

RIPON FORUM

RENEW
TODAY

MAY 1, 1976

VOL. XII No. 9

50 CENTS

EDITORIAL: Foreign Policy

ANSWERING SENSIBLE QUESTIONS

In discussing foreign policy in a presidential campaign, it is not enough to rattle sabers and mouth cliches. As John F. Kennedy demonstrated with his ill-informed talk of a "missile gap" in the 1960 presidential campaign, numerical comparisons of American and Soviet warhead strength can be as politically enlightening as counting the number of angels who can dance on the head of a pin. Former California Gov. Ronald Reagan and Washington Sen. Henry M. Jackson(D) are among the foremost angel-counters on the American scene, but the conduct of foreign policy requires more sophisticated thinking than the "bodycount" mentality displayed in the Vietnam War. As Mark Twain observed, there are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics.

President Ford has had an unsettling dilemma in campaign for the Republican presidential nomination. On the one hand, he is the only President the country's got; Henry Kissinger's the only Secretary of State we've got; and Kissinger's conception of the international balance of power is the only operative notion acting to reenforce world peace. And though Kissinger, according to polls such as one taken recently by CBS News and the New York Times, maintains much of his popularity with the electorate, there is a large segment of conservative Republican opinion which would like to see Kissinger sink slowly in the Panama Canal. As a result, the President has tried to back the Secretary of State as President, it seems, and undercut Kissinger in his role as presidential candidate. The result has been confusing for the electorate and undoubtedly equally confusing in foreign capitals.

Criticizing Kissinger has not been confined to conservative Republicans. Criticism of the Secretary of State spans the political spectrum and both political parties. In that respect, Kissinger very much resembles his mentor, Vice President Nelson Rockefeller.

Criticism of Kissinger, however, has become an accepted alternative to formulation of realistic policy alternatives. If critics as diverse as Reagan, Jackson, former Georgia Gov. Jimmy Carter, and Arizona U.S.Rep. Morris Udall all are criticizing Kissinger, surely the sum total of their criticisms is not a cohesive foreign policy. Henry Kissinger serves a useful function in this year's presidential campaign. The debate over Kissinger's personality and policies has obscured the shallowness of presidential campaign rhetoric. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the details of Kissinger's foreign policy, his conception of a tripartite balance of power among the United States, the Soviet Union and China is still the name of the world game. Strengthening that balance of power is in the interest of every American. Providing incentives for Russia and China to strengthen the balance and penalties or disincentives for weakening it is the business of foreign policy.

Both Democratic and Republican presidential candidates have ducked the hard questions of American foreign policy. How strong America's defense capabilities now are and will be in the near future is fuel for endless debate. The question is not unimportant, but the more important one is whether it is strong enough to accomplish American foreign policy objectives. John F. Kennedy proved you could get elected President by saying the United States is number two. He also proved it didn't mean much.

Ronald Reagan has injected the bunker-house mentality into the presidential campaign. He says he would never give up possession of the Panama Canal, as if physical possession rather than guaranteed access is the real issue on the Panama Canal...and as if the Panama Canal did not have dangerous potential for reviving memories of gunboat

diplomacy in Latin America. Ronald Reagan may play the ostrich and stick his head in the sand, but the American people cannot afford that luxury. They have the right to expect that presidential candidates venture out of the desert of personality politics onto an occasional oasis of issue discussion.

There is no dearth of issues to discuss. It would be foolish to expect that any presidential candidate would cover them all. But by examining a candidate's position on a few of the truly important questions facing foreign policy makers, the American people will be able to gain some insight into the way the candidate thinks. That is a good deal better than the sloganeering currently engaged in by both Republicans and Democrats.

The list of problems is undoubtedly endless, but the Ripon Society has a list of questions which suggest the variety:

* What compromises between purely national interest and international ones should the United States be prepared to make regarding the law of the seas, particularly as it applies to fishing, territorial boundaries, and deep sea mining?

* To what degree should the federal government involve itself in the regulation of activities of U.S.-based multinational corporations beyond U.S. borders?

* What factors---e.g., domestic employment, consumer price levels, the balance of payments, inflationary pressure---should be paramount in determining tariff and quota decisions affecting imports of products whose American counterparts are in economic trouble, e.g., the shoe industry?

* To what extent should the United States be prepared to enter into new bilateral or multilateral defense agreements? To what extent should existing U.S. commitments to nations like South Korea be altered?

* What forces and governments should the United States be prepared to abet or thwart in volatile sections of the world such as southern Africa?

* What actions or policies should the United States pursue regarding gross violations of human rights in the internal affairs of allies like Chile, neutrals like India, and adversaries like the Soviet Union? To what extent should trade policies be controlled by the Secretary of State and foreign policy considerations?

* What adjustments should the federal government be prepared to make in trade agreements involving America's market economy and the planned economies of foreign governments, e.g., the grain deals between the United States and the Soviet Union.

* What policies ought the United States to take regarding extraterritorial possessions and bases whose continued presence in foreign countries arouses nationalist antagonisms?

* What is the future function of NATO forces? What adjustments in American and NATO policy should the U.S. be prepared to take if Communists are included in coalition governments in Italy or France?

* What policies should the United States be prepared to take to improve relations with China and keep Sino-Soviet relations at a level of low-key antagonism? Should the United States be prepared to renege on its commitments to Taiwan?

* What policies should the United States take on the export of American arms and technical assistance to belligerent nations in areas such as the Middle East?

* What action should the United States take to regulate and control the export of peaceful nuclear assistance to potentially belligerent nations?

* What strategic capabilities and weapons systems ought to be priorities for the United States defense system?

Most importantly, however, presidential candidates ought to be prepared to answer the question: What does the United States do to convince the Soviet Union that it is in that country's best interests to pursue the goals of continued detente? Call it "peace through strength" or "Ford has a better idea," the name of the game is still detente. It is time presidential aspirants discussed the rules. ■

HAVE A FRIEND WHO MIGHT LIKE TO RECEIVE

THE FORUM?

Why not send his/her name(s) to:

Ripon FORUM
Box 226
Charlestown, Mass. 02129

COMMENTARY: THE CITY

SENATOR BROCK'S HOUSING IDEA

by Ralph E. Thayer

In January 1973, the Ripon FORUM published a very provocative article exploring the idea of the shared-value mortgage. As Gibbs LaMotte explained in the article, the "shared value mortgage" would empower a loan guarantor such as the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans Administration to provide an interest subsidy to the home purchaser which would be repaid when the house was sold. In effect, both the government and the home-owner would share in the carrying costs of the house and settle accounts at the time of the sale.

Sen. William Brock (R-Tenn.) has apparently pursued the idea and has now introduced a bill (S-3193), calling for amendment of Section 2, Title III of the National Housing Act by adding a new section, "housing Incentive Investment Interest Payments." A companion bill was introduced in the House by U.S. Rep. Thomas L. Ashley (D-Ohio). Calling for a \$1 billion authorization to establish a separate fund in the Government National Mortgage Association, the idea is to provide a stable interest rate (7 percent is suggested) to the purchaser over the life of the mortgage. Simultaneously, the lender is reimbursed by the G.N.M.A. for the difference between 7 percent and his actual interest cost, e.g., 9½ percent. The actual interest cost on which the subsidy is calculated by G.N.M.A. every six months in order to be market-sensitive.

At the time of resale, the subsidy is repaid to G.N.M.A. out of the profits of the transaction. Since approximately 20 percent of the U.S. population moves each year, there should be enough activity to keep the subsidy fund close to self-sustaining. Lending institutions should like the bill since it provides them with a variable interest rate loan sensitive to inflation but without the outraged consumer reaction that changes in monthly payments could provoke.

Without question, current national housing programs are in disarray. The Section 8 rental subsidy program is going very slowly and has done almost nothing to spark new construction. John Hart, president of the Home Builders, calls Section 8 "welfarish" and likely only to drive up everyone's rent. Apart from that, there is a gnawing fear that, if Section 8 does succeed, it will do so by draining the most affluent and stable tenants out of traditional public housing, thereby leaving local housing authorities with an even more unstable income mixture than at present. Section 8 is a workable objective without a delivery system; the Brock plan may well be the reverse.

Brock's plan is aimed at the "working class family," which although not specifically defined would be typified by one with an annual income of \$12,400. Assuming this to be the average of the target group, the income range of the working class would be about \$10-15,000. The maximum mortgage under the plan is \$35,000 while Sen. Brock's own figures show the average new home price to be \$41,000. Either the buyer must come up with about a \$6,000 down payment (which is not mentioned in the bill) or buy a home in an area where land costs, etc. are low and no-frill houses are selling in the \$30-35,000 neighborhood. Sen. Brock's program will build a lot of houses in Texas and Arizona if that is its intent.

The down payment is only one hurdle to families trying to escape the city. Blacks in the city, for example, are less likely than their white counterparts to be able to draw upon stored equity in a previous home to finance the purchase of a suburban home. It is, of course, possible that this program could work in the center city as well as older suburbs except for a barrier inherent in the Brock bill, section 314(c-3). Briefly, if the proceeds of the sale are not enough to repay the subsidy, the "purchaser" is personally liable. (I assume this refers to the initial purchaser or the recipient of the subsidy. If it refers to the new purchaser, the outstanding amount would be similar to a tax lien and could further complicate inner city sales.) Understanding that one of the selling features of this bill is its fiscal integrity, it is safe to predict that this program will be used by G.N.M.A. almost exclusively to cover properties where the possibility of value depreciation of the property is remote. Translation: here comes Levittown again; transition housing areas are too risky for government guarantees.

Third, the working class family today is either leaving the city or desirous of doing so. In fact, the working class should have the same right to housing choice as affluent citizens. In reality, if we further subsidize the exodus from older, urban areas as this bill is likely to do, any savings garnered in the housing program will be eaten up by payments to dying cities or more grants for extension of sewer lines, etc. The national policy objective is to conserve and capitalize on already populated areas. Section 8 embraces this objective but is incapable of major impact. The Brock bill is a potentially potent delivery system but is devoid of an objective in consonance with national policy.

Yet, the Brock plan could work and work well if certain provisions were added. For example, a variable interest mortgage should be viewed as a privilege available only through lending agencies whose actions are in conformance with the locally-designated Housing Assistance Plan. This might serve at least to draw attention to the existence of the H.A.P., which is now simple paperwork. Second, the subsidy should be more attractive to the consumer if he or she makes a housing choice in conformity to national policy. To take a mortgage in a city or inner suburb area which the H.A.P. cites as a location needing stabilization would qualify the purchaser for the full 2½ percent subsidy. For housing in areas which

are environmentally sensitive, for example, (farmland or wetlands) or extensions of urban sprawl, the subsidy would not be available; the purchaser would bear the full cost of living in a location better suited to alternate uses. Obviously, the imposition of such conditions would complicate the program as it is now proposed. However, a potentially potent delivery system without an objective related to national housing policy is likely to be very damaging. The concept is good, but fully inept. When Reagan failed to overcome directed more precisely at objectives which do more than simply stimulate housing construction in unspecified areas. ■

COMMENTARY: CONVENTION

CHOOSING THE VICE PRESIDENT

by Chuck Slocum

In 1972, there was a great cry from the public about the way political parties select their Vice Presidential candidates after a selected nominee was removed from the ticket. Soon after that, a sitting Vice President was forced to leave office and again, the public questioned the way political parties do their business. Both parties involved themselves in a flurry of activity to change the process but nothing concrete has happened.

In Minnesota recently, over 60,000 Independent-Republicans advised us as to their Presidential favorites through our precinct caucuses. We received woefully little input on the Vice Presidential issue. Candidates for President are subjected months of electioneering, questions from the media, and exposure to the public. Yet, the person who is to take over from President in an emergency is still selected in the backroom, maybe unknown to virtually all of the people in the United States. He or she never has to face the same kind of public scrutiny given the top of the ticket.

The Vice Presidency is a meaningful office. Twelve of our country's 36 Presidents trained there; eight of them took over upon the death of a President, and four of our last six Presidents served as Vice Presidents. Four points must be considered in making a change in the method under which these Vice Presidents are selected by their parties:

1. The process must be in compliance with the U.S. Constitution.
2. The process should avoid any great changes in the rules of the national convention.
3. The Vice Presidential nominee should be philosophically and personally compatible with the Presidential nominee.
4. The Vice Presidential nominee should be selected by more than a handful of people.

With these criteria in mind the Minnesota Independent Republican Party has a proposal which is basically very simple. Upon declaring his or her candidacy for the office of President, a candidate would be required to present a list of four to six potential running mates to the Republican National Committee 120 days prior to the Republican National Convention. This list would be a matter of public record. During this four-month period, regional forums could be held to discuss the various names submitted by the Presidential candidates."

After receiving the nomination of the national party, a candidate's list of potential running mates would become a ballot from which the national convention would have to work. If desired, the national committee could report to the convention on each potential candidate. No other people could be added to the list except the previously-announced Presidential candidates, who presumably would have received national press exposure. The Presidential nominee could indicate a running mate preference which undoubtedly would carry a great deal of weight with convention delegates.

This simple reform allows the Presidential nominee to choose a running mate with whom he is philosophically and personally compatible. It also allows reasonable scrutiny of the possible candidates. And, since the list is prepared in advance, it negates the possibility that a Presidential nominee would choose a running mate at a time when he may be under extreme pressure or even mentally and physically exhausted. ■

Contributor Notes: Ralph Thayer is director of the Urban Studies Institute at New Orleans University. Chuck Slocum is chairman of the Minnesota Independent Republican Party.

COMMENTARY: The GOP

SLUGGING IT OUT IN THE SUN BELT

One should not underestimate Ronald Reagan's accomplishments in this year's presidential campaign. Reagan has faltered badly in the opening primaries, but considering the advantages of Gerald Ford's office, Reagan has done quite well. With George Wallace fading from the national scene, Reagan has been able to pick up some of the Wallace constituency as well as the Wallace issues. But as Reagan has learned, winning and Wallace are not the same thing. Increasingly, Reagan and Wallace seem like similar political creatures: men whose capacity for speaking exceeds their capacity for governing and whose capacity for stirring emotions seems to exceed their capacity for stirring rational debate.

Reagan strategists made the same mistake that Ford organizers made last year. Both attempted to make a psychological knockout of the opposition which would quickly end the conflict and avoid the necessity for developing prolonged and detailed strategy. When the predictions of a knockout proved erroneous, both campaigns were open to criticism for their organizational weakness. The criticism was first directed at Ford because his campaign organization in New Hampshire and Florida seemed pitifully inept. When Reagan failed to overcome Ford in those states, the campaign inadequacies of the former California governor quickly became obvious. Where once John Sears was touted widely as a campaign wizard, the same kudos were subsequently awarded to Stuart Spencer. The lack of depth in the Reagan organization became apparent when Reagan failed to contest Pennsylvania, allowed Ohio's filing deadline to nearly pass before qualifying by the barest of margins and failed to even adequately mobilize for the fertile soil of Maryland.

The remaining skirmishing in the South and West promises to be often close and always hard fought. Only pleading by Sen. Barry Goldwater prompted Arizona conservatives to include Sen. Paul Fannin(R) with House Minority Leader John Rhodes(R) as Ford delegates on an otherwise all-Reagan slate. In South Carolina, Gov. James Edwards(R) stumbled only in his search for an all-Reagan slate when he sought a unit-rule for the state's delegation. Causes in Oklahoma have disclosed nearly similar levels of Reagan support. And in states where contests appear to be closer---such as Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Alaska---Reagan forces have often showed surprisingly strong support. In Alaska, for example, Reagan scored well in the Anchorage area, but Ford picked up enough support in Fairbanks and Juneau to probably give him the edge in the May 21-23 convention. Fairly close contests are also

expected to develop in many upcoming primary states such as South Dakota, Kentucky, and Nebraska. Only occasionally---in a case such as Idaho---has the Reagan campaign faltered in an area where they were truly strong. And in Idaho, Ford's strength reflects more the incompetence of the Reagan effort than the competence of the President's own.

The perhaps fatal flaw in Reagan's campaign is its intellectual shallowness. Reagan's failure to attract a large number of kindred conservative officeholders as followers ought to reflect that lack of depth. The "speech," for example, has the oft-repeated line, "Balancing the budget is like protecting your virtue. You have to learn to say 'no.'" Balancing the budget is a bit more complex than that. It is an admirable objective, but to achieve it requires a tradeoff of priorities for which Reagan shows little tolerance or understanding. As former Reagan aide Norman "Skip" Watts, now Ford's director of primary states, observes about Reagan's work habits: "A lot of people have tried to say it is the staff around Reagan. It's not the staff. It's Reagan. I don't think Reagan should be President because you can't have a 9-to-5 President. It would be dangerous to the country and dangerous to the party." Like Carter and Brown, Reagan has never been good at the art of political compromise---an art he would surely have to employ with a Democratic Congress. Recently, the Washington Post's Lou Cannon wrote: "At least 60 former appointees or key political supporters of ex-California Gov. Ronald Reagan have turned against him and are backing President Ford against their onetime political hero. They give varying reasons but the dominant one is that they consider Reagan unqualified to be President."

As cruel and mean-spirited as it may sound, after eight years as governor of California and two decades on the fried chicken circuit, Reagan is still primarily an actor. He may be a damn good actor, but he is still essentially play acting. His speech does inspire confidence and he does give the appearance of leadership---far more so than President Ford, according to a recent CBS-New York Times survey. But Reagan cannot administer and he cannot develop policy. He cannot compromise and he doesn't like the nitty gritty of policy. He doesn't have a strong grasp of national political realities and social problems. And he doesn't know how to administer a bureaucracy effectively. And he hasn't shown much interest in learning. And that may be one of the strongest reasons why Reagan has not attracted more Republican "name support."

Hawaii: Delegates from Hawaii will go to the national convention officially uncommitted, but a minimum of 18 of the 19 will be Ford supporters. Senatorial district caucuses nominated two-thirds of the delegates at the end of April, but all 19 will be elected at the May 15 state convention. The President Ford Committee opened a small office in Hawaii in January, but it soon became apparent that Reagan conceded Hawaii to Ford, even to the point of ignoring the request of several local party officers to organize on behalf of Reagan. The inability of Reagan's national organization to follow up in Hawaii probably cost the former California governor a third of the delegate vote.

Kentucky: A close contest is being predicted for the May 25 primary. Former Gov. Louie Nunn's support for Reagan and Ford's late organizational start gave Reagan an early edge in the state. According to the Louisville Courier-Journal's Bill Billiter, the primary outcome will hinge on Ford's showing in Jefferson County (Louisville) and the GOP's 5th C.D. stronghold. In the latter, the primary may be as much a referendum on the relative popularity of Nunn and U.S. Rep. Tim Lee Carter, a strong Ford supporter, as between Reagan and Ford. There are long-standing grievances between Carter and Nunn. Convention delegates were chosen in late April, but will be committed proportionately on the basis of the primary results.

Missouri: Ford backers in Missouri were jolted by Reagan's incredibly strong showing in Kansas's adjoining Johnson County. As in many states, the Ford campaign has virtually the entire state GOP leadership behind it--- Gov. Christopher S. Bond, Lt. Gov. William C. Phelps, Attorney General John C. Danforth, and St. Louis County Supervisor Gene McNary, who heads the Ford organization. Close contests are expected in many of the predominantly rural and district conventions leading up to the June 12 convention in Springfield.

Ohio: A recent Scripps-Howard newspaper survey showed Ford getting about 60 percent of the GOP vote. Reagan was granted ballot

space in a final ruling by the secretary of state.

South Dakota: The filing of an uncommitted slate in the June 1 primary may aid Reagan's chances of picking up delegates in South Dakota. Ford organizers feel the uncommitted slate will cut into their vote more heavily than Reagan's. Only slates attracting more than 20 percent of the GOP vote will receive national convention delegates so the uncommitted slate may finish out of the running while still damaging Ford. Despite the backing of top elected Republicans for Ford---U.S. Rep. James Abdnor and Attorney General William Janklow support the President and State Treasurer David Volk is his campaign chairman--- Ford and Reagan are rated about even in the state.

YOU ARE INVITED TO A MAJOR POLITICAL CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF NEW YORK

Place: New York University's Loeb Student Center, Greenwich Village

Time: Friday, May 14, 5-10 p.m.

Saturday, May 15, 8:45 a.m.-6 p.m.

Cost: \$15 for conference, including meals; special student and one-day rates.

Sponsor: Ripon Society of New York

Speakers: Dr. Barry Commoner, professor of environmental science, Washington University;

Dr. John C. Sawhill, president of New York University and former administrator of the Federal Energy Administration

Sen. Jacob K. Javits; and State Sen. Roy M. Goodman; chairman of the State Charter Revision Commission for New York City.

Discussion groups: Led by academic, business, and political leaders.

Reservations and Information: Ripon Society, Box 3869, New York, New York 10017. 202-355-3300.

Conference Chairman: Archibald L. Gillies.

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.

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 © 1976 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)

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 \$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.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

Robert D. Behn, Chairman
Clifford Brown
Robert H. Donaldson

Tanya Melich
Robert G. Stewart
Ralph Thayer

Contributing Editors: Clifford Brown, Glenn Gerstell, William A. Koelsch, Daniel J. Swillinger, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Richard W. Rahn, John A. Rehtuss, Thomas A. Sargent, Richard Cleveland, Mark Frazier, Peter Berg, Martin Sours, and William K. Woods.

Technical Editor: Brian J. McCarthy

POLITICS: STATES

CALIFORNIA

The latest Field Poll in California gives a 33-28 percent advantage to former San Francisco State President S.I. Hayakawa over former H.E.W. Secretary Robert Finch in the GOP Senate primary. When U.S. Rep. Barry Goldwater, Jr. (R) was leading the pack at the time of the last Field poll, Finch had a 22-17 percent lead over Hayakawa. Former Lt. Gov. John Harmer (R), who replaced former U.S. Rep. John Schmitz in mid-March as the far-right's entry in the race, carried only five percent of those surveyed by Field while U.S. Rep. Alphonzo Bell (R) was favored by 11 percent. The progressive Bell has moved sharply right, particularly on defense matters, and spent freely of his own personal fortune in an effort to get the Senate nomination. He has been particularly critical of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Finch, but has failed to make campaign headway. Finch, by contrast, has tried to keep the nomination worth getting by appealing blandly to all segments of the party, making obligatory conservative noises without sounding stridently offensive. He came close to receiving the endorsement of the conservative California Republican Assembly, but was blocked at the last minute by Harmer, who is viewed as a stalking horse for Reagan's presidential hopes by some. The object of all this maneuvering, Sen. John Tunney, does not inspire particular enthusiasm among his fellow Democrats, despite a 55-15 lead over former antiwar activist Tom Hayden. Hayden persistently links Tunney to Big Business while the GOP links him to big defense cuts. Tunney has oriented his campaign toward a fall contest with Finch and has moved noticeably rightward in the past year, opposing Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's health insurance bill and favoring mandatory prison sentences. Probably the most damaging thing to happen to Hayden's candidacy was wife Jane Fonda's scurrilous comments about Tunney dating "teenage" girls. Even Fonda had to backtrack on that one. Meanwhile down in the 40th C.D. where Richard Nixon suns himself in San Clemente, U.S. Rep. Andrew Hinshaw (R) has been suffering the persistent effects of a bribery conviction. Although Hinshaw persists in trying to seek reelection, his conviction has attracted a wide range of aspirants, including John Schmitz, the American Party candidate for President in 1972 whom Hinshaw had defeated earlier the same year in the GOP congressional primary. State Assemblyman Robert Badham (R) is favored to pick up the seat although the preponderance of conservative candidates for the seat may allow California State

University professor Harry P. Jeffrey, a GOP progressive, to sneak through to victory. In Bell's district north of Los Angeles, meanwhile, two moderates are seeking the GOP nomination: GOP State Treasurer Michael Donaldson, a 36-year-old lawyer, and Joseph H. Blatchford, 41, former director of Action and Peace Corps.

HAWAII

Lt. Gov. Nelson Doi (D) is making an attempt to unseat Honolulu Mayor Frank Fasi (D), a two-term incumbent who combines both controversy and popularity while waiting to make his quadrennial runs for the governorship. The loser of the Democratic primary might line up behind the Republican candidate, likely to be House Minority Leader Andrew Poepoe.

MARYLAND

It may be 1970 all over again in Maryland---without the Spiro Agnew touches. Sen. Glenn Beall (R) and former Sen. Joseph Tydings (D) appear headed for a rematch of their 1970 clash unless U.S. Rep. Paul Sarbanes (D) can close the gap between the two men before the May 18 primary. Tydings, who was believed to be the underdog in the Democratic race before a February poll by the Baltimore Sun showed that he had a 46-28 percent lead, benefits from far greater name recognition in the state. However, Sarbanes has cut Tydings' lead in recent months; an April Sun poll showed he trailed Tydings by only 41-31 percent. The Baltimore area congressman been considered the early favorite because of Tydings' considerable personal and political liabilities as well as Sarbanes' own organizational strength. The low-key Sarbanes has declined to capitalize on Tydings' weaknesses while Tydings has tried to shed his liberal image, alter his controversial stance on gun control, and adopt a more moderate-conservative rhetorical tone which would appeal to anti-Baltimore, anti-Washington feelings among suburban Democrats. Sarbanes has attempted to build on his Baltimore base but his edge in financial and leadership support has yet to be felt... although a late media surge may undercut Tydings' predominantly self-financed efforts. Beall, a genial and equally low-key incumbent, is widely considered one of the most vulnerable Republicans in the Senate. Although Beall trailed Tydings, 39-36 percent and led Sarbanes 36-33 percent in the February Sun poll, a race against Tydings and his persistent weaknesses might be easier for Beall, who has been overshadowed by the state's better-publicized senior senator, Charles McC. Mathias (R). Congressional race interest has focused on the 8th C.D. where progressive U.S. Rep. Gilbert Gude (R) is retiring, and the 3rd C.D. where Sarbanes is leaving the seat vacant. Gude's suburban Washington seat has attracted 10 Republican and 11 Democratic aspirants. But whereas State Sen. Newton I. Speers, Jr., is the clear

Republican favorite, the Democratic field includes a host of state and local officials as well as former Muskie aide Lanny J. Davis and former McGovern aide Frank Mankiewicz. The 3rd C.D. race is strictly a Democratic ethnic affair with Irish, Italian, and Polish groups represented. One of the aspirants in Baltimore City Councilwoman Barbara Milkulski, who ran against Sen. Mathias in 1974.

SOUTH DAKOTA U.S. Rep. Larry Pressler (R), a controversial freshman who alienated a good part of the party hierarchy during his first campaign and first term, appears to have been spared a serious primary challenge and probably a serious general election one as well. James V. Guffey, a former Democratic state chairman who is commissioner of commerce and consumer affairs, is the probable Democratic candidate, but he lacks the name recognition to seriously challenge Pressler, whose popularity is greater among the general electorate than within the state's GOP. Pressler's peacekeeping efforts during the last six months have smoothed some of the ruffled GOP feathers, however. U.S. Rep. James Abdnor (R), who won 68 percent of the vote in 1974, is also rated a safe bet. Both men may be looking toward 1978 when Sen. James Abourezk (D) comes up for reelection. Abourezk, whose defense of Arab interests in the Senate has made him a unique and somewhat controversial figure, may be vulnerable. Rumors in South Dakota politics have suggested that he might even call it quits himself after one term. The Senate seat will be attractive since South Dakota will lose one House seat after 1980, forcing the remaining congressional candidate to run at large anyway. Another man looking at Abourezk's seat is the new state chairman, Leo Thorsness, a former POW who came within 17,000 votes of unseating Sen. George McGovern (D) in 1972. Ironically, the man Thorsness recently succeeded as state chairman, John Olson, came within 20,000 votes of unseating Gov. Richard Kneip (D) in 1974. Kneip is serving his third and last term so many Republicans are salivating at the thought of a 1978 gubernatorial race. South Dakota was comparatively good to the GOP in 1974, when the GOP took over the only legislative house in the country. This year, South Dakota Republicans think they have a good

chance of capturing the Senate as well.

UTAH The GOP has two tempting targets in Utah this year. The decision of Gov. Calvin L. Rampton (D) not to seek a fourth term and the decision of U.S. Rep. Gunn McKay (D) not to pursue that nomination eliminates the Democrats' two most popular candidates for the post, both of whom led Attorney General Vernon B. Romney (R) in pre-announcement polls. Romney, however, will have opposition for the GOP nomination from Davis County Commissioner Stanley Smoot, whose courthouse ties through Utah's 29 counties may help cut into Romney's lead. Rampton said a Democratic poll helped him step aside because it showed Romney could be defeated by other Democrats; Rampton admitted, however, that only he and McKay actually led Romney. In the Senate race, three Republicans have been prominent in the effort to oust Sen. Frank Moss: Desmond Barker, a former White House aide; Jack Carlson, until recently assistant secretary of the interior, and former U.S. Rep. Sherman P. Lloyd, who lost congressional races in 1960 and 1972, won them in 1962, 1966, 1968, and 1970, and lost a Senate primary in 1964. A fourth candidate, Clinton Miller, who has been a health food lobbyist for a decade, is considered a likely recipient of John Birch Society support and therefore a possible survivor of the June convention which will narrow the field to two for the primary. There are no significant philosophical differences among Lloyd, Carlson, and Barker. All are "moderates by Utah standards, and "conservatives" by national measurements. Lloyd, who recently retired from federal service with the Commerce Department, has the best name recognition and ran only six percentage points behind Moss in a February poll by the Salt Lake Tribune. On the other hand, Lloyd has managed to alienate almost every GOP activist in the state. Carlson is a former University of Utah student body president with firm ties from his Utah days but whose recent absence from the state will hurt him badly. Barker has strong support among GOP activists and boasts former Sen. Wallace F. Bennett as his campaign chairman, but he is almost unknown outside of GOP inner circles. His advertising profession is not considered an advantage.

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.