

RIPON FORUM

VOL. IX, No. 6
MARCH 15, 1973
25 CENTS

The Nixon Deal: A Fairer Share?

The controversy over President Nixon's proposed budget for fiscal year 1974, described by Paul McCracken as "one of the best fiscal plans of the last quarter century," has underscored the urgency to reconsider our approach to social needs in light of the experience of the past decade.

Two aspects of that experience are especially relevant: consideration of the national climate within which government programs and all else must function, and our conclusions as a result of social programs being controlled by the federal government.

Our experience with social programs has varied. Certain of the government's 1,051 domestic programs have produced results. Countless other programs have duplicated each other, overlapped, multiplied administrative costs and have not been productive. Migrant and seasonal farmworkers, for instance, are serviced by different programs run by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Labor.

In an effort to provide more effective government and better care for people's needs, President Nixon has proposed certain reorganization and consolidation of government functions.

More effective use of money is the key to President Nixon's plan. The President repeatedly has expressed the theme, "What we need is, basically, reform of existing institutions . . . reform in the field of education; reform in the field of health; reform in the federal-state relations."

In his budget message to Congress, the President pointed out that spending on income maintenance, manpower training, health programs and other "people programs" now accounts for close to half of the total budget dollar and is nearly double that of four years ago. He mentioned the accomplishments and failures of past efforts. "The seeds of those failures," in the President's words, "were sown in the 1960's when the 'do something, do anything' pressure for federal panaceas led to the establishment of scores of well-intended social programs too often poorly conceived and hastily put together.

"But," the President said, "with vaguely defined objectives, incomplete plans of operation and no effective means of evaluation, most of these programs simply did not do the job."

"We gave these programs the benefit of every doubt and continued them while we continued a long-needed, thorough review of all federal human resources programs. Based on this review, the 1974 budget proposed to reform those programs that can be made productive and to terminate those that were poorly conceived, as well as those that have served their purpose . . ."

In line with this, the proposed federal budget for fiscal year 1974 contains no provision for funding the Office of Economic Opportunity. OEO's operating programs will be transferred to other federal departments. Total savings related to former OEO activities will come to approximately \$328 million in FY (fiscal year) 74 and \$390 million in FY 75.

The federal budget for FY 73 obligated \$676.6 million to OEO. The 74 budget requests \$440.8 million for those OEO programs transferred to other departments. The only cut comes in the omission in the 74 budget for funding local initiative programs, known as community action agencies. They are not abolished, for the federal government lacks authority to create or abolish community action agencies. It is left to community initiative and to the discretion of state and local governments to determine whether or not to use revenue-sharing funds to continue CAA activities.

OEO's research, demonstration and evaluation programs will be placed in the appropriate departments at an \$11.3 million increase over FY 73 funding; the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker program goes to the Department of Labor, up \$4 million; Indian programs go to HEW, up \$9.7 million; Community Economic Development goes to the Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce, up \$2.6 million. Legislation will be introduced making the Legal Services program an independent corporation. *Newsweek* described these moves, saying, "For all the President's austere rhetoric about his new budget, he sustained some important social programs at present levels or better; even the War on Poverty survived almost intact, its components hidden away in other bureaucracies and budgets."

Since 1964, the year OEO was created as part of President Johnson's Great Society program, Congress has appropriated almost \$15 billion under authorization of the Economic Opportunity Act. OEO itself has run approximately twenty-five programs, yet it has only been a small part of the government's total effort to reduce poverty. In FY 73, the government spent nearly \$32 billion in poverty-related efforts, only \$676.6 million of that through OEO.

What has been the result? If statistics mean anything, the number of those living in poverty has dropped from 36 million in 1964 to just over 25 million in 1973. Yet it is impossible to say what part OEO has contributed.

The article's author, Wm. Van Dusen Wishard, is executive secretary of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Before joining OEO three years ago, Wishard was associate director for program development of Up With People, a private educational corporation.



There are other factors as well as government programs which contribute to the reduction of poverty.

The state of the economy and inflation both affect poverty statistics. Poor people benefit more than anyone else from positive moves in these areas. That the 6 percent inflation of the late 60's had been reduced to slightly over 3 percent last year, was no small boon to the poor. That the economy expanded by nearly 10 percent in 1972 compared to 7½ percent in 1971 and 5 percent in 1970, has had a direct result in providing jobs and decreasing poverty.

From a budgetary standpoint, it is common sense to reduce programs whose effectiveness cannot clearly be proven. This does not ignore the human need. It adds urgency to finding more effective ways to meet that need.

As John Ehrlichman said, "There's a debate that is going to have to take place over what we do instead, because the problem isn't going away — we know that. And the question of how we institute a new solution to a continuing problem still lies before us."

One such problem is that of balance between what should be done by the federal government and by other levels of government. The President discussed this in his Second Inaugural Address saying that the key to solving some of these problems "lies in the placing and division of responsibility." In his original New Federalism proposals made in August 1969, President Nixon spoke of a "new and drastically different approach to the way in which government cares for those in need, and to the way the responsibilities are shared between the state and the federal government." He then made his original proposal for revenue-sharing.

Revenue-sharing seeks to develop a new federal-state partnership which allows local governments increased authority over federal dollars spent in their localities. It recognizes that Washington cannot solve every problem, and that a new citizen participation, or what the President calls, "grassroots government," is essential as the scale of our problems increases.

Revenue-sharing, however, is not a guaranteed cure-all. It is simply a mechanism to enable citizens at the local level to determine community priorities and how best to address them. Perhaps the most difficult political task confronting us is the nourishment of an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation which is essential if revenue-sharing is to succeed. As James Reston put it, "The idea is beginning to get around that the governors of the American states, for example, have to work together to deal with their common problems.

"Similarly," Reston continues, "the American cities cannot deal with their urban problems unless they cooperate on transportation, taxes and security with the adjoining suburbs."

The President's actions, controversial as they are, reflect the general feeling of the public. In a Gallup Poll taken last December, 54 percent were in favor of holding down government spending and taxes rather than increasing funds for social programs. According to the *Christian Science Monitor*, a survey of the nation's governors found the President fully in tune with the national mood in calling for less government spending and a lid on taxes. Even the Brookings Institution is in agreement with the majority of the projected budget reductions.

In all this, the President's purpose is to make government more effective. The first step was reorganization. The second phase will be to move into the operating departments of the bureaucracy and attempt to clear away the roadblocks to efficient delivery of Washington services.

Those who complain about alleged "centralization of power in the White House" might recall that President Nixon's four predecessors were stymied by the unwieldy size and unresponsiveness of the federal bureaucracy and never managed to control it. This President is determined to try to redirect the trend of government, and this understandably requires forceful action.

As *Time* magazine noted, "Nixon's budget is finely crafted, revealing a coherent and largely consistent social and political strategy. With more deliberation than any of his predecessors, he has set out to strip the government of some of its superfluous growths and to reconcile some of its conflicting tendencies.

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 sixteen cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of subchapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions and revenues from its publications and contract work.

THE RIPON FORUM is published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Second class postage rates paid at Boston, Massachusetts. Contents are copyrighted © 1973 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, service-men, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$3 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

Robert D. Behn, Chairman

Robert H. Donaldson

James Manahan

Tanya Melich

Howard Reiter

Ralph Thayer

Contributing Editors: Clifford Brown, Glenn Gerstell, William A. Koelsch, and Daniel J. Swillinger

Circulation and Copy Editor: Judith H. Behn

Art: Leslie Morrill and Annie Greene

Editorial Assistants: Deborah Bowen and Victoria Golden

POLITICS: PEOPLE

● The appointment of **Michael P. Balzano, Jr.** to head the Action agency may signal the Phillipization of Action. Balzano, who came to Administration attention as a result of his criticism of VISTA, may not balkanize the agency which includes the Peace Corps, VISTA, the Teacher Corps and other volunteer programs, but it seems likely that he will cut it back — a job that Mrs. **Patricia Hitt**, who was previously in line for the appointment, may have been unwilling to do. Balzano, a high school drop-out with a Ph.D. in political philosophy, has worked both as a garbage man and as an aide to **Charles Colson**.

● **Vipers Beware Department**: It has been a slow season in the Alaska legislature, but it may come to a slithering halt on the issue of snakes. State Rep. **Dick McVeigh** and State Sen. **C. R. Lewis**, who is a national council member of the John Birch Society, have introduced a bill prohibiting the transportation or importation of poisonous snakes. You don't have to be Alaskan to love St. Patrick's Day.

● State Sen. **Donald E. "Buz" Lukens (R)** attempted to file petitions for governor of Ohio last month. Secretary of State **Ted W. Brown (R)** rejected the petitions because the Butler County Elections Board has certified Lukens's 1972 campaign expenditure report was 12 days late. Under Ohio law, Lukens is barred from seeking office for five years. Lukens has called such action "cruel and unusual punishment."

● California Republicans have received a setback in their bid to retain control of the state senate. The GOP was split, 19-19, with the Democrats but two special elections were scheduled to fill unoccupied seats. Since the GOP was conceded probable victory in one seat, attention focused on a southern California district where two young politicians, Democrat **Alan Robbins** and Republican **Phillip Johnson**, were competing. In the February 28 election, Robbins won slightly over 50 percent of the vote but Republicans have vowed to fight his seating on the grounds that he was not a district resident for a full year prior to the election.

● **Phyllis Schlafly**, former president of the National Federation of Republican Women, an early Goldwater supporter and author of **A Choice Not An Echo**, has organized "STOP ERA" and is touring the country in an attempt to prevent the ratification by state legislatures of the women's Equal Rights Amendment.

● Republican wit, Senate Minority Leader **Hugh Scott** — the man who coined the "Three A's" tag for **George McGovern** (Amnesty, Abortion, and Acid) — has come up with another homily: "If Congress can't add, then the President must subtract so that taxes don't multiply."

● Six Georgia Republican state senators are threatening to punish Lieutenant Gov. **Lester Maddox** unless he stops punishing them. The six men voted against Maddox earlier this year in a senate power play so Maddox has blocked their legislation. Unless Maddox loosens up his tactics, the Republicans are threatening to organize against the former governor in next year's gubernatorial primary. Under Georgia's crossover primary, they might be able to swing enough Republican votes toward Maddox's opponents to defeat the maverick Democrat.

● **Bumper Sticker Department**: Sen. **George McGovern**'s supporters in Massachusetts have not given up. The most recently spotted bumper sticker says: "Nixon 49, America 1."

● Michigan Gov. **William Milliken** and House Minority Leader **Gerald Ford** reportedly tried to dissuade U. S. Rep. **Donald Riegle** from joining the Democrats. They would have liked to see the young, former Republican run for the Senate in 1976. Riegle had unsuccessfully sought the Michigan GOP's 1970 Senate nomination against Sen. **Philip Hart (D)**. Democratic U. S. Rep. **Wayne Hays** was not so happy about the proposed switch either. Hays took the floor of the House on February 20 to "Implore the Republican side of the House — I do not see the gentleman from Michigan on the floor — however, I want to implore the Republican side of the House to try to dissuade him from switching parties. We in the majority have treated you fellows pretty nice since I have been here, so I do not see why you would want to inflict him upon us. You know after all is said and done, we have enough troubles of our own, and I do not think you ought to send any of your troubles over on our side." Referring to the Biblical admonition that the "Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away," Hays continued, "Well this time I just hope, since the Lord has given him to you, that He keeps him over there and you do all you can to keep him there, too."

● **Human Events**'s latest cause for concern is the appointment of Ohio U. S. Rep. **Clarence "Bud" Brown** to head "Operation New Magic," the congressional Republicans' 1974 candidate-hunting effort. What worries **Human Events** is that Brown may allegedly move to oust conservative Southern Democrats with moderate Republicans. Moreover, "Brown is a White House favorite." But although the White House has anointed Brown as the chosen successor to Republican Congressional Committee Chairman **Bob Wilson**, Brown's noted independence would seem to be reason enough for less dramatic White House enthusiasm. Brown's goal is to target 65-80 Democratic districts for Republican challenges and produce 26 new Republican congressmen in 1974 — enough to take control of the House of Representatives. He hopes to place sufficient pressure on aging Democrats so that they will be encouraged to retire rather than face a strenuous re-election campaign. And despite Brown's appointment, Wilson continues to protest that he is not quitting the chairmanship.

● Republicans continue to get the short end of the staffing stick in the House of Representatives. U.S. Rep. **John B. Anderson (R-Ill.)** introduced a proposal in the House Rules Committee on February 27 to bring the staffing resolution to the House floor under the open rule which would have allowed minority staffing amendments. Although the House Democratic Caucus had endorsed the open rule the previous week, the committee Democrats voted down the proposal on a straight party vote, 8-4. Republicans are upset because, according to the Republican Research Committee, "In December, 1972, the last month for which complete figures are available, Republicans received only 9 percent of committee investigatory funds. In that month, out of a total of 534 committee employees hired with investigative funds, Republicans had only 51, or only 10 percent." On the floor of the House, Republican attempts to increase their minority staffing position fell short by 13 votes in the first week of March but lost by only one vote in the second week of March. Democrats argue that the country has elected a Democratic Congress and has therefore entrusted to them the responsibility for enacting a Democratic program. Republicans argue the logic of a congressional "adversary" system for which they need their own staff. They promise to keep trying to win over their Democratic colleagues.

POLITICS: REPORTS

CONNECTICUT

HARTFORD — Gov. Thomas J. Meskill's first budget message to a Republican-controlled legislature was a model of his first two years in office. It slightly insulted almost everyone and egregiously offended only a few.

For two years, Gov. Meskill has been an exciting example for political scientists to study. He has acted on the theory that if you kick enough people often enough, they will vote for you. While political scientists may find this experiment of great interest, practising politicians view it with alarm.

In two years, Gov. Meskill has managed to kick rather sizable blocs of the electorate. These groups include:

1. State employees. The Governor's limousine has a bumper sticker which declares that "state employees are beautiful." Only space limitations, no doubt, preclude it from listing the Governor's real feelings: they should be overworked and underpaid. While state employees have been ignored in the Governor's budget, 44 state commissioners and their deputies have had their salaries raised by the Meskill-dominated Personnel Policy Board.

2. Anyone connected with higher education. In his last budget, the Governor singled out all professional employees in higher education by recommending that they receive no increment. They were beautiful enough.

3. The media. Meskill calls them holders of a "grubby press card."

4. The insurance companies and their many employees. Hartford is known as "the insurance city" but the Governor treats the insurance industry with disdain. Although the state's insurance business has traditionally been a political plum, the designation of the Carlson Insurance Co. as the sole recipient of state insurance commissions caused a political stir. The agency's owner is Adolph Carlson, the powerful commissioner of finance and control and a close political ally of Meskill.

To repeat, the Governor seems to be convinced that unpopularity pays dividends at the ballot box.

On a day-to-day basis, Gov. Meskill surrounds himself with a staff carried over from his congressional office. Most of these people are of limited talents and all were completely ignorant of the state and its problems. He relies for advice on long-time friends. Many of these have turned into obsequious sycophants and, in response to one of his whims, the term "no" is seldom heard in the Governor's office. To make matters worse, the Governor has developed a paranoid style in politics such that no one who might possibly disagree with him is allowed to see him. He avoids the public as if it had leprosy.

Gov. Meskill and state party leaders are now attempting to read into the November elections, which put the Republicans in control of the state legislature, some kind of mandate for, or vote of confidence in, the Governor. It is difficult to interpret the elections in this way, however. Most Republican candidates avoided any mention of Meskill and he did almost no campaigning for legislative candidates. Democratic candidates, sensing his unpopularity, often tried to pin a "Meskill rubber-stamp" label onto their Republican opponent. The electorate apparently rejected this line of argument because the Republicans won in many areas where the Governor had lost in 1970. Even so, legislative leaders are going to have the whips out for the Governor's program and they will use the results of the 1972 elections as their rationale.

Can it be all that bad? Does the Governor have even a glimmer of his problems? Can his image be changed? There are rumors of a poll, the results of which are available only to the Governor; to J. Brian Gaffney, Republican state chairman; and to Lewis "Chip" Andrews, the Governor's director of communications. This poll shows Meskill in deep trouble. A veteran observer of the Republican scene indicated that, while he did not know of the poll and its results, there must be something "in the air" because he had never seen a governor's staff do so much "scrambling."

One of the criticisms often made of Meskill is that everything he does is

"politically inspired." This is way off the mark. No politician would continue to hold the Governor's Ultramontanist view on abortion. No politician would have made that "grubby press card" remark. Instead, the Governor exhibits many tendencies of a person with a very strong death wish. The question is whether he can be cured in the next two years or whether he will insist that the Republican Party in Connecticut follow him into his political grave. ■

KANSAS

LAWRENCE — The dismissal of Sen. Robert Dole as GOP national chairman does not seem to have hurt his re-election chances; in the long run, it may even help his 1974 campaign.

Dole might be in trouble if he were up for re-election today. However, his resignation as chairman of the Republican National Committee has eliminated the basis for one of the main Kansas complaints about his performance — that he was spending too much time representing the GOP and not enough time representing Kansas. As a result of his resignation, he will have plenty of time in the next two years to woo the Kansas voters and mend fences. Already, he is appearing more frequently in the Kansas news.

U. S. Rep. William Roy, a former Republican legislator turned Democratic Representative, now appears to be Dole's likely challenger. Gov. Robert Docking probably will choose to run for his first four-year term since his interests allegedly lie more in state administration than in national politics.

Roy, an able legislator as well as a doctor and a lawyer, has announced that he is beginning preliminary spadework for the 1974 run but has also stated that he will not run if "another prominent Democrat," e.g., Docking, decides to make the race.

The possible passage of another amendment to the state constitution has meanwhile been upheld by the Kansas Supreme Court. State Treasurer Tom Van Sickle, a former Young Republican national chairman, will be hurt if the proposed amendment is adopted by the Kansas legislature since it eliminates as constitutional offices both his office and that of state auditor.

"He has not been given sufficient credit for this."

There is an aspect of government, however, that goes beyond organization; it is a symbol of a free people's ability to rule themselves, and is the focus of their hope and belief for the future.

Peter Drucker observed, "What is needed in this world today is not primarily wealth. It is vision. It is the individual's conviction that there is opportunity, energy, purpose to his society, rather than problems, inertia and hopelessness."

Conventional wisdom says that government is unable to give society purpose; that government administers national affairs but society draws its purpose from within itself.

Possibly this is true. One wonders, however, just how revenue-sharing will fare unless there is some sense of common purpose at every level of government association

with it. Certainly, a new degree of concern on the part of many local officials is required if the poor people are to benefit from revenue-sharing.

All this presents a different kind of challenge to Republicans. Can we energize the spirit of America with a dynamic attitude and expectancy? Revenue-sharing provides the mechanics of a "grassroots government;" but it needs the propelling force of a new grassroots conviction about America and where we should be headed if it is to succeed.

This may appear a long way from OEO and President Nixon's proposed budget for 1974. Yet, perhaps it is not as far as it seems. For in the long run, what is at stake is not a budget or an agency but whether we have the vision that can provide unity and momentum; whether we can define our political tasks in the dimension that a new age calls for and that excites the public imagination. ■

POLITICS: PROFILES

AUDREY COLOM

WASHINGTON, D.C. — "I'm a wife and mother. Everybody leaves that out," says Audrey Colom, one of three new vice chairwomen of the National Women's Political Caucus.

In addition to these roles, the former fourth grade teacher is employed at the Washington Research Project working on a children's issues project. Along with a group of five other staff members working on the project, Ms. Colom is investigating the "system of labeling children" as mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. She points out that it is a "shame that a child of 8-9 years old is isolated from peers" because of a handicapped condition which may not have been diagnosed properly. Protection for children and parents is needed in this labeling process, according to Ms. Colom, to prevent such mislabeling, rigid isolation and discrimination against minority groups.

Like her post at the NWPC, to which she was elected at the group's February convention, her job at the Washington Research Project, which is primarily a public interest law firm, is a new one. She previously worked for the National Welfare Recipients Organization where she was originally a special assistant to the NWRO leader, George Wiley, and later became the NWRO's political director. In the latter role, she worked to develop a voter education program for welfare recipients, to develop strategies for 1972 political conventions and on a

"get out the vote" campaign for the fall. NWRO tried to convince welfare recipients, according to Ms. Colom, that "poor people are taken for granted because they don't vote" and will continue to be taken for granted by politicians until they do get out and vote. With the recent departure of Wiley from NWRO, she views the group's future as shaky until a new staff can redirect NWRO toward specific targets rather than the shotgun approach used by NWRO in the past.

She would also like to see the National Women's Political Caucus become "a lot more involved in poor people's issues." Part of the problem with the NWPC is that it "hasn't really been an advocate for poor women." There was, for example, she points out, considerable enthusiasm at the Houston convention for a minimum wage for domestic workers.

As for implementation of the convention's goals, Ms. Colom says that "we haven't had a chance to sit around and talk about it." Child development legislation will essentially be a dead issue until 1975-76; she feels it will take that long to develop legislation acceptable to conflicting viewpoints in the aftermath of President Nixon's 1972 veto of daycare legislation.

A prime goal for NWPC will be the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the constitution. As of March 1, ten states were needed for ratification — but the chances of passage have grown steadily dimmer. The NWPC

official lauds the roles of White House Counsellor Anne Armstrong and her aide, Jill Ruckelshaus, in pressing for ratification — but optimism is guarded even at the White House.

Rather ironically, the Houston convention adopted essentially a "states' rights" platform for the NWPC. "The mood at Houston was for state control," and dissatisfaction with the "super star syndrome" of such caucus leaders as U.S. Rep. Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.). The result, says the District of Columbia Republican, "will strengthen the organization."

As a participant at both Republican and Democratic conventions, Ms. Colom says that she hopes the Steiger Commission will act to make convention delegations representative of the state and party make-up. She cites the unrepresentative nature of the Washington, D.C. Republican delegation. Although the Republican Party in D.C. is overwhelmingly black, the delegation was overwhelmingly white.

The black Republican leader, however, says that she senses that a movement away from "personality politics" among blacks might aid efforts to interest blacks in the GOP. "It's difficult to get blacks to join the Republican Party basically because people attach to personality . . . and to a lot of blacks Richard Nixon is the Republican Party."

"The issue is the important thing," she says, not the personal goals of black leaders.

Ms. Colom is optimistic for 1976. "Good people are going to be out there seeking the nomination," she says. As for the Democrats, "I don't think that the Democratic Party can be positive that it is any longer going to get a majority of black voters." ■

Republicans in the state suffer from a certain defeatism regarding their statewide prospects; they feel that neither Gov. Docking nor his apparent successor, Attorney General Vern Miller (D), can be defeated for the gubernatorial spot. The new GOP state chairman, Jack Ranson, is working to boost GOP morale. He has one advantage not accorded his recent predecessors; he does not have the stigma of leading a losing cause against Gov. Docking. Ranson was supported for election by the allies of Lt. Gov. Dave Owen. If another constitutional amendment places both the governor and his lieutenant governor on the same ballot, Owen might be further propelled toward a 1974 shot at the governorship. ■

SOUTH DAKOTA

RAPID CITY — When Sen. George McGovern runs for re-election in 1974, he may face Mrs. Barbara Gunderson, the able, progressive Republican who was the first woman appointed to the Civil Service Commission.

If nominated to oppose McGovern (who has already begun his campaign moves), Mrs. Gunderson might add the exotic touch which Republicans will need to defeat McGovern. Mrs. Gunderson is a former national committeewoman and was recently appointed to a Presidential commission studying ways to better utilize women in government.

Another possible candidate, in the view of State GOP Chairman Robert Burns, is the defeated 1972 Senate GOP candidate, former State Sen. Robert Hirsch; he received 43 percent of the vote in his losing race against newly-elected Sen. James Abourezk. Abourezk ran one of the best campaigns South Dakota has witnessed, but there is little reason to believe that the very conservative Hirsch would be more successful against McGovern than against Abourezk.

Carveth Thompson, the moderate Republican who lost to popular Gov. Richard F. Kneip, is considered unlikely to seek another try at a statewide campaign, but businessman Charles Lien, who ran third in the Republican senatorial primary last year, may be interested in another attempt at winning statewide office.

Meanwhile, the authority of Republican State Chairman Bob Burns has been severely tested in the past few months. At a January meeting of the State Central Committee, a move to reduce his salary was defeated, but at least one moderate Republican called for his resignation on the grounds of his weak party leadership. In a letter sent to all the members of the State Central Committee dated March 5, Burns announced that he will tender his resignation at the next full meeting of the State Central Committee, which he will call to elect a new state chairman.

Progressives seem to be gaining ground. Possible candidates for the state chairmanship include Steve Smith, an attorney from Mitchell and former Davidson County chairman; and Jim Cope, a successful businessman from Yankton whom Burns defeated for this post in 1971. ■

TENNESSEE

MEMPHIS — Gov. Winfield Dunn's (R) budget proposals have stirred up a hornet's nest among both Tennessee Republicans and Democrats.

His most controversial proposals include:

— \$13 million in state aid for mandatory kindergartens, raising the specter of busing in some legislative minds.

— \$12.5 million in refunds of state tax collections in a "circuit breaker" fund for low-income families.

— The permanent closing of Brushy Mountain State Prison which Dunn closed temporarily last summer during the guards' strike.

Dunn has also initiated proposals

for a no-fault auto insurance system and a shield law for journalists, but his budget proposals have caused the greatest ire, both among Democrats who feel outflanked and among Republicans who feel ideologically alienated.

Commenting on Dunn's proposals, Memphis *Commercial Appeal* Politics Editor William B. Street said, "Whether any or all of it is written into the statute books, Democratic politicians in 1974 can hardly say that the Dunn Administration has been unresponsive to the needs of the people, or at least to the Administration's conception of that need." Street said that although the Dunn budget was bound to create disunity in Republican ranks, it would also loosen traditional party voting lines in the state.

Meanwhile, Republicans are not exactly unhappy about House Speaker Ned McWherter's (D) decision to make House committee leadership positions into a private Democratic preserve. The GOP hopes to make McWherter's move, which broke with past legislative tradition, a campaign issue in 1974.

Republicans in Shelby County (Memphis) are meanwhile involved in a dispute over U. S. Rep. Dan Kuykendall's (R) proposal to redistrict the three districts which are now located totally or in part in Shelby County. Kuykendall's plan would dramatically decrease the number of black voters in his own district while dramatically increasing the number of black voters in the district now represented by U. S. Rep. Robin Beard (R). Both Beard and U. S. Rep. Ed Jones (D), who would be moved out of Shelby County by Kuykendall's plan, have voiced strong opposition to any major change in their districts' boundaries. ■

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Ma. 02138. Second class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.