ARIZONA

PHOENIX — Sen. Barry Goldwater won't have any trouble renewing his return pass to the Senate this year, but other Arizona Republicans may not be so fortunate.

For the first time in history, according to the Phoenix Gazette, both parties will have primaries. Now that Gov. Jack Williams (R) has officially announced he will not seek re-election, Republicans appear headed toward a four-way race for the gubernatorial nomination. Four Phoenix residents are running: former Mayors Milton Graham and John Driggs, Maricopa County Board of Supervisors Chairman Robert Corbin, and former Corporation Commissioner Russell Williams. (Graham reportedly lost one professional campaign adviser already in a dispute over moderation of Graham's flashy wardrobe; he served three terms as mayor before he was defeated in 1970 by Driggs.)

Gov. Williams, himself a former mayor of Phoenix, delayed his retirement announcement until March, prompting speculation he would seek a fourth term. Auto dealers, who seem to be prominent in both parties in Arizona, will be represented by Evan Mecham, in Republican speculation. Because of the possible heavy concentration of Maricopa County talent in the primary, State Senate President William Jacquin was given a good chance to win a multi-candidate field; Jacquin is from Tucson in Pima County. Currently, Russell Williams is regarded as the GOP favorite.

The leading Democratic gubernatorial candidate is Raul H. Castro, former ambassador to Bolivia who is now a Tucson lawyer. Castro, who came within 7,000 votes of defeating Jack Williams in 1970, lost some Democratic support by opposing the effort to recall Williams as governor. Mesa auto dealer Jack Ross, who ran against Castro in the 1970 Democratic primary, has also announced. Phoenix Attorney Gerald Pollock may also enter the race against the moderate Castro and the conservative Ross.

Both U.S. Reps. Morris K. Udall (D) and Sam Steiger (R) are favored for re-election. (Steiger was instrumental recently in convincing the White House to assist in the strangulation of land-use legislation sponsored by Udall.)

A number of Arizona Republicans would refrain from weeping if U.S. Rep. John B. Conlan (R) had a tough race, however. In 1972 Conlan won 53 percent of the vote against Democratic attorney Jack E. Brown. This year's Democratic candidate Jack Brown has an "A" for a middle initial and cattle and real estate for an occupation. Brown, backed by Steiger, will oppose a Phoenix attorney, Daniel Salcito, and another Brown (Byron T. "Bud")


U.S. Rep. John J. Rhodes (R) also had a relatively tough race in 1972, winning only 57 percent of the vote, compared to 68 percent in his old district in 1970. Rhodes' new prestige in Washington, however, will aid his re-election campaign, which was boosted to a quick start with $50,000 from the state GOP's quarterly Trunk 'n' Tusk dinner. That contribution wrinkled some noses in the Arizona GOP, where $10-20,000 is closer to the normal state GOP donation for congressional candidates. Rhodes will probably face Mesa veterinarian John Carney this year.

Two Democrats have shown an interest in Goldwater's Senate seat: Jonathan Marshall, a Scottsdale publisher, and Bob Begam, a Phoenix attorney.
KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON — Kentucky’s Senate election this year may be decided in the courts this spring.

At issue is the decision of state officials that GOP Sen. Marlow Cook is ineligible to run because he failed to file papers listing his campaign treasurer. Although Cook filed for the May 28 primary on March 22, he was not notified by of the error in filing until April 4, one day after the deadline.

Cook is contesting the ruling by Kentucky Secretary of State Thelma Stovall and Attorney General Ed Hancock, both Democrats, in the state courts. Cook, who said he was unaware of the new state law requiring the designation of the campaign treasurer, may have been treated differently from other candidates. Two Kentucky congressmen, both Republicans, filed in January. They did not file the treasurer designation either, but were able to correct the defect within one week of the original filing when Stovall notified them of the error.

However, according to Stovall, she verbally notified Cook of the missing name on the day that Cook filed his papers. Cook will argue in court that he is in “substantial compliance with Kentucky law.”

Since Kentucky has a closed primary, Cook will be unable to wage a write-in campaign. Either he wins in the courts, or the former Louisville official will be vacating his office for Gov. Wendell Ford (D) next January.

Cook was first elected to the Senate in 1968 after serving as a state legislator and county judge of Jefferson County. His record in state and local government was one of innovation and opposition to the old guard bipartisan leadership in the moribund Kentucky General Assembly. As a senator, however, he has moved somewhat to the right and has been a general supporter of the programs of the Nixon Administration. His independent streak remains, however, and the President cannot count on Senator Cook to be a knee-jerk rubber stamp on all issues.

Wendell Ford began his political career in the Kentucky and United States Jaycee organization, rising to National Jaycee president. He returned to Kentucky to become a state senator in 1965, lieutenant governor in 1967, and governor in 1971. Ford is a moderate conservative, associated on the national level with the Henry Jackson wing of the Democratic Party.

The governor will be the strongest possible candidate the Democrats could run. Before and during his term as governor, Ford and his allies have been building a well-financed campaign vehicle. Democratic hopes were bolstered by 1973 victories in Louisville, Jefferson County, and the General Assembly, further limiting Republican strength to the southeastern 5th C.D. Ford’s decision effectively precluded candidacies by Lt. Gov. Julian Carroll (D) and Jefferson County Judge Todd Hollenbach (D), both of whom are now expected to seek the governorship in 1975.

Republican fortunes have tumbled since Cook’s election in 1968. Since that time, the GOP has lost the governorship, the other Senate seat, a congressional seat, and numerous local and county offices. In the legislature, the Republicans, once a powerful near-majority, have diminished to a rear guard of only 29 of 138 legislators.

Cook in 1968 put together a coalition of votes from Louisville, Lexington, northern Kentucky, and the rock-ridden 5th C.D. Today, the Democrats control Cook’s former stronghold in Jefferson County, and in virtually no other region or locality have the Republicans been able to make gains. Cook has not been seen often in Kentucky, leading some GOP leaders to complain that “Marlow comes in for a Lincoln Day dinner and then we don’t see him again for a year.” While that sentiment may be unfair, Cook has not been keeping his fences mended with party officials and grass-roots workers.

The November election, therefore, puts Cook at a disadvantage. Ford will be well financed and at the head of a smoothly rolling campaign organization trying to keep its string of victories intact. Cook has to bear the cross of President Nixon’s unpopularity and the recent ineffectiveness of the Kentucky GOP.

Cook, however, is a great campaigner and should not be counted out yet. The Democrats should make this a probable gain, but Kentuckians are notoriously independent and have upset many past candidates who were “sure bets” to win. Ford is an ambitious man, and the national Democratic leadership wants the Kentucky seat quite badly. Kentucky, therefore, will be the site of a classic confrontation between the parties, with important overtones for 1976.

ALASKA

JUNEAU — In 15 years of statehood, Alaska has had three governors. All three are again running for that office this year: incumbent Gov. William Egan (D), who has occupied the office for 11 of those years; former Gov. Walter Hickel (R) who left office in 1969 for the Nixon Administration; and Hickel’s successor, State Sen. Keith Miller (R) of Anchorage.

Real estate executive Hickel’s announcement that he would seek the governorship rather than oppose Sen. Mike Gravel (D) surprised some political observers, who had interpreted an earlier candidacy announcement by Miller as indicative that Hickel would not also challenge Egan.

Hickel has hinted that he would like Miller as his running mate for lieutenant governor and there is speculation that Miller might drop out — just as there is speculation that former State Sen. Jay S. Hammond (R) might drop into the gubernatorial race. Hammond, now mayor of Bristol Bay Borough, has a mixed image as a poet and wilderness guide; he is a former State Senate president.

Egan has been defeated only once for governor (in 1966 by Hickel); he ousted Miller 52-46 percent in 1970. Now, however, Egan’s popularity may be dimming and it may be time for another governor . . . even if it is a former governor. Egan has not yet announced for governor but reacted to Hickel’s announcement by saying, “I think he would be the easiest to beat.” (The Hickel announcement apparently shelved plans by House Speaker Tom Fink (R) to run for governor.)

Although he did not totally rule out involvement in 1976 presidential politics, Hickel said he intends to
serve a full, four-year term if elected.

With Hickel out of the Senate race, State Senate President Terry Miller, 31, is the leading Republican candidate. The liberal Miller will face another state senator, C. R. Lewis, a member of the national council of the John Birch Society.

Gravel has damaged himself in many ways in the eyes of his constituents during his first term, but he has been campaigning actively for the past year. He's won pipeline points with the passage of legislation allowing progress on the Alaskan pipeline. So far, Gravel's only prominent primary opponent is former House Speaker Eugene Guess, who was demolished in the 1972 Senate election by Sen. Ted Stevens (R). Guess's loser image won't help his campaign effort this year.


Rounding out the Miller situation in Alaska, Anchorage State Rep. Jo Ann Miller (R), who reportedly is not popular with other legislative ladies, would like to be lieutenant governor.

----

PHILADELPHIA — Traditional Republican-Democratic roles may well be reversed in Pennsylvania's Senate contest this fall.

Once, Sen. Richard Schweiker (R) looked like a sure bet for a second term. Schweiker, whose backing ranges from labor to the anti-gun control lobby, appeared earlier to have only the state insurance commissioner to fear. However, two Democrats are now vying for the opportunity to oppose Schweiker: former Insurance Commissioner Herbert Denenberg and Pittsburgh Mayor Peter Flaherty. Flaherty, a genial populist whose fiscal parsimony has endeared him to Allegheny County residents, is the favorite. Denenberg's candidacy is annoying to Gov. Milton Shapp, who would like to avoid a ticket headed by two Philadelphia Jews. (The GOP ticket will be headed by two suburban Philadelphia WASPs, a situation some Republicans also sought to avoid.) While Denenberg will pour money and organization into his drive, Flaherty's campaign will be pure personality Pete.

If Flaherty is nominated in the May 21 primary, as expected, he will campaign as an opponent of spending and criticize Schweiker as too liberal. His appearance on the ticket with Schweiker will provide geographical balance to the statewide ticket and be a formidable obstacle for Schweiker and the GOP candidate for governor, Andrew Lewis. Lewis, former GOP finance head and business executive, faces a governor immensely strengthened by his performance in the nationwide truckers strike.

Lewis' own problems are characterized by his first bumper stickers which asked "Drew Who?" Having overcome some of his recognition problem with a TV advertising campaign, Lewis' stickers now say "Drew When?" Although Lewis is an impressive figure on the campaign trail, he may well be a candidate this year whose name has not yet come. (A sharp setback in the gubernatorial race may well cost the GOP the state House of Representatives. House Speaker Kenneth B. Lee (R) is the Republican candidate for lieutenant governor but his obstructionist legislative tactics may be a GOP drawback this fall.)

Pennsylvania Republicans are still recovering from last fall's debacle in Philadelphia, when the city Republican organization lost the posts of district attorney and controller as well as 3,000 patronage jobs in the court system. Philadelphia Republican leaders William Meehan and William Devlin had backed D.A. Arlen Spector for governor until his defeat in 1973; Meehan reportedly has yet to reconcile himself to Lewis' candidacy. Both former Gov. William Scranton and U.S. Rep. John Heinz III turned down entreaties that they run for the state house.

At a meeting March 16, State Sen. Richard C. Frame was elected to succeed State GOP Chairman Clifford L. Jones, who will become an executive with the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. Frame was Lewis' choice for the job.

Although Philadelphia continues in disarray after the new Democratic district attorney refused to empanel a grand jury to investigate new charges of corruption on the Philadelphia police force, Mayor Frank Rizzo's coterie of loyalists are held together by the city's declining crime rate and steady tax rates.

Situations in two eastern Pennsylvania congressional races are murky. In the 5th C.D. where U.S. Rep. John Ware (R) is retiring, State Rep. Richard Schulze, 44, is the choice of organization leaders in Montgomery, Chester, and Delaware counties. Schulze has four primary opponents, however, including former White House aide John Robin West, a 27-year-old attorney with a high-spending campaign; Edward Conroy, a moderate attorney who formerly was chief counsel for the federal Economic Development Administration; and James S. Milne, a liberal political science professor from West Chester State College.

Organization support may not be all it used to be in these counties, however, as demonstrated by the situation in Delaware County's 7th C.D. where U.S. Rep. Lawrence G. Williams (R) has been denied the endorsement of the "War Board," the
GOP's board of supervisors which has run the county with iron hands. Williams has developed delusions of independence from the War Board, which dumped him in favor of County D.A. Stephen J. McEwen, Jr. The primary will be a test of strength for Chester County boss Ted Rubino.


INDIANA

INDIANAPOLIS — Mayor Richard Lugar's Senate candidacy has been slowed somewhat by revelations by the Indianapolis Star of corruption in the city police department. Lugar has already demoted the police chief and replaced him with a criminology professor, but the handling of the scandal by the nation's most visible Republican mayor may well determine his chances against Sen. Birch Bayh (D) this fall.

Four issues are expected to dominate the Senate campaign: Bayh's support of busing will be contrasted with Lugar's opposition to court-ordered, one-way busing for eight Indiana counties. (The plan will close several inner-city schools.) Bayh's opposition to the Alaskan pipeline will be criticized by Lugar. Lugar may be helped by his support for the Highland Dam in suburban Marion County; Bayh has opposed the dam. On balance, Lugar strategists expect "energy" to help the GOP. And then there is Richard Nixon; Bayh rated inclusion on the White House enemies list.

Lugar, however, has looked like a "politician" in some of the opening moves of the campaign and may be hurt by his 1971 pledge to serve out his term as mayor. Undoubtedly, Richard Nixon will be one of the top issues this year in the state. The Democratic state chairman seldom loses an opportunity to describe Lugar as Nixon's "favorite mayor." Lugar, so far, has not shied away from the President, saying, "I believe my identification with President Nixon will be helpful." In fact, some Republicans think the Lugar campaign should identify more closely with Nixon.

In the 11th C.D. which will be the chief target of Democrats, the divorce of U.S. Rep. William H. Hudnut III, a minister, may be offset by the earlier divorce of Hudnut's predecessor and current opponent, Andrew Jacobs (D). Hudnut upset Jacobs in 1972 by only 4,601 votes. His re-election effort may be further irritated this year by a pro-impeachment opponent in the GOP primary. Lugar's presence on the ticket, however, will help Hudnut in a marginal district.

U.S. Rep. Earl Landgrebe (R), who escape primary opposition, will also face a rematch. In 1972, the arch-conservative Landgrebe beat Purdue University Professor Floyd T. Fithian by 19,000 votes in the 2nd C.D. Landgrebe's margin in 1970 was even slimmer. Fithian is back in '74, but not expected to win.

A less conservative Republican than State Sen. Allan Bloom (R) might have defeated U.S. Rep. Edward Roush (D) in the 4th C.D. in 1972; Roush got only 51 percent. In 1975 Roush will face State Sen. Walter Helmke (R), but the incumbent is perhaps the state's best Democratic campaigner in a basically Republican district.

Helmke's name identification as a former prosecutor should make the district the GOP's best bet to win a Democratic seat.

A third rematch is shaping up in the 10th C.D. U.S. Rep. David W. Dennis (R) defeated Philip R. Sharp with 57 percent of the vote in 1972. Sharp must defeat four Democrats to face Dennis in November, but Dennis' involvement in the proceedings of the House Judiciary Committee may limit his appearances in the district.


Although in the 5th C.D. U.S. Rep. Elwood H. Hillis won re-election with 64 percent of the vote in 1972, he is also considered vulnerable. His fate may hang on the health of the auto industry in Anderson and Kokomo.

Indiana voters still tend to vote tickets, and the fate of many Republicans in the state may well hinge on how well Richard Lugar does in his Senate race. Both the GOP's present control of the legislature and Lugar's presidential ambitions may hang in the balance.

LOUISIANA

NEW ORLEANS — Louisiana Republicans held a state convention March 2-3 and discovered that the party could no longer "hold its convention in a phone booth."

The Louisiana GOP still has trouble finding party members (only three percent of statewide registration is Republican), workers, and candidates, but
about 400 delegates were able to hear John Connally, George Bush, North Carolina Gov. James Holshouser and U.S. Rep. David Treen of Louisiana. Treen, whose own district is only three percent Republican faces the possibility of a stiff re-election campaign, but no Democratic challengers have yet announced.

Treen was replaced as national committeeman at the state convention by Alexandria businessman John Cade. Cade, who ran Treen’s 1972 congressional campaign, defeated New Orleans attorney Martin Feldman for the post.

Feldman denied he was a liberal, but apparently enough Republicans in the GOP State Central Committee distrusted his past friendship with Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) to cost him the post. Because GOP National Committeewoman Jean Boese also comes from Alexandria, she resigned and was replaced by Patricia Lindh of Baton Rouge.

Meanwhile in the 6th C.D., a “self-described “Charles Percy Republican” hopes to oppose U.S. Rep. John Rarick (D) this fall. The young moderate, Morton Laitner, will be opposed by GOP State Treasurer Henson Moore.

POLITICS: PEOPLE

○ In the March 1 FORUM, it was reported that Cleveland City Councilman Dennis Kucinich had withdrawn as a Democratic candidate for the 23rd C.D. in Ohio. Actually, Kucinich, who received 47 percent of the vote as the Democratic candidate in 1972, is running as one of five independent candidates in the race; there are six Democrats seeking their nomination. One independent, Boydan Futey, is basing his campaign on the claim that he is the “only genuine ethnic candidate.” The leading Republican in the three-way primary is State Rep. George E. Mastics.

○ Kansas State Treasurer Tom R. Van Sickle, a former leader of the National Young Republican Federation, has announced his candidacy for attorney general. Van Sickle also sought the same nomination in 1970, but was defeated in the GOP primary by former Assistant Attorney General Richard Seaton. The incumbent attorney general, Democrat Vern Miller, is running for governor. U.S. Rep. William Roy (D) recently announced his candidacy for Sen. Bob Dole’s seat.

○ John Marttila, the former RNC official who helped mastermind U.S. Rep. Richard VanderVeen’s upset victory in Michigan, says there’s only one way for Republicans to escape such disasters this year. The Democratic campaign consultant says Republicans have to completely disassociate themselves from President Nixon; the President, according to Marttila, is a legitimate campaign issue. Voters don’t really have to choose which candidate is more qualified — just who will represent their views more effectively, he argues.

○ Florida Public Service Commissioner Paula Hawkins has been moving toward an announcement that she will challenge Sen. Edward Gurney. Mrs. Hawkins, the GOP national committeewoman, has accused Gurney of lying when he denied that she had been under consideration for the post of U.S. treasurer. “My only feeling toward him is one of pity,” she said. Shocked and very disappointed, a man of his stature, and holding an office as high as he holds, would stoop so low as to take a swipe at a housewife from Maitland,” she said. Asked at a news conference if she would help a move to dump Gurney, Mrs. Hawkins said, “Where?”

○ “The political truth is that the President is involved with Watergate if only by virtue of his handling of the crisis. And if by our silence, his is the only Republican voice that speaks on Watergate, then his words become Republican words. They become our words. And I don’t care if every Republican walks out of this room, the President’s words are not my words, his politics not my politics, his tactics not my tactics,” said Sen. Lowell Weicker (R) in a speech in New Milford, Conn., March 16. Weicker called White House statements on Watergate “trash” and was particularly critical of references to the “mandate” of the 1972, election. “As a Republican I’d like to differ with Richard Nixon on the mandate of 1972. It would have been a great mandate if it had been achieved under rules that were the same for everybody. They weren’t. And so goodbye to the mandate of 1972 as a Republican plus.”
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"...is an important and useful book for anyone who wants to keep abreast of contemporary politics.” John Gardner.
Conservative disenchantment with the Republican Party appears to be spreading. In a recent issue of Human Events, American Conservative Union Chairman M. Stanton Evans wrote, "The major issue to be decided is whether the Republican Party will somehow manage to become the vehicle of that (conservative) feeling," or whether, as suggested by the rise of the independents, some other political entity will play the decisive role instead. (See "Mavericks and Lincoln's" in the March 15 FORUM.)

The resolution of a long-standing feud between Tennessee Gov. Winfield Dunn (R) and U.S. Rep. James H. Quillen (R) may be closer since March 12, when the Tennessee legislature overrode Dunn's veto of a second state medical school at East Tennessee State University. Quillen had pushed the creation of the medical school, which will receive federal Veterans Administration funding, but Dunn had opposed the school, preferring instead to boost funding for the existing state medical school in Memphis.

U.S. Rep. Dan Kuykendall (R) has been hurt by the redistricting action of the Tennessee legislature. Although the original legislation changing the precincts in Kuykendall's Memphis district was vetoed by the governor, the veto was overridden with the help of State Sen. Fred O. Berry, Sr. (R-Knoxville). Commenting on Berry's vote, Kuykendall said, "Anytime you get an undertaker that wears a diamond studded horseshoe, you can figure out what's going to happen."

George Meany may still dislike George Wallace, but the AFL-CIO in Alabama likes him. Wallace's gubernatorial candidacy was unanimously endorsed by a state convention in Montgomery. The only Republican entered in the gubernatorial contest is Elvin McCary, a former Democratic state senator who has little statewide recognition. Alabama politics may undergo a radical change next year, despite the predicted re-election of Wallace. Lt. Gov. Jere Beaasley, and Attorney General Bill Bazley, all Democrats. Under court-ordered redistricting, legislators will now be elected from single-member districts, opening the way for greater representation of blacks, Republicans, and women. Republicans have seven candidates for the 35-member senate, including the only female Senate candidate. The GOP will field 35 candidates for the 105-member House, including seven women and three blacks. (The only black woman running, Charlene Crowell, is a Republican.) GOP Executive Director Bill Harris is "hopeful" that the party will greatly expand its current two-man legislative delegation.

Phyllis Schlafly, former first vice-president of the National Federation of Republican Women and conservative Republicans' answer to Bella Abzug, told the California Republican Assembly in Fresno, March 23 that President Nixon should resign if the House of Representatives impeaches him. The conservative CRA endorsed Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke for governor and State Sen. H. L. Richardson for senator.

South Carolina Republicans have elected Jesse Cooksey, a 41-year-old conservative former Democrat from Spartanburg, to replace Kenneth Powell as state GOP chairman. Cooksey has promised not to "leave any Democrats unopposed" this year. The GOP may finally have found a candidate to oppose Sen. Ernest Hollings (D): State Rep. Weston Adams of Columbia.

New Jersey politics are now back to the pre-Cahill days when Webster Todd was state GOP chairman and Conover Spencer was GOP executive director. Both men lost their posts when William Cahill became governor, and both men are now back in their old GOP jobs. Spencer replaces Frederick Coldren, a former aide to U.S. Rep. Charles Sandman (R), who has returned to the Sandman fold, which Spencer in turn left to return to the state GOP.

San Francisco State Sen. Milton Marks (R) will not seek the congressional seat being vacated by U.S. William Mailliard. Marks will instead devote his attention to the 1975 mayoralty race in San Francisco. Incumbent Joseph Alioto may have irrevocably derailed his gubernatorial campaign in the recent strike of municipal employees.

Sen. Walter Mondale's hopes to spark interest in a possible run for the presidency may have received a setback February 27 with what was widely described as a lackluster performance on the topic of campaign finance before the new Democratic Forum. Established shortly after the 1972 election, the Forum has drawn together many former campaign aides who can be expected to return to national races in 1976. Organizers of the session said Mondale "didn't know his stuff."

Vermont Lt. Gov. John Burgess (R) has announced he will seek the congressional seat being vacated by U.S. Rep. Richard Mallary, who is running for the Senate. Burgess, who had been considered a likely gubernatorial candidate, will be opposed by former Attorney General James Jeffords (R). There is speculation, meanwhile, that the high turnover in the Vermont House of Representatives might lead to Democratic control next year.

The aborted Senate candidacy of Utah House Speaker Howard C. Neilson (R) leaves Jake Garn back in the undisputed lead for the GOP Senate nomination to succeed Sen. Wallace Bennett (R). Neilson announced his candidacy March 14 and withdrew April 6, because of a combination of organization, financial and family problems. Salt Lake City Mayor Garn far outdistanced his three competitors in a poll taken for the Salt Lake Tribune. He is not expected to emerge from the Republican state convention with the 70 percent necessary to avoid a primary, however. Similarly, on the Democratic side, polls show U.S. Rep. Wayne Owens (D) leading Salt Lake attorney Donald Holbrook by more than 4-1. Owens leads Garn in the polls, 48-34 percent, but Garn advisors are encouraged and convinced they are well within striking distance of Owens.
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COMMENTARY: POLITICS

Does Scoop Got It?

by Clifford W. Brown

Several Democrats have started walking for the 1976 presidential nomination. Walking has become a useful political tactic in recent years, but Sen. Henry Martin "Scoop" Jackson has added a new twist to walking for President. Jackson is walking across America's television screens and leaving the clear imprint of his heel mark: "I told you so." In so doing, it has been prophesized that Jackson will trample all the other Democratic walkers — Senators Walter Mondale, Lloyd Bentsen, et al. — underfoot by convention time.

Jackson is correctly regarded as a "right of center" Democrat, but "right" in a special sense. He is a strong supporter of what the Ripon Society has called the "New Right" philosophy (see "The Old Right Versus the New Right," January FORUM), and he would like to lead the Democratic Party in the same direction that John Connally would like to push the Republican Party: towards a new corporatism where Big Government, Big Business, and Big Labor would enjoy a warm, cozy relationship of mutual backscratching justified by a doctrine of security — job security, corporate security, and, of course, national security. In fact, in economic affairs, the only difference between these two Democrats is that Connally would like to start with a warm relationship between government and business and bring in labor as a regulated junior partner, while Jackson would like to start with government and labor and bring in business in a similar fashion.

There are many examples of Jackson's affinity for this new corporate image of society: his close proximity to the military-industrial complex, his support for the Lockheed loan and other governmental subsidies for key industries, his proposal for a national land-use program, and his suggestions for regulation of the oil industry. All these show that the "senator from Boeing" is not a laissez-faire capitalist in the usual right-wing tradition — a fact that Barry Goldwater pointed out with great vigor in a speech to the board of directors of the American Iron and Steel Institute.

To suggest that Jackson is the Democrats' answer to Connally, however, is a vast oversimplification. The Washington senator is a very complex man, and over the years he has tracked back and forth over many issues on all sides of the prevailing left-right spectrum. For example, he is famous for his efforts on behalf of conservation (until ecological doctrines began to conflict with corporate interests). He is noted for his fascination with Israel and the Jews. He is remembered for his suggestion over a year ago that a massive Apollo-style program was necessary to develop our energy resources. He is also remembered as a consistent hawk, an ancient foe of the Russians, and as one of the few senators to deny consistently that the Vietnam War was a mistake. He earns a 100 percent COPE rating most of the time, and he has a commendable civil rights record — although in 1972 he hopped nimbly on the anti-busing bandwagon. In short, almost every group in this country can find some action of Henry Jackson's that they find commendable and, with the exception of the AFL-CIO, almost every group can find some minimum percentage, say 15 percent.

The rule will have several effects: Every serious national contender will have to run in every state to accumulate his percentage. There will be a strong tendency toward favorite-son candidacies, in order to create a convention-bargaining posture. These two tendencies and the general dynamics of the situation will make it very difficult for any one candidate to average more than 50 percent in every state across the country — the minimum requirement for a first-ballot victory. The situation created by this rule will be the functional equivalent of a national primary with 50 percent required to win. The chance that this reform will produce a power-brokered convention is enormous, since it will be mathematically very difficult for anyone to reach the 50-percent figure. Consider the 1972 situation in which McGovern won because of the unit rules. In fact, McGovern got 50 percent of the vote in only two primaries. (Wallace fared much better, incidentally, but in overall votes, he, McGovern, and Humphrey had equivalent shares.)

Two other trends also shape the rules of 1976. First, the tendency toward more primaries will continue. Second, there will be some sort of campaign funding reform, probably a limit on the size of individual contributions. Together these reforms create an interesting situation, because the need to enter more primaries will
boost costs, while campaign contributions will presumably be cut. This combination will greatly benefit labor candidates and "cause" candidates (such as Wallace and his equivalents on the Left), while hurting the moderates (Muskie, for instance, suffered from a similar problem in 1972 on a smaller scale). Under these guidelines, Scoop Jackson will have a difficult time getting either 50 percent of the delegates or emerging as the nominee of a brokered convention.

It will be difficult for Jackson to emerge from this new nominating process with enough delegates to be within striking distance of an early ballot majority. In addition to the mathematical problems, Jackson has an image problem. If the nominating process becomes the functional equivalent for a national primary — with everyone having to run in every state — then candidates and their managers will have to turn increasingly to nationwide media purchases, which are more economical than local media purchases. This means network television, talk shows, debates, etc., as well as strictly "media" appearances along the expanded campaign trail. Television is not Jackson's medium. He is harsh, wooden, and dull. Television is a relaxed medium where a sense of humor is an asset. He lacks the verve of the revivalist that might translate his "conservatism" into a medium to which Wallace supporters could relate. Furthermore, he lacks the charisma and pseudo-sophistication that might translate his "liberalism" into a medium that New Left professionals would find attractive. Jackson is a conventional man, and television is a more demanding medium. Jackson suffers from a lack of warmth, a particularly revealing attribute on the tube.

Jackson is also not on good terms with the Establishment and its media connections. The press may respect him, but it does not love him.

If Jackson has a personality-image problem, then it seems logical that he must create an "issues" constituency. Jackson, however, is competing with Wallace for the same kind of supporter in many parts of the country: the conservative southerner and the northern blue-collar worker. To the extent that Wallace is a serious contender, he will cut severely into Jack-

son's base. The liberals will have candidates that will suit them better. So will the blacks. Jackson's civil rights record will not gain him many points in the delegate selection process. His biggest potential, obviously, is labor. Labor may well come to view him as the vehicle for stopping Wallace and restoring its pivotal position in the nominating process. Labor's efforts, however, cannot be limited to the usual twisting of arms behind the scenes. Labor will have to mount a major campaign in primaries and caucuses. It will have to commit itself wholeheartedly to Jackson early and wage for the first time an all-out intraparty campaign, while other left-wing candidates also make claims on its loyalties. Considering the possibility for dissenion from liberal unions such as the United Auto Workers, labor unity in 1976 may be more effervescent than it was in 1972. Without labor's wholehearted backing, Jackson will be lost. Even with it, he will have problems.

Assuming there is no clear convention choice in 1976, Jackson might appear to be a logical compromise between the supporters of Wallace, organization-labor, and left wings of the party. After all, Jackson's Conservatism overseas and his patriotism at home would appeal to the first group; his historic loyalties and voting record would appeal to the second group; and his civil rights record (together perhaps with his Russophobia) to the third group. It is possible, however, to envision a situation in which Jackson would be totally unacceptable to both left and right wings, of the party. In a brokered situation, the length of the enemies list is more important than the length of the friends list, since many have a veto power but few have an unchecked king-making power. It is easy to see Jackson's civil rights record and his affinity for big labor and business alienating the racist-populism of Wallace delegates (especially if Jackson was their chief antagonist in the campaign). It is easy to see Jackson's hawkishness, emphasis on defense spending, and cozy relationship with the military-industrial complex becoming an unacceptable liability for the Left. And it is easy to see labor choosing one of its many other acceptable candidates in order to placate right and left wings and win the election.

Even more important is the question of how the convention might be brokered. There is no recent precedent for such a situation. In the old days, brokers brokered. That is, they spoke for their delegate blocs. In 1976 there will be a serious question about whether many "brokers" will exist in the classic sense of the word. The new rules will generate delegates committed to causes or principles but not "deliverable" in the classic sense. Wallace might control his delegates, but he could not deliver them to a liberal candidate. Labor might control "its" delegates, but certainly not to the extent it traditionally has been able to do. The Left leadership would lose its delegates if it tried to be too "strategic" in its maneuvers. The favorite son would be able to hold their blocs but not convey them. The process of delegate selection would take on a different meaning in a situation without traditional power brokers.

Finally, a "compromise" candidate would face an additional variable: the willingness of various factions to compromise rather than pick up their marbles and "bolt." There is a vast legitimacy problem in the Democratic Party, and unless it is solved reasonably well to the satisfaction of the major factions, no "compromise" candidate will emerge.

Henry Jackson, for all his strengths, may not be in the Democratic spirit of 1976.
COMMENTARY: NATION

Income Tax Reform

by Richard W. Rahn

Nobody likes taxes, but public opinion polls show that Americans increasingly believe that their taxes are levied unfairly. Although it may be difficult to describe objectively a "good" or "bad" tax system, it is reasonable to assert that the tax screws should turn with equal force on persons of equivalent income.

Unfortunately, the current American income tax system does not provide such equality.

The present system also violates the tenet that a tax ought to be neutral. Taxes ought not to affect the price and supply of some goods and services differently than others, for if it does, it will result in disruption and inefficiency in the economic system.

The current income tax structure provides for rates ranging from 14-70 percent, with the maximum average effective rate of about 30 percent applying to persons with incomes over $100,000.

The recommendations which follow would make the income tax system more equitable and thus would help restore the public's faith in their tax system. If these recommendations are put into effect, the present rate structure could be substantially reduced to something on the order of 12-50 percent and still generate the same federal income.

If it is agreed that an income tax ought to tax income, then all income ought to be taxed alike whether it comes from salaries, gambling, gifts, inheritances, interest, dividends, or capital gains. (Income-averaging provisions could be expanded to take care of large fluctuations in income resulting from sweepstakes winnings, inheritances, or large capital gains.)

Since an income tax is based on the principle of "ability to pay," the way the income is spent should be the business of the income earner, not the government.

If these premises are accepted, then the following changes in the tax law should be enacted:

Income-splitting provisions for married couples ought to be eliminated. For years, single individuals complained of the discrimination of the income-splitting provision. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 gave singles some relief but discriminated against married people where the income of each spouse was approximately the same. Specifically, a married couple who each makes $15,000 has to pay a greater total tax than if they were both single and living together. (Separate filing for married people does not eliminate this discrimination.) Hence, the state encourages marriage at certain income levels and discourages it at others. The income tax system should be blind to the marital status of taxpayers, particularly in view of population concerns.

To alleviate a possible increase in the tax burden to low-income families as a result of the elimination of the income-splitting provision, major increases should be made in the personal and dependent income exemptions. An adjustment in the personal exemption from the current $750 to $2,000 per person would more accurately reflect the cost of contemporary living. This change would also reduce the burden felt by the working poor in supporting their dependents.

Corporate income taxes should be revised so that the amount of taxable income would be reduced by the amount paid out in dividends. Stockholders would then pay the same income tax rate on their dividends as on earned wages, but would not be taxed twice on the non-excluded portions of dividend receipts, as they now are. This provision would also encourage corporations to pay out a larger portion of their earnings.

Provisions for a lower tax rate on capital gains tax preference cannot be justified by the money inflation of assets, since it treats all capital gains equally regardless of whether the property was purchased in 1776 or six months ago. Nor can it be justified on our "ability to pay" premise. Such gains as the sale of a house can be handled as fairly by income-averaging and the overall reduction of marginal tax rates.

Tax-exempt state and municipal bonds should be eliminated by prohibiting the issuance of any new ones. Not only is this a tax preference that only the wealthy can enjoy, but the federal government loses more revenue from them than state and local governments save. An increase in direct subsidies to state and local governments by such devices as revenue sharing would be a more appropriate means to the desired end.

The interest expense deduction should be eliminated. It is as much of a discretionary expense as others for the income recipient, and there is little justification for treating it differently from any other expenditure.

Most deductions for charitable contributions should be eliminated or curtailed, e.g., such contributions as church donations, which result in one taxpayer indirectly supporting another taxpayer's theology with which he may not agree. (This particular provision also results in greater subsidies for high-cost religions as opposed to low-cost ones. This occurs because any tax deduction reduces total government revenue which must be offset by higher tax rates for everyone.) There exist many other organizations which all taxpayers subsidize by deductible contributions but which produce highly debatable general social betterment.

Each of these suggested reforms will be opposed by highly vocal vested-interest opponents. Given the increasing cynicism with which the public views government in general and the tax system in particular, it would behoove Congress to show a little strength and honesty by increasing the fairness of our income tax system and enacting a program such as the one described.
The Future Of Vietnam

by Peter Hughes and Mark Haroff

"The Vietnam War," wrote Robert Bartley in the Christian Science Monitor, is "far greater national tragedy than even Watergate. In this case it cannot be said that our institutions restrained mistaken men."

Vietnam has come to symbolize the loss of 55,000 American lives, domestic divisiveness, violent protest, a fallen President, and a deeply wounded national pride. The result is that most Americans have attempted to block Vietnam out of their consciousness. Only one year after the Paris cease-fire agreement, the war in Vietnam continues unabated. Although America's military involvement has ended, the nation is still faced with the task of defining what its future role in the Vietnamese struggle should be.

For many Americans, the moral disillusionment of the Vietnam war has spurred the country to turn inward and toward isolationism. But the United States has an international responsibility which should be based on the lessons of its mistakes and an awareness of its limitations.

Since the Vietnam cease-fire accord was signed in Paris in January 1973, there have been more than 335,000 cease-fire violations. The Soviets and Chinese have continued to pour weapons into North Vietnam, and the United States has responded in kind. There is clearly no immediate hope for peace since all available intelligence data still indicates that the leadership of North Vietnam remains committed to the goal of taking over the South, which is enjoying greater legitimacy with the general populace than ever before.

South Vietnam is not without its problems, including the continuing war, corruption, and inflation. But the government of South Vietnam is not an anonymous collection of military and bureaucratic "hacks." The average age of Thieu's cabinet is 41 years, compared to an average age of 60 years for members of Hanoi's Politbureau. Many of these young cabinet members were educated in the United States and share a common belief in classical liberalism. Most would like to see the government's decentralization and civil liberty expansion proceed as quickly as possible. South Vietnam's minister of information, H.E. Hoang Du Nha, one of the most able Cabinet members, is totally committed to the growth of a "loyal opposition." Nha's attitude toward political opposition is illustrative of a growing flexibility in the Thieu government. This fact is recognized by Professor Nguyen Ngoc Huy, who, as leader of the opposition party (Social Democratic Alliance), finds increasing freedom to speak openly about the government.

America's long-time involvement in the Vietnam conflict and the effects of a relentless war have made South Vietnam's economy dependent upon continuing U.S. aid. That our aid will not continue endlessly has been recognized by the South Vietnamese leadership. President Thieu is now actively seeking international economic assistance, and he seems willing to accept the fact (perhaps reluctantly) that the extent of American support will continue to decline. Herein lies the future of America's role in South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is a developing country with a great economic potential. Through its strong agricultural base and with economic development the country certainly has the potential to achieve economic stability. The prospects for discovering oil on its shores are rated excellent, and such a discovery would be a major boost toward that country's self-sufficiency. But these developments will take time, and it is time that the United States seems unwilling to give them.

Somewhere in the process of becoming involved in Vietnam, we seem to have forgotten both the international events that resulted in America's commitment as well as our original purpose. We now have the opportunity to learn from our mistakes and come forth with a positive policy.
than does the distribution of what is produced, and the businessmen seeking influence have not been old-fashioned captains of industry but newer breeds from the sales, promotion, and advertising departments. Today, continues Rovere, "what is generally regarded as business talent has less to do with production or engineering or even, for that matter, banking, than with manipulating techniques that are not unlike those employed in politics."

And we might add, during Nixon's years in politics, the Republican Party's association with American capitalism has become less one of encouraging the productivity of aggressive and intelligent entrepreneurs than of protecting the inefficiency of the aggressive and intelligent manipulators.

- "William Scranton Remains Aloof: He Says He Doesn't Want To Be God, or Governor," by Steve Neal. Philadelphia Inquirer, March 31, 1974. William Scranton has in the past six years rejected bids to become vice president, secretary of state, ambassador to three countries, and energy czar. He has also rejected the entreaties of Pennsylvania Republicans to run for governor this year. The 56-year-old former governor is chairman of the board of Northeastern Bank in Scranton and prefers reading to running for office. Commenting on his abortive 1964 presidential run, Scranton says, "I knew that I never had a chance to be nominated. There just wasn't enough support there with the liberal end of the party. I ran primarily out of concern for the future of the party. Republicans were being portrayed as a white supremacy party and that really threw me off — it was so contrary to the party's record. I was disturbed about what was happening to the party. I wasn't personally ambitious for power. This bothered people like Hugh Scott who think that everybody wants to be God. I did not want to be President."

- "Sheehan's Campaign for Governor Faltering," by David Farrell. Boston Globe, April 11, 1974. Peter Fuller, the Massachusetts Republican who was gearing up his independent gubernatorial campaign, suddenly withdrew from the race for unexplained personal reasons in late March. Fuller's withdrawal has had an adverse effect on the gubernatorial campaign of another anti-Sargent Republican, former Commerce Secretary Carroll Sheehan. According to Farrell, Sheehan hoped to pick up Fuller's supporters in his primary campaign against Gov. Francis Sargent. Sargent, however, has an almost magical ability to discourage Republican opposition, most recently coopting Sheehan's prospective running mate for lieutenant governor, Raymond Fontana, a former member of the Governor's Council. "Several of the original leaders of the anti-Sargent faction are starting to back off and head out of the building before the whole structure collapses on them. About the only certainty of the current situation is that it will be a miracle and a lot of money for Carroll Sheehan to refuel his sagging political fortunes. Both are unlikely," says Farrell.

- "Ford Scraps on 'Edset Future for GOP,'" by Robert Constock. (Hackensack, N.J.) Record, March 31, 1974. Vice President Gerald Ford's March visit to New Jersey failed to put much of a dent in U.S. Rep. Charles Sandman's huge debt from his 1973 gubernatorial campaign. Sandman raised only $55,000 against his $247,000 debt. "Under an arrangement worked out by GOP state Chairman Webster B. Todd, Ford's appearance in Atlantic City was supposed to exhaust the state party's obligation for Sandman's debt. The state party, meanwhile, raised $47,000 the same night against its $124,000 debt. Members of the board of directors have public dreams of sweeping the entire 15-man congressional delegation this fall.

- "Party Hopping Dims Connolly's Candle," by David S. Broder. Newark Star-Ledger, March 17, 1974. "From the look of things here, it will be a long time before (John) Connolly's new allies have a genuine gubernatorial victory — or much of anything else — to celebrate. Last spring, when the former three-term governor and political strongman took his presidential ambitions into the GOP, Texas Republicans hailed his move as 'the most tremendous political breakthrough' possible. They predicted a wave of conversions that would tip the balance of state politics to the GOP." But it did not happen. "Whatever the explanation, it appears unlikely that Connolly will be able to claim credit this year for helping his adopted party score any significant breakthrough in his own state. And that failure — together with the milk fund testimony and the continuing problems of his patron, President Nixon — may well cloud his chances of heading the Republican ticket in 1976," writes Broder.

- "Connally — A Man Without A Party," by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. Boston Globe, March 25, 1974. Despite the success of John Connally's dinner campaigning in recent months, his presidential campaign is not going anywhere. The reason, according to Evans and Novak, that "Connally is a Republican to the Democrats, but he is still a Democrat to the Republicans — in short, a man without a party. Moreover, his politically inert defense of President Nixon may not hurt him in the South, but it is not helping either. The columnists quote one Connally supporter: 'He is as much a liberal as the Democrats think that he is. He's for Nixon and national politics like they think in Dallas, and Dallas just ain't the USA.' So, the columnists say, 'With no Connally political organization in sight and not the slightest Connally effort to build one, 1976 looms bleak today. And 1976, Connally says, would be the last chance for him.'

- "Congress and the Media: Partners in Propaganda," by Ben H. Bagdikian. Columbia Journalism Review, January February 1974. Local media are too uncritical of congressional incumbents, according to the Review's national correspondent. Citing such examples as the employment of joint employment of a Senate reporter by both the Tribune and U.S. Rep. Joseph M. McDade, (R-Pa.) Bagdikian argues that the media advantages of congressional incumbents contribute to the low turnover in the House of Representatives and ultimately to "the growing impotence and Insensitivity of the legislative branch." Although about half of the House of Representatives were freshmen a century ago, the percentage dropped to 12 percent by 1970. Concludes Bagdikian, "...the renewal of the House on the basis of performance and changes in public desires is not working. One important reason is that the news media simply don't tell the folks back home what their member of Congress really does. Worse than that, most of the media are willing conduits for the highly selective information the member of Congress decides to feed the electorate. This propaganda is sent to newspapers and broadcasting stations, and the vast majority of them pass it off to the voters as professionally collected, written and edited 'news.' The impact that aggressive media coverage could have on Congress is revealed in one persuasive statistic cited by Bagdikian: 'In 1972, for example, of 60 new members elected to the House, including 39 vacancies, 57, or 95 percent, came from the minority of House districts with a newspaper or broadcasting station that maintains some direct Washington correspondence.' According to the Ralph Nader Congress Project, the percentages of media outlets with Washington contacts were: daily newspapers, 28 percent; TV stations, 4 percent; and radio stations, 1 percent.