Scott's seat. "The only fly in the ointment appears to be the possibility of a primary tussle between Casey and Shapp ally William J. Green 3d, the liberal congressman from Philadelphia. But Green's interest in the Senate seat...is problematical and it remains to be seen whether Green is eager to fight for it."

● "60 Days Not Enough To Judge Governor," by Vic Ostrowidzki. Albany Times Union, March 16, 1975. Asked his reaction to speculation that he would be a one-term governor, New York Gov. Hugh Carey(D) called such speculation "premature" and noted that "I'm going to fulfill the four-year term here and then we will see what the people on the street are saying." According to Ostrowidzki, Carey "must know that 'something is rotten' in New York, that his television commercial image of 'a doer' has been tarnished and that he is in serious trouble not only with the general electorate but also with members of his own political party." Ostrowidzki also notes that Carey's answer indicated his own abandonment of hopes for a spot on the Democratic presidential ticket. Despite Carey's statement, however, Ostrowidzki suggests, "Since the first presidential primary is still almost a year off, Carey will have plenty of time to change his mind again."

○ "Gloria: Trying In Blushing Pink To Improve Some Statistics," by Bob Conrad. Hartford Times, March 16, 1975. Connecticut Secretary of State Gloria Schaffer(D) seems to be the leading Democratic candidate to oppose Sen. Lowell Weicker(R) next year. The former legislator and state television personality has some handicaps, however, suggests Conrad: "One is that some people in her party don't take her seriously as a potential Senate candidate. They tend to regard her as fine as secretary of state but one who ought to confine her ambitions to nice, uncomplicated jobs and to leave the 'biggies' to the real candidates. Another minor problem is that she is a woman and, ye gods, we already have one of those in the governor's office so that should be enough."

● "President's Supporters in Minority," by George Dissinger. San Diego Tribune, February 14, 1975. Reagan supporters are in solid control of the California GOP in the wake of the February state central committee meeting. If Ronald Reagan seeks to use his state's delegation as a basis for an intra-party challenge to Gerald Ford in 1976, "he will have strong organizational support," according to Dissinger. Speaking of the meeting, Dissinger says, "Ford's only defender at Sacramento was Attorney General Evelle J. Younger, who gave a speech praising Ford's economic program. Younger met recently with Ford and pledged his support for a Ford candidacy. He also hinted that he would like Ford's endorsement as the Republican spokesman in California. Younger is not a naive politician so it's apparent he is betting all his marbles on the survival of Ford next year."

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices.