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Bust The Trust

Clarence Darrow once said, "When I was a boy, I was told that anybody could become President; I am beginning to believe it." But Darrow was wrong. The field of presidential possibilities has been narrower than that for the pro football draft. The FORUM's editors feel that Republicans should give greater thought to possible presidential candidates: businessmen, labor leaders, college presidents or even politicians. We urge you to "mention" your favorite unmentioned candidate in the reader survey on page 9. It's your draft pick.
PETERSBURG — In all modesty, my house is under-assessed. Even my house’s worst detractors (and they are many) have a hard time believing that it is assessed for $500.

There is no impropriety involved, but I thought I should make the whole thing public so the American people can understand. I am perfectly willing to let the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation review the whole matter even though my real estate taxes are no concern of theirs.

"That piece of junk," as one friend describes my house, is not one of America’s choicest pieces of real estate. After all, I don’t have a helipad or private golf links. I dream of the day when I can install a tennis court, but it would take a lot of filling to level off the 45-degree slope in back of my house.

It’s not exactly a classy neighborhood. Bebe Rebozo and Bob Abplanalp haven’t discovered the local real estate market yet. In fact, I wish the old railroad line adjoining my property would be revived so I could see a locomotive bisect the ugly mobile home which now straddles the railroad right-of-way. I bet the Secret Service could take care of that problem.

Not that I don’t like my neighbors, but they wouldn’t all tramp through my property to go fishing in the Little Hoosick River if the Secret Service were around. Pacifist that I am, it scares me every autumn to see those 12-year-old kids running around town with double-barreled shotguns and hunting licenses. They don’t have to put up with that in San Clemente.

On the other hand, I don’t think the President bought his house out of a catalog, the way I did. Actually, I took a look at the real item before I bought it. The catalog described it as a “handyman’s buy.” The catalog didn’t lie. Every floor and every wall sloped a different way. It was only after I bought it that I discovered that the state of New York owned half my front lawn and half my neighbors had rights of way through my property. “Challenging buy for the handyman who likes working with tools and is alert enough to see the beautiful showplace this could become.” Most observers simply see the mess it now is.

But I am a visionary (or a nut). Which is why I buy houses out of catalogs for $4,000. Cash, mind you. I owe Rebozo and Abplanalp nothing.

Still, my assessment was only $400 when I bought the house. And I didn’t complain. I thought maybe they dropped a zero by accident. When they raised the assessment to $500 last summer, I still didn’t complain. What did the town fathers know about all the fancy improvements I put in — such as a heating system. (Actually, in Petersburg, I would be surprised if the town fathers didn’t know everything.)
COMMENTARY: POLITICS

Busting the Candidate Trust

by Richard J. Behn
and
Robert D. Behn

Presidential politics has become a monopoly enterprise. Presidential candidates are the new “robber barons” who by virtue of their “mentioned” status in the media have monopolistic control over the money and resources necessary to a presidential campaign.

There has been a growing wellspring of concern for the ethics of campaign fundraising but comparatively little distress over the quality and sparsity of members of the Candidate Trust. One has only to compare politics to poker to see how badly the cards are stacked against a true “choice” for 1976. It is hard to remember a time when Rockefeller, Reagan, and Connally were not “mentioned” for President. There are always a few “jokers” in the deck — Baker, Brock, Buckley, Percy, Richardson, and (if Nixon resigns or is impeached) Ford — but the aces never seem to change.

By whom are the aces “mentioned”? Several years ago, Russell Baker of The New York Times revealed the existence of the “Great Mentioner” — the one who is responsible for newspaper stories that begin: “Nelson Rockefeller, who is frequently mentioned as a potential presidential candidate.”

Unfortunately, the Great Mentioner is extremely selective about those whom he mentions. Although the criteria for being mentioned are obscure, they are clearly restrictive. Donald R. Matthews, a political scientist at the University of Michigan, has calculated that in the Gallup presidential preference polls from 1936 through 1972, only 47 Republicans have been mentioned with sufficient seriousness to develop, at one time or another, the support of one percent of the GOP rank-and-file. There are almost that many Republicans in the Senate today.

The Democrats have been slightly more generous, discovered Matthews, for Gallup has recorded 62 individuals who have had at least one percent support from Democratic voters sometime during the last ten campaigns. Commenting on Matthews’ findings in a recent column in The Washington Post, David Broder asked: “Is it conceivable that in two generations, this nation of 200 million produced only 109 men and women with qualifications to be considered presidential possibilities by one percent of their party’s adherents?"

The Great Mentioner seems to have established a Candidate Trust: a select group of political figures — vice presidents, senators, a few big-state governors, and former presidential candidates — who monopolize the two parties’ presidential fields. Richard M. Nixon, for example, was a principal stockholder of the Trust for over a decade before he was elected President; and Nelson Rockefeller, another senior member, helped the Trust limit any real primary challenges to Nixon in 1968. As Broder argued, an effort should be made “to improve and broaden the quality of the presidential field.”

Listing the members of the Candidate Trust is a boring litany, even though “circumstances and the force of events” have recently added a few names. Still, the meteoric rise of Vice President Gerald A. Ford — from “unmentioned” by Republicans when Gallup polled in early October to “the lead” when Harris talked to GOP voters in mid-November — can charitably be attributed not so much to his long unrecognized talents as to his “starlet” quality. Ford became an instant hero for Americans, particularly Republicans, shellshocked by daily crises and searching for a hero. In today’s political climate, honesty is sufficient for idolatry.

The events of last year have forced some new faces forward. The Watergate hearings propelled Howard H. Baker, Jr. onto the presidential preference polls and the Agnew resignation did the same to Ford. But are they leaders? With two-thirds of the public now believing that they can trust their government only "some of the time" — a 20 percent increase in the past year, according to the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research — are the Great Mentioner’s traditional methods of selecting new members of the Candidate Trust adequate?

The American Assembly thinks not. At the end of last year, it recommended “that, well before the nomination process begins, national, state and local party organizations, members of Congress, state and local officials and private organizations, not only assess such candidates as present themselves, but also conduct a systematic search for persons who should be encouraged to contend. Serious consideration by such organizations should stimulate appropriate attention by the media.”

The following list of “unmentioned” Republicans who ought to be considered for the 1976 presidential nomination is not meant to be all-inclusive — nor have all those mentioned had their presidential qualifications carefully examined. Rather, the objective is to stimulate the thinking of Republicans beyond the narrow membership of the Candidate Trust. (FORUM subscribers should also take up the suggestion of the American Assembly; the opportunity to participate in the mentioner game is provided on page 10.)

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias is an obvious candidate; he is quoted monthly in the New York Times by James Ripon Forum
Reston and Tom Wicker, yet these two columnists never suggest that Mathias is of presidential caliber. Another senator who should be mentioned is Jacob Javits, important in Washington but, as a New Yorker, overshadowed on the national scene by Nelson Rockefeller (who is only four years younger than the 69-year-old Javits). Yet Javits was voted the “brightest” senator in a survey of senatorial legislative assistants and tied for second as the “most effective” — a significant compliment to a member of the minority. Another member of the Senate who deserves more serious consideration is Sen. Edward W. Brooke, a leader who, in the battle to elect a minority leader to succeed Everett Dirksen, proved he is one progressive Republican who can count noses. Senators Richard Schweiker, Robert Taft, Jr., and Mark Hatfield are others whose talents are unrecognized by the national media or the party.

The House of Representatives has not been fertile ground for would-be Presidents as the candidacies of Wilbur D. Mills, John M. Ashbrook, and Paul N. McCloskey demonstrated in 1972. In fact, the House has not produced a presidential nominee in this century, unless you count John W. Davis, the 1924 Democratic candidate who served one term, 1911-1913. Still, there are several representatives who have already demonstrated their leadership abilities, with John B. Anderson, the chairman of the House Republican Conference, heading the list. Others include Paul Findley and Tom Railbuck of Illinois, Barber Conable of New York, John Dellenback of Oregon, Louis Frey of Florida, Gilbert Gude of Maryland, Mark Andrews of North Dakota, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio and Silvio Conte and Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts. And Pete McCloskey deserves another opportunity to try for national leadership.

Today, most members of the Candidate Trust come from Washington where there exists the access to the national media that is essential if one is to be seriously “mentioned.” Yet, members of either branch of the U.S. Congress lack any experience as political and policy administrators. In contrast, governors daily confront the managerial problems of making government work and bureaucracies respond; they are forced by their constituents to produce results rather than speeches and legislation, and therefore should be given more serious attention than the Great Mentioners of the national press and trustees of the Candidate Trust currently award them.

As governor of Michigan, George Romney swallowed too much too quickly when he attempted to brave the waters of presidential politics. His first dip in to the sea of national politics might not have been so chilling, however, if he had been able to slowly immerse himself, learning about the tides and undertow more slowly rather than being forced to dive into the rocks. Earlier attention to governors from states other than New York and California, which are already well covered by the media, would provide a better test of how transferable individual gubernatorial talents are into presidential ones.

Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon has already suggested he might run, as an independent, in 1976. Other Republican governors who deserve examination are Robert Ray of Iowa, William Milliken of Michigan, Daniel Evans of Washington, Winfield Dunn of Tennessee, and retiring Gov. Linwood Holton of Virginia. If Houston Flournoy is elected governor of California this year, he will automatically be considered.

Administrative experience has also been gained by Republicans serving in the Nixon Administration, many of whom left with honor. Elliot L. Richardson is the obvious example, and the “Saturday Night Massacre” launched him into the polls. William Ruckelshaus need not remain in Richardson’s shadow, however, for he too proved his managerial skills in several administrative capacities. Also worthy of serious consideration is Peter G. Peterson who left the Administration under fire and who is now chairman of the investment banking firm of Lehman Brothers, Inc.

In fact, several businessmen would make worthy Republican candidates. J. Irwin Miller, the president of Cummins Engine Company in Columbus, Indiana, was mentioned in a 1966 Esquire magazine cover story headlined, “This Man Should Be President”; from Indiana, Miller could be the Wendell Willkie of 1976. And if we are going to nominate a Rockefeller, why not David, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank?

Finally, there are those political figures whom fate has barred from the Congress or gubernatorial mansions. Richard Lugar of Indianapolis is the only Republican mayor of a large city, though he has not received much exposure since it is no longer an asset to be “Richard Nixon’s favorite mayor.” U.S. Attorneys Richard Thornndike in Pittsburgh and James Thompson in Chicago also merit consideration; after all, Theodore Roosevelt and Thomas Dewey first proved themselves as prosecutors/police commissioners.

America’s next President need not be in the current stable of “stars.” The country should not be resigned to a contest between Ronald Reagan and Edward Kennedy in 1976. The Republicans have more candidates than Rockefeller, Connally, and Ford; the Democrats do not have to restrict their choices to Jackson, Muskie, or Wallace. Charles Percy and Howard Baker, Walter Mondale and Daniel Walker are the 1976 starlets — but are they really what we mean by “new leadership”? As the American Assembly recommends, we need to “conduct a systematic search for persons who should be encouraged to contend.” It is time to bust the Candidate Trust.

February, 1974
COMMENTARY: NATION

Is Private Philanthropy "Government Money?"

by Robert F. Gobeen

Last week John Doe pledged $15 to his town's United Fund. A doctor in the local hospital saved a child's life with a $3,000 piece of equipment paid for by a wealthy doctor. Representative College announced $25,000 contributed by alumni donors for an enlarged student aid program. The Charitable Foundation reported grants totaling twice that amount for drug abuse prevention, population studies, an experiment in school decentralization, and investigations into new methods of converting waste into energy. Sarah Jones put $5.00 in the collection box at her church to celebrate the christening of a nephew.

Whose money was involved in these various philanthropic acts? There are those who hold it to be basically the government's money because it is tax deductible, and in recent years this view has gained a strong foothold in the major tax-writing committees of the Congress.

But if one accepts the premise that charitable activities and giving represent not so much valued personal commitments as government expenditures, then the door is opened to drastic changes in the traditional independence of private philanthropy and its capacity to contribute fruitfully to the well-being and improvement of our society.

If the assets of tax-exempt organizations are indeed government money, then it is only logical that their policies and practices should be fully subject to federal regulations. But where, then, do you draw the line? Within our federal tax laws, deductions and exemptions are almost as ubiquitous as fire and police protection. Virtually every taxpayer uses either one or more of the assorted itemized deductions or else the optional standard deduction. Are we then, on these grounds, to obliterate all distinctions between public and private activity?

Current decisions of the courts seem divided on the extent to which the sole fact of tax exemption either entitles or requires the government to force federal regulations on the management and practices of private institutions.

Ending racial discrimination and the injustices of racial segregation are important objectives of national policy. It is especially noteworthy, therefore, that in Green vs. Connally (1971) the District Court of the District of Columbia ruled that gifts to segregated schools in Mississippi could not qualify for tax exemption because segregation in education contravenes federal public policy.

On the other hand, there are a number of other cases where the courts have held that the government's granting of favorable tax treatment to eligible institutions does not in itself make them arms of government and subject, ipso facto, to all its policies and regulations. Such a ruling was given, for example, by the Supreme Court in a 1970 case involving the tax exemption of church-owned property (Walz vs. Tax Commission).

The influence of a contrary and potentially much more restrictive position has been growing, however, which may be called the "Surreyan view," for no one has done more to give it intellectual clout than Professor Stanley Surrey, brilliant tax theorist of the Harvard Law School and former assistant secretary of treasury for tax policy. Professor Surrey considers all tax deductions, including those permitted for charitable giving, as representing "costs to government." He also describes them as "government subsidies" and while serving in the Treasury led the formulation of a new "treasury tax expenditure budget" that includes charitable deductions as governmental expenditures.

The Surreyan view appears to have little historical basis in the thinking and motivation of those who wrote the exemption of charitable institutions and the deductibility of charitable giving into the American tax system. The congressional deliberations and debates of that time reflect, instead, a concern to preserve the vitality of nongovernmental charitable enterprise and the view that such enterprise represents gains for the society rather than costs to government. For example, in 1917, Senator Hollis in introducing the amendment that assured the deductibility of contributions to charity, observed:

Look at it this way: for every dollar that a man contributes for these public charities, education, scientific or otherwise, the public gets 100 percent; it is all devoted to that purpose. If it were undertaken to support such institutions through the federal government or local governments and the taxes were imposed for the amount, they would only get the percentage, 5 percent, 10 percent, 20 percent or 40 percent, as the case might be.

Again in 1938, the Congress stated, "The government is compensated for its loss of revenue by its relief from
financial burdens which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds." In the Tax Reform Act of 1969, Congress not only endorsed again the basic principle of the charitable deduction on income tax, but raised the maximum allowance to 50 percent of adjusted gross income. From the perspective of history, then, the Surreyan view seems to reverse the basic rationale of charitable exemptions and deductions in the U.S. tax system.

No one, however, can deny that serious problems of inequity have emerged in that system — some of them tied to tax preferences and other deductions more available to the rich than to the average taxpayer. At the same time, as a people we have developed such large needs and aspirations in the areas of health care, education, and other social services that enormous added pressures rest now on our tax system. It is not surprising, then, that politicians and economic planners alike seek to close off "tax preferences" and so-called "loopholes."

Most unfortunate, however, has been the entangling of charitable giving in these combined drives for larger tax revenues and greater tax equity. For, in fact, charitable giving is not a "loophole" in the sense that the giver is enriched by it. The man of high income and the man of modest income are both out of pocket $1,000 if each contributes that much to charity. If, for example, one is in the 70-percent tax bracket and the other in the 14-percent tax bracket, each would have been out of pocket in lesser amounts — $700 and $140, respectively — if he had not given the $1,000 to charity and had to pay income tax on that amount.

When gifts are made in appreciated securities which if sold would entail a capital gains tax, this basic situation still prevails — unless one assumes that the individuals are under compulsion to sell. This cannot be a universally valid assumption. Both the 14-percent tax-bracket person and the 70-percent tax-bracket person may, and often do, simply hold on to their appreciated securities and enjoy their yields, in which case no capital gains tax is involved. This fact simply reinforces the proposition that the gains which philanthropic donations afford flow not to the individuals who make the gifts but to the charitable institutions receiving them.

Turning the issue around, regarding gifts to charity as government tends, the Surreyan view argues that the man in the 70-percent tax bracket has $700 of his $1,000 in cash gifts paid by government, while the man in the 14-percent tax bracket has only $140 of his $1,000 paid by government (i.e., the amount each does not pay in tax). So, from this point of view, the $1,000 cash contribution costs the rich man $300 and the man of modest income $860 — at face value a glaring inequity.

But even if one accepts that viewpoint, there are two important points to recognize with respect to the disparity: (1) In neither case does the charitable giver save money. After making the donation and taking the deduction, both donors have less cash in-hand than before. (2) While it cost the rich man proportionately less and the tax incentives to giving are thus enhanced for him, it is precisely on large gifts that colleges, universities, and many other forms of private charitable enterprise are most heavily dependent. For example, in a survey of 1972 giving to colleges and universities, 75 percent of the total amount received came from less than 5 percent of the donors in gifts of $5,000 and more. In sum, if there is an inequity in the charitable deduction, it is not the sort that results in personal gain for any taxpayer. It results, rather, in advantageous support for needy recipient institutions.

Tax reformers thus confuse the issue when they mix consideration of the charitable deduction in with the consideration of "tax preferences" and "loopholes" that do confer net economic benefits to those who take advantage of them. The Surreyan view of charitable deductions as "government expenditures" or "government subsidies" encourages this confusion, even as it reinforces also the sentiments of those who would have government extend its control into the policies and practices of tax-exempt institutions.

The fervor about tax reform in the early phases of the 1972 presidential campaign appears to have cooled ap-preciable in 1973, but the issues are still very much with us. Three proposals with serious negative implications for many philanthropic organizations are already under attention by the tax-writing committees of this Congress.

One is a proposal to limit deductions for gifts of appreciated securities to public charities, as was done with respect to such gifts to private foundations in the 1969 Tax Reform Act. A second involves placing some percentage limitation on the proportion of estates that can be left to charities without taxation. (Wilbur Mills, sage and influential head of the House Ways and Means Committee, has indicated he may favor such a limitation.) The third is a new income tax recommendation from the Administration called "Minimum Taxable Income." Offered as a remedy for occasional noteworthy cases where combinations of legal exclusions and deductions result in wealthy persons sometimes paying little or no tax, the "MTL," as currently proposed involves dangerous side effects for charity.

Big issues, then, are involved in changing tax laws which affect voluntary private giving. Nor is "who pays the bill" the only issue. At debate is the very organization of our society; the extent to which it values its pluralism and voluntarism; the maintenance of a multiplicity of solutions to social problems; and the existence of independent institutions attempting to meet important human needs.

Each proposal above beclouds what have been important incentives in our tax system that have helped encourage persons of means to make substantial charitable gifts. Singly and together they raise serious threats to present patterns of funding the country's philanthropic institutions, and especially so for its universities. How we feel about these proposals may be strongly influenced by whether we come to regard the current exemptions and deductions accorded to philanthropy in our tax laws to be the state's money or money that still belongs to the people. I would strongly urge the latter view as historically based and intimately related to the continuing strength and vigor of the country's many voluntary nonprofit institutions.
COMMENTARY
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Can Two Enemies Tango?

by Robert G. Stewart

Overzealous debate over abortion has diverted attention from the broader problem of the rights of pregnant women and unborn children.

The woman-unborn child question encompasses a spectrum of serious issues. On one side of the spectrum lies the rights of pregnant or potentially pregnant women. On the other side lies the rights of unborn children. Abortion is only a narrow issue in the center of the spectrum delineating the proper balance between the woman's right to liberty and the unborn child's right to life.

On the woman's side, the American Civil Liberties Union Women's Rights Project has compiled a veritable litany of outrages perpetrated upon pregnant women and those who might become pregnant at some future time. Prospective employees can be grilled as to their maternity plans. Some applicants for mortgages must agree to sterilization, birth control programs, or even abortion so that the woman's tenants have often been forced to leave. Meanwhile, women's groups must agree to federal courts have held that an unborn child may qualify as a child for the purpose of benefits under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.

Thus, beyond the question of his right to life, an unborn child's rights are more a function of geographical luck than a serious pattern of thought.

The tragedy is that the very pressure groups who ought to be most interested in reform in both areas are paying insufficient attention to them. They are too busy squabbling over the issue of abortion.

Religious groups (particularly the Catholic Church), right-to-life groups, and others spend an enormous amount of time and resources beating if not a dead horse, at least a crippled one, in trying to overturn Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court's abortion decision. Meanwhile, women's groups, pro-abortion groups and others, unsatisfied with Roe v. Wade, spend a great deal of their time trying to obtain even more changes in the abortion laws such as state-financed abortion services and laws prohibiting even private hospitals from refusing to perform abortions.

The very principles which guide these groups apply as well to the other serious problems involving women and unborn children. The church and right-to-life groups are guided by the principle of sanctity of life, the women's and pro-abortion groups by the principle of dignity of the individual. These very principles are the ones which demand protection for the unborn as well as for pregnant women — decent pre-natal care for indigent pregnant women and their unborn children, laws protecting women from the kinds of harassment regarding pregnancy uncovered by the ACLU, and consistent, reasoned laws for the economic protection of unborn children. Unlike abortion, these issues hold out a realistic chance of reform.

Both sides should reconsider an elementary principle of bargaining which is applicable to multi-group lobbying efforts: concentrate first on those parts of the problem on which you agree.

A firmly committed pressure coalition could force passage of virtually any reasonable law in the area of the rights of women and unborn children — and could soundly defeat any legislator who dared to stand in its way.

The price for reform is a lobbying moratorium on abortion. Without it, too many resources on both sides are wasted; neither side can afford to let up unilaterally on abortion. The cost is small, however, as there is little hope of new victories for either side. This is not to suggest that discussion should cease on the fundamental issue of abortion, even temporarily. But the discussion should be channelled toward finding an answer.

What is needed is to put the theological, philosophical and scientific minds of the nation to the task in an organized manner, such as through a presidential commission whose mandate would be to ascertain whether a national consensus can be found on the proper balance between the right of an unborn child to life and that of its mother to personal liberty. Failing this goal, it should seek to understand and formulate the alternatives and their justification. It should have a reasonable deadline of three years.

If the collective wisdom can produce convincing answers, fine. If not, at least the right questions might be found and the alternatives available to answer them formulated.

Ripon Forum
**Bust The Trust**

The American Assembly has recommended "that, well before the nomination process begins, national, state and local party organizations, members of Congress, state and local officials and private organizations, not only assess such candidates as present themselves, but also conduct a systematic search for persons who should be encouraged to contend for the presidential nomination." The American Assembly argued that "serious consideration by such organizations should stimulate appropriate attention by the media." (See Commentary article, pages 4-5.)

The Ripon FORUM is conducting such a "systematic search." We are asking our readers to recommend Republicans who should be "encouraged" to seek the 1976 GOP presidential nomination. Republicans who receive any significant response at all will receive a letter from the FORUM suggesting they consider seeking the nomination. The results of this search will be published in the April issue of the Ripon FORUM magazine.

**Rules for the Candidate Search**

1. You can mention up to five Republicans who you believe should be considered by the GOP for its 1976 presidential nominee. Please list your candidates in preferential order. It is suggested that you personally write the Republican at the top of your list and urge him or her to run.

2. You can tear out this page, xerox it, or simply list your names on a piece of paper and mail it to:

   **BUST THE CANDIDATE TRUST**
   Ripon FORUM
   Box 226
   Charlestown, Mass. 02129

3. Your list must be received by Friday, March 1, 1974.

4. The following Republicans are already members of the Candidate Trust and are thus adequately taken care of by the Great Mentioner. You should devote your attention to others.

   - Howard Baker, Jr.
   - Charles Percy
   - John Connally
   - Ronald Reagan
   - Gerald Ford
   - Nelson Rockefeller

My suggestions for the 1976 Republican presidential nominee are:

1. ...
2. ...
3. ...
4. ...
5. ...

**POLITICS: REPORTS**

**RIPON SUIT**


Although Judge Jones did not completely prohibit a bonus delegate system, he did rule that the current bonus system violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The formula adopted by the 1972 Republican National Convention awards 4.5 delegates to each state that voted for Nixon in 1972; one delegate to each state that elects a Republican governor before 1976; a delegate for each Republican senator elected before 1976; and a delegate for each state with a House delegation with a Republican majority.

In its suit, the Society contended that this formula distorted the inequities of delegate representation well in excess of the distortion found in the Electoral College; Ripon argued that the Electoral College distortion of the representation of big and small states was the maximum allowed under the Constitution. Judge Jones ruled that "a bonus system which would reward states casting their electoral vote for the 1972 Republican nominee for President by allocating a number of delegates to such states on the basis of 60 percent of the electoral vote of each of such states would have a constitutionally rational basis."

Ripon had argued that the allocation of bonus delegates discriminated against Massachusetts, but Judge Jones ruled that electoral college vote was a reasonable standard for the apportionment of bonus delegates. "Plaintiffs' challenge to such apportionment of bonus delegates is unpersuasive and, therefore, does not alter this court's earlier conclusion that a system which rewards states producing Republican victories, by allocating a number of delegates reasonably proportionate to a state's electoral vote, has a constitutionally rational basis."
Judge Jones' ruling was similar to the one he issued in April 1972 in response to Ripon's first suit challenging the constitutionality of the delegate allocation formula. Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist issued a stay just prior to the 1972 Republican National Convention, however, so Ripon filed an amended complaint in December 1972 charging that the formula still discriminated against large states and the Northeast.

In responding to the District Court ruling, a Ripon spokesman said, "The apportionment scheme adopted at the 1972 Republican National Convention was imposed by the leaders of a faction which tried to ensure that the regions where that faction dominates the party organization would control the process leading to the nomination of the party's presidential candidate in 1976. Their end was divisive, their means unconscionable and, as the Court has now confirmed, unconstitutional."

The spokesman observed that the court's ruling ensures that the apportionment "is fair to Republicans throughout the country and accurately reflects each state's Electoral College and Republican strength. We look forward to working with the Republican National Committee on the development of a formula which meets these standards."

Because Ripon feels that the court's ruling would still discriminate against Massachusetts (the only state not to vote for President Nixon), the Society said it would consider an appeal. The Republican National Committee is still studying the ruling and has not yet announced if it will appeal the case.

Mississippi GOP State Chairman Clarke Reed had none of the RNC's uncertainty about appealing Judge Jones' ruling. Reed was sure it would be appealed. Reed, one of the moving forces behind the Republican National Committee's opposition to the Ripon suit, indicated he was not surprised by the ruling and expected the suit to go all the way to the full Supreme Court. Reed said he didn't think Ripon cared what happened to the GOP. If the Ripon Suit is successful, said Reed, "it will be one of the greatest things to weaken the party that has ever happened."
mer Buffalo Bills quarterback Jack F. Kemp. The Buffalo congressman may have a tougher time winning re-election than he did in 1972, when he won 73 percent of the vote, but it still should be an easy score for Kemp.

Javits will also probably avoid primary contests with U.S. Rep. Peter Peyser and State Sen. Richard Schermerhorn. Topping the Democratic list of Senate challengers are lawyerperson Ramsey Clark, Jr.; consumerperson Bess Myerson and politiciperson Al­lard K. Lowenstein. Lowenstein, however, may try again to get the Brooklyn House seat now held by U.S. Rep. John J. Roney (D).

In nearby New Jersey, New York Knicks basketball star Bill Bradley appears to have settled on the 13th C.D. as his next field goal. The Repub­lican incumbent, U.S. Rep. Joseph J. Maraziti, won election in the new district in 1972 with only 56 percent of the vote and will have to hug­gle to win in 1974.

Down in southern New Jersey, for­mer boxer John Hunt (R-1st C.D.) may also have trouble in his re-election bid. Although the Democrats will probably have a primary, the most likely candidate is State Assemblyman James J. Florio, a 36-year-old attorney.

In 1974, 1st C.D. U.S. Rep. John Hunt won 77 percent of the vote in the 1st C.D. In 1972, the conservative former sheriff won only 53 percent of the vote. His opponent was Florio.

The gregarious Republican congress­man is an active member of the Chicken Shack Gang, a group of about 20 arch-conservative congressmen who meet each Wednesday night for a fried chicken dinner in Maryland. The Chicken Shack Gang is social, but it's members form the conservative hard core of the House (e.g., Republican Samuel L. Devine of Ohio and and John H. Ware of Pennsylvania.)

Hunt's one salvation may be a proposed congressional redistricting to save U.S. Rep. Peter Rodino (D). Apparent­ly, Gov. Matthew Byrne (D) "owes" new district lines to Rodino in return for Rodino's support in last year's gubernatorial race. White Rodino currently has a heavily-black district.

In Philadelphia, meanwhile, they have been talking about running for­mer basketball star Tom Gola, who was ousted from his post as Philadel­phia comptroller in the 1973 elections, for the Republican nomination for lieutenant governor in 1974. Stay tune, sports fans.

CONNECTICUT

HARTFORD — Connecticut Gov. Thomas J. Meskill (R) is in political trouble. Republican polls reportedly show Meskill trailing three possible Democratic opponents in this year's gubernatorial election: U.S. Rep. Ella T. Grasso; former University of Connect­icut president Homer D. Bab­bidge; and Attorney General Robert K. Killian.

U.S. Rep. Robert H. Steele (R), who has yet to announce if he'll run against Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff (D), did better in his half of the poll. Steele allegedly trailed Ribicoff by a narrow margin. If Steele decides to challenge the popular former Democratic gover­nor, the ex-CIA agent will be leaving a safe House seat for a risky Senate race. In the case that he runs for the Senate, the 2nd C.D. seat Steele has held will be sought by Lt. Gov. Peter Cashman. Cashman's spot on the GOP ticket is expected to go to Bridge­port Mayor Nicholas Panuzio, who could help Meskill among both urban and Italian voters.

Republican State Chairman J. Brian Gaffney opened up an intra-party sqabble in December when he suggested that Ribicoff's age — he'll be 64 this year — should be a cam­paign issue. Republican Sen. Lowell Weicker, Jr., immediately contradict­ed Gaffney, calling the age issue "just ridiculous."

In the gubernatorial race, Killian had not even announced his candidacy when Gov. Meskill demanded his resigna­tion. The day before the January 5 announcement, Meskill told reporters that Killian should resign as attorney general because his candidacy amount­ed to a "conflict of interest with his role as a legal advisor to the gover­nor." Commenting on past difficulties with Killian, Meskill said, "It has been difficult to get advice that has not been laced with political intrigue." Killian refused to resign.

Killian's early announcement and his quick moves to sew up support among party officials may have precip­i­tated Grasso's candidacy declaration, which came quickly on the heels of the formal announcement from the attorney general. According to Hart­ford Courant political writer Jack Zai­man, both Democrats feel they have earned their party's nomination. Mrs. Grasso was an extraordinarily popular secretary of state before she vacated that elected office to run for the con­gressional seat vacated by Meskill. On the other hand, Killian feels he's earned the honor by surviving the Meskill victory of 1970.

Less seriously considered for the nomination are Bab­bidge, now master of Timothy Dwight College at Yale University, and Frank Zullo, former mayor of Norwalk in southwestern Fairfield County. The big names in the party — Ribicoff, State Democratic Chairman John Bailey and former Gov. John Dempsey — are maintain­ing their neutrality.

Still in doubt are the intentions of Gov. Meskill, who has admitted boredom with his office on occasion and fail­ed to endeavor himself with the electorate when he went skiing in Vermont while large portions of the state were powerless as a result of a severe ice storm. (State residents did not find out about the trip until later — but neither did Lt. Gov. Cashman who should have been acting governor during Meskill's absence.) If Meskill did step aside, there has been some speculation that Steele might run for governor. The for­mer New Britain mayor almost did not run for governor in 1970. He had scheduled a press conference to ann­
pronounce his decision not to run but cancelled it because of a threatened snowstorm which never materialized. When Dempsey retired, Meskill decided to make the race.

**WYOMING**

CHEYENNE — Wyoming Republicans are "very optimistic" that they will be able to retain the seat of retiring Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway (R).

One reason for their optimism is the possibility of a bruising primary between Democratic factions led by U.S. Rep. Teno Roncalio and Sen. Gale McGee. Roncalio had at one time been rumored as a possible gubernatorial aspirant, but under pressure announced in November that he would seek re-election instead. State Sen. Harry E. Leimback, a Casper attorney who was formerly a field man for Roncalio, will probably contest Richard Brown, currently a McGee field man, in the August gubernatorial primary. Because Leimback is in the middle of his Senate term, he will have to resign, under Wyoming law, to seek the governorship.

There are three serious Republican aspirants to succeed Hathaway: Attorney General Clarence "Bud" Brimmer, a former GOP state chairman; State Rep. Roy Peck, Riverton newspaper publisher and a former director of economic planning and development in the Hathaway administration, and State Sen. Tom Stroock, a Casper businessman and oil executive. Former State Superintendent of Schools Harry Roberts was regarded as the front-runner until he dropped out of the race this winter.

A key asset for Republicans, in the opinion of Wyoming GOP State Chairman Jack Speight is the "beautiful record" of Gov. Hathaway. He hopes to parlay that record, plus Democratic division, into Republican victory.

Republicans have less chance of unseating Roncalio. The liberal Democrat has always eked out victory — winning by about 800 votes in 1970 and by about 5,000 in 1972. The only serious Republican candidate to emerge so far is Todd Sermon, a businessman-rancher from Laramie.

---

**ILLINOIS**

CHICAGO — Shifts in the lineup of the Illinois congressional delegations should center this year on three seats being vacated by incumbents and the marginal seat held by Republican U.S. Rep. Samuel H. Young.

Former U.S. Rep. Abner Mikva, whose 2nd C.D. seat was wiped out in the 1972 redistricting, is seeking a rematch against Young. Mikva, who moved his home to the new 10th C.D. to keep a post in Congress, lost a narrow 52-48 race to Young in 1972. The conservative Young ran far behind President Nixon, who received 62 percent of the vote in the district.

In another suburban Chicago district, the 6th C.D. being vacated by U.S. Rep. Harold R. Collier, there are prospects for a stiff fight between State Rep. Henry Hyde, an able, articulate Republican conservative, and former Democratic State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan, whose run-ins with the Black Panthers contributed to his defeat in 1972. Hanrahan, who once was considered the heir-apparent to Chicago Mayor Richard Daley (D), and Hyde both will have primary challenges, but both are expected to win. Hyde's principal opposition in six-man GOP race is Roy C. Pechous, a 37-year-old lawyer.

U.S. Rep. Leslie Arends was almost redistricted out of his seat in 1972. Arends district was merged with the seat then held by U.S. Rep. Charlotte T. Reid. When Reid resigned to join the Federal Communications Commission, however, her successor promised not to run against Arends. Now former U.S. Rep. Clifford Carlson, Illinois Republican national committee-man, is one of the leaders to succeed Arends. The 20-term House Republican whip is retiring; he will turn 79 this year and has held his House leadership post for 30 years.

The 58-year-old Carlson, a Geneva industrialist, will have four Republican opponents for the 15th C.D. seat. Other Republican aspirants include William C. McConkey, former deputy regional director of the federal Commerce Department. McConkey, a 31-year-old progressive, now teaches political science at Aurora College. He lost the 1972 primary for the Reid seat to Carlson and a third candidate, John A. Cunningham, 34. Cunningham, now working on a master's degree at Governors State University, won election as Aurora commissioner of public property at 25 but lost a re-election bid in 1972. The two other candidates are Tom Corcoran, 34, chief of staff to the Illinois Senate Republicans and State Rep. Carl W. Soderstrom, 58, the son of a former long-time president of the Illinois AFL-CIO.

Regardless of the Republican nominee, he will have a tough race. Democrat Tim Hall, a liberal teacher from Dwight, ran strong campaigns against both Carlson and Arends in 1972. He lost to Carlson by 5,000 votes and won a respectable 43 percent of the vote against Arends. Hall will be opposed by Martin Dubin, a professor at Northern Illinois University and DeKalb County Democratic chairman, and Emmett J. Slingsby, an aide to the state superintendent of public instruction.

The GOP's chances may be bleakest in the 24th C.D. where U.S. Rep. Kenneth J. Gray (D) is retiring. The strength of the Republican organization may be indicated by Gray's 1972 election margin; he won 94 percent of the vote without any Republican opposition. In 1970, however, when he had a Republican opponent, he won only 62 percent. The probable Democratic candidate to succeed Gray may be no less formidable: Paul Simon, the former reform-minded lieutenant governor whose aspirations for the governorship in 1972 may be crushed by the endorsement of the Daley organization. Although the Republicans will have a three-man primary, the leading contender appears to be Va Oshel, who ran unsuccessfully for Congress in 1968 and served in the administration of former Gov. Richard Ogilvie (R).
California State Assemblyman Jerry Lewis (R) narrowly missed avoiding a runoff in a special election for the State Senate in December. Lewis won 49 percent of the vote in the original election in the Republican district, but lost the runoff to Democrat Ruben S. Ayala, a moderate Chicano who received 54 percent of the runoff tally. The loss is a bad one for Republicans. It tips the balance in the California State Senate to the Democrats, 21-19, but more seriously, it is a reflection of voter disenchantment in a normally Republican area.

First Monday, the Republican National Committee monthly which hardly knew Watergate existed when John D. Lofton, Jr., was editor, rediscovered the controversy in its December 1973 issue. The bulk of the magazine was devoted to a defense of President Nixon's Watergate actions, and it included a solicitation of information concerning support-the-President activities. "This information will be forwarded to the White House so that Mr. Nixon will know about it," said First Monday. It might be even more interesting to know how many Republican congressmen displayed "Support the President" bumper stickers (which were enclosed in the magazine) when they returned home for the Christmas recess.

Washington Gov. Daniel Evans (R) says he's keeping his beard because it keeps his face warm when he skis — even if icicles do form on his whiskers.

Maine State Sen. Bennett Katz has dropped out of the Republican gubernatorial race, suggesting that "the state may have lost a 55-year-old sex symbol." Katz explained that polls showed that 80 percent of his support came from women. The decision to withdraw came the day he was going to announce his candidacy.

Maryland Republican National Committee woman Louise Gore, who has the distinction of introducing former Maryland Gov. Spiro Agnew to Richard Nixon, is now running for governor herself. Gore was Maryland's first female state senator, is a former ambassador to UNESCO, and is a poker-playing friend of Alice Roosevelt Longworth.

Tennessee Gov. Winfield Dunn (R), who cannot succeed himself in this year's election, is leaving open the possibility of another gubernatorial run in 1976.

The announcement of Mississippi Sen. John Stennis, now 72, that he will seek re-election in 1976 may be virtually tantamount to re-election itself. It is almost unthinkable that the Mississippi GOP will mount a challenge to Sen. Stennis, despite his age.

South Carolina Republicans hope they have found a candidate to oppose Sen. Ernest Hollings (D). Air Force Col. Quincy Collins, a former POW still in the service, has made numerous speeches around the state and excited the interest of top Republicans, including RNC Counsel Harry Dent.

Arkansas Republicans are still waiting for a candidate to announce for Sen. William Fulbright's seat. Polls show that Gov. Dale Bumpers (D) could beat Fulbright in a primary, but Bumpers is considered unlikely to risk the race. Meanwhile, Arkansas Republicans have their sights set on humbler targets. They have only one seat in each house of the legislature and will target eight Senate seats and 40 House seats in the 1974 elections.

Fuel Crisis: Ron Rietdorf, executive director of the Tennessee GOP, predicts that politicians will be traveling less and seeing more people in upcoming political campaigns. Commenting on the impact of the gasoline shortage in Tennessee, Rietdorf said, "The candidates will take a long, hard look at voter counts when they go into an area, and because of this, most campaigning will probably be done in the six or seven most-populated counties."

Inspiration Department: Hollywood songwriter Henry Tobias may have written 1974's answer to the "Ballad of the Green Berets." It is called "Hang in There, Mr. President," and features such uplifting lyrics as: "We are with you, Mr. President / With all our might / They may use you and abuse you / Holler quit, quit / But you've heard that all before / Just clench your fist and grit."

Speaking before the Republican Governors' Conference in Memphis in November, New York University Professor Irving Kristol provoked considerable laughter by quoting from Berkeley Professor Aaron Wildavsky: "Laboratory experiments show that rats who are consistently given contradictory commands become neurotic, if not psychotic. The same phenomenon is readily visible among politicians. Give them incompatible demands; insist that they fulfill contradictory impulses at the same time, and they, too, will show the classical symptoms — withdrawal, self-mutilation, random activity, and other forms of bizarre behavior unrelated to the ostensible task at hand."

Republican arch-conservatives apparently still know how to sling the dirt. Prior to U.S. Rep. Barber B. Conable, Jr.'s election as chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, a letter was distributed to GOP members castigating Conable's membership in the "ultra-liberal" Council of Foreign Relations. The scurrilous letter, signed by "Janice Blakely" was distributed from a congressional office. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak quote U.S. Rep. Sam Steiger (R-Ariz.) as attributing the unmarked correspondence to U.S. Rep. John B. Conlan, a vigorous enemy of Steiger's. Responsible conservatives were livid over the Watergate mentality which produces such diatribes.

Lest Republicans forget the ideological pre-disposition of the Young Republican National Federation, a memo to YR leaders across the country in late November served as a reminder. The memo from the YRF Issue Development Committee reviewed the Saturday Night Massacre and concluded: "Furthermore, President will do well to resist the pressure to give Elliot Richardson another position in the Administration. Richardson is a Boston-based liberal of the A.D.A. stripe who openly stated that he was reinstituting Ramsey Clark's philosophy in the Justice Department. Any Republican administration would be better off without him — and the same applies to cohort William Ruckelshaus."
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Bill of Rights

I thoroughly agree with the need for a sensible “bill of rights” in the juvenile corrections. (See “The Rights of Juvenile Delinquents,” September 1973 FORUM.)

However, my recent nine or ten months’ experience here in Illinois in what is essentially a child welfare agency which encompasses part of juvenile corrections — it is increasingly clear that the rights of children in state care can usually are trumped upon in all directions. I’ve been appalled to find this to be the case in an agency with a long “social work” tradition and one with an ideology of “helping and concern.” It has made more real to me the comment of Ivan Illich in his book Deschooling Society that he includes among what he describes as “right-wing institutions” prisons, police forces, the CIA, penitentiaries — and child welfare organizations. There is a great deal of truth to that inclusion.

JEROME G. MILLER, D.S.W.
Director, Department of Children and Family Services
Chicago, Illinois.

Sound-In The Abstract

Your recent editorial (November, 1973), “Jackson Amendment: Moral Imperialism,” is by and large a sound statement of foreign policy — at least in the abstract. Unfortunately, the major issue which was and is before the Congress is not exactly as you framed it. The issue was not trade but whether the United States, through credit and guarantees from the Export-Import Bank, should subsidize trade with the Soviet Union. Therefore, consideration of internal moral and political questions is not inappropriate.

Although your editorial note was silent on the question of how do we know the credit permission, which the Administration sought (ironically it already had it) and the House rejected (by more than 200 votes), involved 10 percent down, the remainder being financed half by the Ex-Im Bank (20 years, at six percent) and half by commercial banks (guaranteed by the Ex-Im Bank). What this amounts to is subsidization of big business and big banks who would like to the Soviet business trade, with the risk being borne by the taxpayer. Some kinda risk capitalism!

If detente is real, then it should go forward on real terms. As it stands we in the United States are asking the Soviet Union to be friendly towards giving them things they want on terms which are wholly favorable to the buyer. It is well known that American technology is not a glut on the market. It can, and therefore should be used to make its own way. In other terms, such terms cannot in any may be conducive to building mutual respect, founded on real assessments, by trading partners who have something to gain from the commercial intercourse. Instead we look like pansies. That is not the flower of sound detente.

Your editorial missed the point.

DANIEL JOY,
Board of Directors
American Conservative Union
Rockford, Illinois
**Duly Noted: Politics**

- "Philadelphia GOP Leaders Said to Ponder Naming Black Leader for Mayor Race." (Philadelphia) Observer, January 7, 1974. "Philadelphia Republican leaders, still suffering from the defections of Arlen Specter and Tom Gola, have started a series of discussions aimed at rebuilding the party for the 1975 mayor's election. One of the plans of the GOP apparently is to give the party nomination to a top black leader in the hopes of starting a new power base in the North and West Philadelphia communities, and hoping that the Democratic organization will challenge the notion."

- "Goldwater's Outspoken Criticism of President Nixon Has Increased, the Arizona Senator Underscores, on the Eve of a Two-Day Speech-Making Trip to Illinois and Wisconsin." (Goldwater) Arizona Republic, December 16, 1973. "Bobby Goldwater, like a Republican cloth coat rediscovered in the closet at the end of a fashion era, is back in style. For a decade, Democrats gleefully scorned him. Recently, he has discovered his political legacy; now they applaud him. The reason is Watergate — and Sen. Goldwater's outspoken criticism of President Nixon and what he plainly believes is Mr. Nixon's failure to deal effectively with the Watergate scandal. The blunt candor that devastated the senator's campaign for the White House in 1964 appears to many to have become something of a standard."

- "A Washington Perspective," by Lou Cannon, California Journal, December 1973. "While the South is changing, (California Gov. Ronald Reagan) seems much the same. His approach to a prospective candidacy also appears to possess some of the same liabilities that accompanied his belated campaign in 1968. At the Republican Governors' Association winter conference in Memphis, Reagan startled his listeners by alternately denouncing the pressure groups of teachers and unionists who he said had defeated his tax-limitation initiative and, in the next breath, discounting the effect of the pressure groups, lobbyists and contributors on political campaigns and state government. Some governors, not unfriendly, privately confessed that they were baffled by these statements, which were reinforced by reports of the new-Buckley, Eastern reporters that he is a waiter without the substance for the presidency." writes Cannon. "It is early, of course, and Ronald Reagan has made a career of confounding adversaries who have underestimated him. But there is less time for the Republican Party than anybody would ever have believed when Nixon buried George McGovern a year ago. George Gallup bluntly told the Republican governors that the GOP is in the worst shape of any party since he began polling in 1935, and Republican politicians everywhere are searching for someone to lead them out of the Watergate darkness. It is too soon to say whether Reagan is the man. But it is fair to suggest, on the basis of all polls and all that has gone before, that a Southern strategy is not enough."

- "Around City Hall: Auld Lang Syne," by Andy Logan, New Yorker, January 14, 1973. "Commenting on the departure of John Langan, a man who took much of his power from their positions of public power, Logan observes that New Yorkers are now bereft of easy targets for political pettiness. The successors to Langan are much less visible to hasty hostility. The styles of Malcolm Wilson and Abraham Beame are much more subdued. "In the new regimes in Albany and in City Hall a number of changes are expected and there are some hopes that they will be taken place. In both places, sober blue suits have replaced much of last month's bright-colored shirts and sports jackets. Wilson's ties are nineteen-fifties narrow, and when asked about the problem of transition from one governor to another a Rockefeller staff member who plans to stay on said, 'Well, the first thing we're all doing is cutting our ties in half.' At City Hall, scissors have been supplied to be used by employees, totally or partially."

"Naming Black Leader for Mayor Race." (Philadelphia)Observer, December 16, 1973. "Barry Goldwater, Arizona senator and a presidential contender, Roberts concludes "What it comes down to — where Walter Mondale finally is standing in the blur of his political two-step — is that he is not, as he claims, for the poor and the powerless. He is against them. In fact he is afraid of them. Mondale has spoken several times in recent months of his fear of the rise of Know-Nothingism, of the possibility that an anti-political party might spring up and that the ascendants out. As he put it to me, 'If a guy decides to ride the backs of welfare mothers and other protest groups into office, he's got a right. But we have to ask if his role is also the role that we want a man who talks constantly of 'empowering the powerless' and in the crunch does just the opposite to further his own career.'"

- "Duryea Is Given Applause From Both Sides of the Aisle," by Linda Greenhouse, New York Times, January 10, 1973. "Twice in the opening minutes of the 1974 legislative session (January 8, Assembly Speaker Perry Duryea's) Republican and Democratic colleagues were entirely of good cheer for the completion of the new regime in the General Assembly, and when asked about the problem of transition from one government to another a Rockefeller staff member who plans to stay on said, 'Well, the first thing we're all doing is cutting our ties in half.' At City Hall, scissors have been supplied to be used by employees, totally or partially."

- "GOP Future Reasonably Robust, Buckley Says," by Joseph V. Ganley, Syracuse Herald-Journal, December 5, 1973. "Sen. James L. Buckley, former GOP vice presidential nominee and the 1976 candidate of the conservative wing of the party, said he was prepared to mount a full-scale nominee bid, if the party renominated him. His victory in the New York Senate race earlier in the day was likely to solidify his position as a leading figure in the national GOP, but it was not clear whether he would run in 1976."

- "The Major Organizes a 'Last Hurrah,' " by Michael Kilian, Chicago Tribune, December 16, 1973. "According to Kilian, Illinois Lt. Gov. Neil Hartigan, a former deputy mayor under Richard J. Daley, is the Chicago mayor's leading opponent in the 1975 mayoralty contest against U.S. Attorney James Thompson (R). "For those who wish to oppose candidates the image he carries as a leader of the Conservative Party, the move was interpreted as an attempt by the mayor to project himself into the national political arena to obtain exposure which might lead to an elective position on the national scene in the future — perhaps vice presidency or the presidency." The party's future must be "robust" if Buckley is milking the GOP for $2.50 per speech.

- "The Mondale Myth," by Wallace Roberts. New Times, January 25, 1974. "Analyzing the performance of Minnesota Sen. Walter "Fritz" Mondale (D) as both a senator and a presidential contender, Roberts concludes "What it comes down to — where Walter Mondale finally is standing in the blur of his political two-step — is that he is not, as he claims, for the poor and the powerless. He is against them. In fact he is afraid of them. Mondale has spoken several times in recent months of his fear of the rise of Know-Nothingism, of the possibility that an anti-political party might spring up and that the ascendants out. As he put it to me, 'If a guy decides to ride the backs of welfare mothers and other protest groups into office, he's got a right. But we have to ask if his role is also the role that we want a man who talks constantly of 'empowering the powerless' and in the crunch does just the opposite to further his own career.'"