

RIPON FORUM

Help sneak the FORUM
Into the Ivory Tower;
Give a FORUM gift subscription
To your alma mater's library.

FEBRUARY 15, 1975

VOL. XI, No. 4

50 CENTS

COMMENTARY: ENERGY

IS NUCLEAR POWER THE ENERGY ANSWER?

by Tanya Melich

In his State of the Union message, President Ford outlined a varied, ten-year approach to achieving energy self-sufficiency. His proposals stressed the production of petroleum from the Alaskan oil fields, off-shore wells, and shale deposits; an increase in coal production and coal-fired power plants; and the building of 200 major nuclear power plants.

The President mentioned neither solar or geothermal energy. While the technologies for these energy sources are not now sufficiently advanced for commercial use, any reasonable solution to the energy problem must include a serious look at them. Energy solutions must also address both long-term and short-term perspectives and the interrelationship between the time differences involved in coping with the energy crisis. The interrelationship of long-term and short-term perspectives is critically important in determining what should be done with nuclear energy.

Ford's message leaned heavily on nuclear power as a solution to the nation's immediate problems. Claiming that "utilities have cancelled or postponed over 60 percent of planned nuclear expansion," the President said he planned to submit legislation to expedite nuclear licensing and more rapid site selection. While the specific legislation has not yet been made public, the dangerous nature of nuclear power demands that licensing and siting of such plants be done in the most careful manner. The process should not be speeded if it requires the sacrifice of careful safety measures.

Even when great care is supposedly taken in nuclear plant siting, mistakes can be made. For example, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company tried to build a light water reactor (LWR) only 1,300 feet from the San Andreas fault, whose shifts have caused all of California's devastating earthquakes. The AEC originally had approved the site as safe and only after six years of litigation was the project dropped. It is unrealistic and foolhardy to believe that the nuclear industry can build the proposed 200 safe reactors in ten years. In fact, many existing plants may have to close down this year because of a shortage of space for radioactive waste.

In late January, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the recently-renamed part of the abolished Atomic Energy Commission which handles atomic power licensing, ordered 23 of the nation's 52 commercial reactors temporarily shut down. These 23 nuclear reactors produce about 7.5 percent of the nation's electricity. The NRC had discovered cracks in the emergency cooling system of an Illinois reactor and ordered the others to make similar searches. It was the second time in four months that such inspections had taken place.

Of the proposed reactors, the most controversial and potentially dangerous one is the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR), commonly called the plutonium recycle or breeder reactor. The threats to human health from the plutonium recycle system completely overshadow the present dangers of the existing LWRs.

Plutonium is produced in nuclear reactors from uranium. Plutonium 239, the principle isotope of that element, has a half-life 24,400 years. Scientists consider plutonium to be the most lethal element ever handled by man in quantity. Micrograms in skin wounds cause cancer; when micron-sized particles are inhaled, lung cancer is a likely result. A baseball-sized piece of plutonium can cause a massive nuclear explosion.

Plutonium is presently created in small quantities as a by-product of LWRs. A typical LWR makes about 200-250 kilograms a year. Plutonium is not presently used as a primary fuel, however, and is stored with high-level radioactive waste. It is this radioactivity which protects the plu-

onium from theft. Under a plutonium recycle plan developed by the AEC and the nuclear industry, 140 tons of plutonium is expected to be recovered by 1985 and 1700 tons by the year 2000.

The process of plutonium recovery itself increases the likelihood of theft, terrorism, or accidents. The unrefined plutonium would be shipped from LWRs to reprocessing plants where radioactive wastes would be removed, making it relatively easy to handle and steal. It would then be transported to a reprocessing plant for fabricating into fuel pellets and then into fuel rods. Finally, these products would be shipped to a breeder reactor to be used as fuel. Little imagination is needed to recognize the risks and added security involved in transporting that much lethal material over public roads. The AEC has proposed a special federal police force to guard such plants and shipments. The restrictions on individuals resulting from the constant surveillance needed to protect the plutonium could propel the nation toward 1984.

Considering the health risks, the dangers posed by transporting so much plutonium, the strain upon our society by the needed security precautions, and the dangers of political terrorism or natural catastrophes, one questions why the AEC and nuclear industry want to build the LMFBR for commercial use. The answer is efficiency, conservation, and cleanliness. The LMFBR produces more fissionable fuel than it consumes, thus conserving uranium. LMFBR proponents argue that the breeder is at least as economical as alternative sources although the expenditures needed for safeguards and safety would substantially increase the real cost. They argue that since the breeder does not use a water cooling system, environmental damage from radioactive heat discharges would be prevented.

LMFBR backers also argue that plutonium recycling would reduce fuel cycle costs and avoid certain capital expenses. These economy arguments are rather spurious considering that development of the LMFBR has already cost the taxpayers \$2 billion. Total project cost of the largest research and development project ever undertaken by the United States is now pegged at \$6.8 billion.

In the next few months, Congress must decide whether it wants to invest large amounts of the nation's resources in LWRs and the LMFBR. Congress must not make the same mistake that was made in the late 1950s and early 1960s when it authorized programs to make nuclear energy the nation's primary future energy supply. It is unrealistic from technological and economic standpoints to believe that by 1985 the nation can depend upon nuclear power for a sizable share of its energy. It is even more unrealistic and even irresponsible to plan on dependence on the hazardous LMFBR.

A more reasonable alternative is for Congress not to appropriate additional money for the planned LMFBR at Clinch River, Tennessee; to pass the Plutonium Moratorium Bill which forbids the building of commercial breeder reactors without the explicit consent of Congress, and to shift sizable amounts of energy research funds into the development of coal for immediate needs and for the development of solar and geothermal resources for the long haul.

In the twenty-first century, nuclear power may be cheap and safe enough for use as our primary source of energy, but for the next 25 years, the United States must develop other resources to achieve energy self-sufficiency. ■

14a ELIOT STREET

The Chicago Chapter will host the 1975 Annual Ripon Dinner and Issues Conference on April 19 in Chicago. Coordinating the meeting will be Chicago members

Jean Hamm, Alice White, and James East.

- National Associate Member Lila Sapinsley is now minority leader of the Rhode Island State Senate.
- The Detroit-Ann Arbor Chapter was addressed January 11 by a panel composed of pollster Robert Teeter of Market Opinion Research and State Representatives Michael Dively, Dennis Cawthorne, and Robert Edwards. The meeting was held in East Lansing.
- Kati Sasseville, an attorney for the U.S. Navy in Washington and a former member of Ripon's National Governing Board, has been appointed to the Minnesota Public Service Commission by Gov. Wendell Anderson(D). Her appointment was effective February 1.
- The New York Chapter's annual conference will be held April 26. Conference chairman is Edward Goldberg, who is also the new national vice president for finance.
- In the January 1 FORUM, New York Chapter Vice President Anne Heavner was erroneously listed as a member of the campaign staff of Gov. Malcolm Wilson. She did not work on the Wilson campaign.
- Peter Baugher is the new president of the Chicago Chapter. Attorney Baugher is a former president of the New Haven Chapter. Other new Chicago officers include Paul Kimball, secretary, and Carolyn Gibson, treasurer. The chapter sponsored a luncheon for Chicago aldermanic candidates on February 6. Lola Flamm, a member of the Chicago Ripon board of directors, is a candidate for the Board of Alderman from the 7th Ward in North Evanston. She won high praise for her unsuccessful campaign for Cook County clerk in 1974.

COMMENTARY: ECONOMY

THE COSTS OF OIL, MONEY, AND CONSERVATION

by Donald E. Weeden

Even without the Arab-Israeli confrontation, the growing shortage of low-cost energy would have surfaced. But rather than face reality, the United States has tried to ignore the problem and to engage instead in sabre rattling. It has wasted more than a year without debating the real issue: the days of cheap energy are over.

The current U.S. effort to organize a consumer cartel of industrial nations to confront the oil producers cartel is no more calculated to succeed than John Foster Dulles' fiction about unleashing Chiang Kai-shek on Mao Tse-Tung. There is no better way to reinforce the strength of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries than to create a consumers' cartel---or more accurately, to try to create a consumers' cartel.

The French have the better strategy: first cut domestic energy consumption to the bone through effective conservation, and second, open channels for talk, trade, and investment between producers and consumers. That strategy avoids a confrontation which the U.S. would be sure to lose, while at the same time maintaining the possibility that one or more oil producers might set its own, less disruptive pricing policy. The flaw in the Administration's Middle East policy to date has been to overestimate the ties which bind the OPEC countries together and to underestimate the ties that bind OPEC to the West and the West to OPEC.

The Kissinger cartel proposal is wrong. Monopoly only begets monopoly. The first commandment in politics and economics is to keep the power spread around. Those with any sense of history must recognize that the Arabs are just using on us the same monopoly power we used on the Iranians in 1953 when we boycotted her oil.

But one can dwell excessively on the increase in the price of oil and lose sight of the fact that other essential commodities have increased almost as much. The reality is that the nation is in the midst of a commodity revolution. Surely that is the lesson that Henry Kissinger and the Agriculture Department learned to their chagrin and discomfort after the 1972 Russian wheat deal. Back then, the Agriculture Department was still operating under the old surplus, P.L.480, "cheap food" mentality which argues that it is great to unload 25 percent of your annual wheat production for \$1.62 a bushel, on credit, to a foreign government. Thereafter, the price of wheat soared to over \$5.00 a bushel, cash. By hindsight, the U.S. should have kept the wheat in storage and sold it only for gold.

As with energy, the days of cheap food for America are over. All the subsidies and quotas in the world---ours or theirs---will in the long run do precious little to alter the basic fact that there are more people in the world, many of whom have come to enjoy a higher standard of living and have the means to raise the prices of what they sell us in order to buy our food---even at quadruple the 1971 prices. So long as beef sells for \$4 in Tokyo and \$3 in Paris, there is little long range prospect for prices much less than \$2 a pound in San Francisco and New York. The only essential differences between cities are distribution costs. That is what interdependence in world trade is all about. A growing number of people understand this and are prepared---given some leadership---to adjust to the new realities of high-cost energy and high-cost food.

And what about the high cost of money? It has been argued that long-term interest rates over the past two years are an aberration soon to be corrected. Since 1973, the vast majority of American corporate managements have postponed raising needed capital in the hope that somehow in 1975 long-term interest rates would fall significantly. How realistic is that hope for 1975---with the Treasury in the money market, sopping up huge amounts of private capital to finance a \$40-50 billion budget deficit? Long-term rates at 4% at any time in the foreseeable future are about as realistic as gasoline for \$.30 a gallon and beef for \$.75 a pound. The true cost of long-term money has been about 3% while the additional cost has represented the anticipated cost of inflation. Given the remoteness of a possible drop in world inflation to the 2-3% level, a drop in the cost of long-term money to the 8% level (let alone 5%) is equally remote. Remember, money moves around the world much faster these days, thanks to sophisticated financial vice president of multinational companies and their helpful international bankers.

There are no easy answers for safely increasing the U.S. supply of money---only a series of qualified trade-offs. All those theories for more rapid recycling of petro-dollars as a way out of the liquidity crisis are a bit of an intellectual fad. American bankers are worried sick

over any more borrowing short from the Arabs and lending long to Americans. The problems of government to government transactions are not significantly less hazardous.

Those in high places who continue to resist drastic measures to conserve our use of imported oil, and thereby reduce the dollar drain, are going to have a lot of explaining to do to the American people. There is no way those sums can be safely reinvested in the United States at anything approaching the rate at which they go out. And few officials in Washington seem to appreciate just what an economic drag it is on the economy in general and capital formation in particular to have \$25 billion a year syphoned off and out of our domestic system. The cumulative costs of further delay on stopping the dollar drain are a heck of a lot higher than an immediate 30-50¢ a gallon increase in gasoline taxes and really stiff excise taxes on new and old automobiles based on the autos' weight and horsepower. Whether waste is reduced by rationing or taxation is a legitimate issue about which reasonable men can differ. What seems beyond dispute is the need to cut down our inefficient use of essential commodities---and that includes money.

What a bonanza the energy crisis could be for the automobile manufacturers if they would get off the defensive and do some creative thinking and talking. A government-supported plan for Detroit could produce 20 million compact cars a year in order to get us out from under our existing inefficient auto fleet. The bulk of the job could be completed in five years if the nation went all out. Eliminating waste should be the heart of Project Independence, but instead, it is all so much expansionist talk about nuclear power, shale oil, and wind mills.

Without even trying, Americans drove three percent less in 1974, the first driving drop since 1944. The potential for conservation is huge. In 1973, Americans drove 1.309 trillion miles. In 1974, Americans drove 1.270 trillion miles. That is 300 miles less for each of the nation's 130 million cars, which are driven an average 10,000 miles a year. If every American drove 1,000 miles less a year, the U.S. could save 10 billion gallons of gasoline or 250 million barrels of oil. If, in addition, American automobiles averaged 25 miles per gallon, OPEC would crack. All I am talking about is reducing automobile usage by 10% (1,000 miles per car) this year, and 20% (2,000 miles less per year per car) in 1976, and increasing gasoline mileage to 25 miles per gallon by 1980. Do that and the Shah would have to hock his Peacock Throne!

Some of my friends who enjoy playing with numbers claim that the true cost benefits of recycling American automobiles is so great that if you add up all the direct and indirect costs---which range from unemployment related to Detroit to higher interest costs to a portion of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean to massive loans and gifts of military aid in the Middle East---the government would come out ahead by simply buying truly efficient, compact, \$2,000 cars from Detroit and giving them away to all who would turn in a gas-guzzling dinosaur.

The numbers that proposal generates are hard to follow and even more difficult for anyone not in government to check. Still, the thrust of the suggestion---to get Detroit working again, but this time on energy conservation rather than on bumpers and air-conditioning---is sound.

The worst and the best are yet to come. The worst because Big Business, Big Labor, and Big Government are always painfully slow to react to each new crisis. The Big Boys have a penchant for getting in the way of evolution because they are forever trying to preserve their personal status quo. The first and most awkward part of charting a new interdependent course will be to give up the sentimental notion that the U.S. can turn back the tide and go it alone. Sentimentality can lead to violence. For those who have grown up believing in cheap food, cheap energy, and cheap money, there will be a decided wrench in adjusting to the Age of Conservation, of learning to get more and better use from what we have.

The prospect of the Age of Conservation ought not to be perceived as a diminished view of America. I never understood the American Dream to exclude thrift (an old Yankee virtue), or worse yet, to mean that others had to be exploited in order for the United States to prosper. The current crises run very deep. We are being forced to see ourselves and the world more clearly than ever before. But just as surely as this country outgrew its old dependence on slavery and cheap immigrant labor, so too we will outgrow our present dependence on supplies of food, energy, and money so plentiful that they can be wasted. ■

Contributor Notes: Tanya Melich is chairman of the National Governing Board of the Ripon Society and a member of the FORUM Editorial Board. Donald E. Weeden is chairman of the board of Weeden & Co., a Wall Street securities firm. James Harrington is a FORUM correspondent and a student at Suffolk University Law School. Daniel Swillinger is a contributing editor to the FORUM and assistant dean at Ohio State Law School.

POLITICS: MAINE

MAINE AFTER MUSKIE AND OTHER MUDDLES

by James Harrington

1975 looks like 1971, only worse. That makes Sen. Edmund Muskie (D-Me.) look good. From his new vantage point as chairman of the congressional Budget Committee, Muskie may be able to resume the Lincolnesque image he lost somewhere in the snows of New Hampshire in 1972. Considering the likelihood of a Democratic convention deadlock in 1976, the possibility of Sen. Edmund Muskie as the Democratic nominee is becoming more plausible. Muskie trailed Gerald Ford by only a slight margin in a recent Gallup Poll and he has the recognition that many moderate-liberal Democratic possibilities now lack.

Given the possibility of another Muskie assault on national politics, Maine's political scene faces another shakeup in 1976. Muskie has recently mended the state and local political fences that he left untended for years. Had he not done so, he might have had trouble seeking reelection to his Senate seat in 1976. Muskie now says he will seek reelection, but he has not ruled out a presidential run though he will probably not enter primaries.

Should Muskie bow out of state politics in 1976, former Gov. Kenneth Curtis (D) would probably be pressured to make the Senate race. Curtis, a moderate and extremely popular Democrat, has apparently informed key party officials that he is available. If Muskie does seek reelection, Curtis might be prevailed upon to challenge freshman U.S. Rep. David Emery (R), who narrowly unseated U.S. Rep. Peter Kyros (D) in November. Curtis lost a similar contest against U.S. Rep. Stanley Tupper (R) in 1964 by a narrow margin.

At 26, former state legislator Emery is seriously considering support for legislation which would reduce minimum age qualifications for federal office-seekers. He is also shoring up his shaky political tenure by opening five district offices in stores throughout the 1st C.D. His seats on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and Science and Astronautics Committee should aid his effort to improve the 370-vote margin of 1974. Commenting on the reason for his win recently, Emery said, "I know it sounds unbelievable but Kyros didn't campaign even at the end of the race. He had won 59 percent of the vote in the last two elections and believed the newspaper polls which gave him a big edge throughout the campaign."

Besides Curtis, Emery's potential Democratic opposition for 1976 includes unsuccessful Democratic gubernatorial nominee George Mitchell. The former Muskie aide and Portland lawyer placed a strong second to Gov. James Longley in November. Mitchell supporters blame his loss on the support of many conservative, urban Democrats for the independent Longley, himself a very conservative Democrat. Another Democrat considering a congressional run is Atty. Gen. Joseph Brennan, who was an unsuccessful candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1974. Although Kyros has promised to recapture his former seat, many Democrats hope he will have second thoughts.

In the 2nd C.D., U.S. Rep. Bill Cohen (R) has recently declared that he will wait until 1976 to disclose his political plans. The energetic, independent Republican is under increasing pressure to seek the Muskie Senate seat. Although Cohen was the target of considerable flack for his stand on Nixon's impeachment, he received an unprecedented 72% of the vote in 1974. Cohen supporters hope that Cohen would be able to capitalize on Muskie's remoteness from Maine. The senior senator's recent attention to local politics reflected his failure to attend several major Democratic functions during the 1974 campaign. Muskie's long January sojourn in Maine may reflect both the unrest among party regulars and his cognizance of Cohen's popularity. Cohen might, in fact, have an easier campaign against Muskie than against former Gov. Curtis.

Another prominent Republican with his eyes on Muskie's Senate seat is Robert Monks, who was appointed by Curtis last July to a one-year term as Maine's energy director. Monks received 32% of the vote in his 1972 Republican Senate primary against Sen. Margaret Chase Smith. A Monks-Cohen primary in 1976 is a possibility.

Potential Republican successors to Cohen in the 2nd C.D. include State Sen. Theodore S. Curtis, a progressive and conscientious lawmaker from Orono who proved his votegetting ability by defeating the incumbent Senate president in last year's primary. State Rep. John McKernan, a 25-year-old Bangor lawyer who was recently elected assistant House minority leader, is also considering the race. Former State Sen. Wakine Tanous, an unsuccessful gubernatorial aspirant in 1974, and young State Sen. Neil Carson are also mentioned. Like newly-elected GOP State Chairman Jack Linnell, Curtis, and McKernan are members of the Ripon Society.

Democratic possibilities for the seat are fewer; Cohen's 1974 opponent, former POW Mark

Gartley(D) is now secretary of state, and it is unlikely he will make a second congressional run. House Speaker John Martin(D) might make the race after his usual cautious analysis.

Note: GOP State Executive Director James Nesbitt recently resigned his post after Linnell's election. He was replaced by Dan Bourassa, who worked on the gubernatorial campaign of Harrison Richardson(R) and the congressional campaign of Cohen. ■

POLITICS: OHIO

GERRYMANDERING IN SEARCH OF A SIGNATURE

by Daniel Swillinger

Ohio Democrats, taking advantage of their newly-won control over both houses of the state legislature and a quirk in the Ohio Constitution, have passed a congressional redistricting bill which they hope will add two new Democratic seats. The fate of the redistricting bill, however, depends on the outcome of at least three pending law suits.

The Democratic gerrymandering occurred during a legislative circus in early January. The Ohio Constitution provides that the legislature is to be sworn in January 7 and the governor on January 13, allowing the Democrats to take advantage of a Democratic legislature and a Democratic governor for a six-day period. Democrats passed the redistricting bill over Republican opposition, but state law requires the signature of Lt. Gov. John W. Brown(R), the Senate's presiding officer. The Democrats therefore passed a Senate rule allowing the Senate president pro tem to also sign legislation. Republicans then ran to the county courthouse for a temporary restraining order preventing State Sen. Oliver Ocasek(D-Akron) from signing legislation as president pro tem. The order was granted and Lt. Gov. Brown prepared to bed down in his office from adjournment on Friday, January 10 to 12:01 a.m. Monday, January 13, when Republican James A. Rhodes officially became governor. Brown hoped to prevent Ocasek from signing in Brown's absence. On Sunday, however, Ohio Supreme Court Judge Frank Celebreeze issued a stay of the restraining order, permitting Ocasek to sign the bill (and five other partisan bills passed the previous week). By then, Gilligan had already signed the bills, arguing that the lieutenant governor's signature was a mere formality. On Monday when Gilligan staff members tried to present the bills to Secretary of State Ted. W. Brown(R) for filing, Brown refused them on the grounds that Rhodes was now governor and that the staff members were acting without his authority.

The same day, State Sen. Mike Maloney(R) of Cincinnati filed a taxpayers' suit in state court challenging the validity of the legislation because it lacked the lieutenant governor's signature. And then later in the week, a "friendly" suit was filed by a Democrat in U.S. District Court in Cleveland, whose jurisdiction Democrats hoped would supersede that of the state courts. Gov. Rhodes has asked Atty. Gen. William J. Brown(D) to provide special counsel for him in these suits since Rhodes alleges that Brown would have a conflict of interest if he defended the governor. Brown gave the legislative Democrats advice when they passed the original legislation.

The object of all this Machiavellian cum Mack Sennett activity is a bill which would pair six incumbent Republican congressmen and radically change two other GOP-held districts. Drawn into the new 12th C.D. under this proposal are incumbent U.S.Reps. Chalmers P. Wylie(R) and Samuel P. Devine(R), both of Columbus. The district would include roughly the northern half of Franklin County, all of rural Delaware and Union counties, and parts of rural Madison and Morrow counties. The proposed new 15th C.D. is drawn to favor Democratic candidates and includes roughly the southern half of Franklin County and a northward projection which was drawn into the plan to include Columbus Councilwoman Francis Ryan, who was defeated by the ultra-conservative Devine by a narrow margin in 1974.

The Democratic plan also redraws congressional districts in Hamilton County (Cincinnati) into what has been called a half-donut shape. The new, urban 2nd C.D. is the hole of the donut, surrounded by the suburban 2nd C.D. Conservative U.S.Rep. Donald Clancy(R) now lives in the western half of the new 1st C.D. and freshman U.S.Rep. Willis D. Gradison(R) resides in the 2nd C.D. part of the new configuration. Gradison would probably have to move into Clancy's district and face a primary if the new plan holds up in court.

The gerrymandering bill puts incumbent U.S.Reps. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.(R-Dayton) and Thomas N. Kindness(R-Hamilton) into the proposed 8th C.D. between Dayton and Cincinnati. It places U.S.Reps. Tennyson Guyer(R-Findlay) and Clarence J. Brown(R-Urbana) into the new 7th C.D. If the plan holds up in court, Ohio Republicans will surely lose a seat each in Columbus and Cincinnati, and could have problems with either Brown or Guyer. ■

POLITICS: STATES

New Job: Former Oregon Gov. Tom McCall(R) will become president of a nonprofit research corporation, specializing in energy and environmental research.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

It may be the end of a not-so-beautiful love affair. Gov. Meldrim Thomson(R) and Manchester Union-Leader Publisher William Loeb have disagreed. The disagreement began January 23 when Loeb published an editorial calling for the election of former Sen. Norris Cotton(R) as GOP state chairman. "Sen. Cotton, at 74, is no tired old man. He admits now that when he most unfortunately retired from the Senate, he made the decision on the spur of the moment when he happened to be feeling badly from one of his sinus attacks," wrote Loeb in his editorial which also suggested that unsuccessful congressional aspirant David Banks (another Loeb favorite) be elected state GOP treasurer. According to Loeb, "It is all very well for the governor to have this very direct appeal to the voters, but his difficulty derives from the fact that when he comes to the legislature and finds himself involved in other situations, he simply doesn't have the troops to carry out many of his splendid ideas." A GOP nominating committee subsequently suggested the names of Cotton, Frank Wageman, and John A. Clements as possible state chairmen. Wageman, who once lost the state chairmanship with Thomson's backing, disclaimed any interest this time. Thomson said he wanted former state housing commission chairman Gerald P. Carmen as state GOP chairman and tried to convince Cotton to drop out of the race. The governor told the nominating committee that it was a "rump session, dominated by what our people have come to recognize as the remnants of the Concord gang." When it came time for the GOP state committee meeting, Thomson's lieutenants backed businessman Clements. Cotton was nominated by former Gov. Walter Peterson(R), a progressive who noted that he seldom agreed with Loeb about anything. When a Thomson lieutenant tried to convince Cotton on the telephone that he should decline the nomination, Peterson took the phone and assured the 74-year-old Cotton that the committee overwhelmingly wanted him. Thomson finally gave up on efforts to change Cotton's mind several days later. Meanwhile, former bosom buddy Loeb editorialized: "This newspaper hopes that if there is an attempt at revenge and a show of what might be called ingratitude by an opponent to Norris Cotton, the man who has done more for the Republican Party than any other living man and has done it longer, the vast majority of the state committee will override[sic] that opposition. We say this even if the opposition comes from political leaders whom we have supported. Even the best men sometimes become so involved in battling that they forget to be generous and become petty and ungrateful." Well, now Gov. Thomson knows how Ed Muskie must have felt.

NEW JERSEY

Democratic members of the New Jersey State Senate have disciplined State Sen. Alene Ammond(D-Cherry Hill) for being obnoxious. The Democratic caucus voted to exclude her from their group, to kick her off the Senate Judiciary Committee, and to organize a five-member committee to investigate Ammond's actions. These actions consist mostly of criticism of her fellow legislators, including questioning their ethics and revealing what they do or say in closed-door sessions. Senate President Frank Dodd(D) has been moved to call her a "liar" and another Democratic Senate leader said, "In the days of Salem they burned women like her at the stake." Democratic retaliation against Ammond could backfire; the Democrats may discover they had burned a Joan of Arc rather than a Salem witch. As one Democrat observed: "The best thing to do with a person like her is ignore her."

VERMONT

For the first time since the GOP was established in Vermont (c. 1856), the Democrats have elected a speaker of the legislature's lower house. But despite that election, it is difficult to tell who is the majority leader in the House because no one is quite sure of the partisan lineup. State Rep. Richard Snelling(R) says he is the majority leader despite the election of a Democratic speaker and State Rep. Thomas Candon(D) has insisted that he is satisfied to be minority leader, but the problem persists. There were 73 representatives elected solely as Republicans in November and 73 solely as Democrats, but four representatives were elected both as Republicans and Democrats because state law permits cross-filing in the primary. As many as 77 legislators have shown up at the GOP caucus, but that may not mean much. When the election for speaker was held, Democrat Timothy O'Connor, Jr., 38, defeated Republican Emory Hebard, 57. The vote was 77-63 with 10 votes going to State Rep. Orrin Beattie(R), a moderate who was defeated for the speakership nomination in the GOP caucus but who nominated Hebard before the full House. Since the Beattie votes reportedly came equally from disgruntled Democrats and Republicans, it took considerable Republican support for O'Connor to win. Hebard may have been hurt by his assertion while seeking the GOP caucus nomination that only Republicans would hold committee chairmanships if he won. Meanwhile, Snelling's election as majority leader may presage a run for the governorship in 1976. The wealthy, conservative Snelling was the GOP's 1966 gubernatorial nominee. Note: The post of House majority whip went to State Rep. James Douglas (R), a 24-year-old second-term legislator from Middlebury.

DULY NOTED: STATES

After U.S. Rep. John Jarman of Oklahoma switched his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican, he received a congratulatory phone call through the White House switchboard. The call, however, originated in San Clemente, California. Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) later confirmed that Richard Nixon has not lost his interest in disrupting Republican Party politics. After a luncheon meeting with Nixon in January, Goldwater told the press, "We discussed whether he would be accepted back into the party's affairs. And I told him I thought he would be." The reaction of most other Republican politicians to the possibility of the reappearance of the Nixon ghost was horror. The former President is one spook the GOP would prefer not to hear go bump in the dark.

● "N.J. Republicans Take Heart, Sit Up," by Robert Comstock. (Hackensack, N.J.) Record, February 2, 1975. The New Jersey GOP has faced numerous disasters in recent years, but it has hope for 1975's legislative elections. Republicans expect the campaign to be "in large measure a vote of confidence in Governor Byrne and his Democratic legislature. A typical GOP reaction to that prospect was that of one party veteran who chortled: 'That Byrne, he's beautiful! He hasn't done anything right yet.'" Vice President Nelson Rockefeller's recent trip to the state also left the party considerably improved financially. Bergen and Passaic County GOP organizations are still dealing with the aftermath of corruption charges against top leaders, but at least in Bergen County, there is some indication that County GOP Chairman Richard J. Vander Plaats is beginning to put together the pieces of a party shattered by the leadership of Nelson Gross and Anthony J. Statile.

● "Herman Resigns National GOP Post," by David Beeder. Omaha World-Herald, January 22, 1975. "R.L. 'Dick' Herman resigned [January 22] as Republican national committeeman from Nebraska, saying his trucking business and beer distributorships demanded too much of his time." Herman's likely successor is Omaha lawyer William E. Morrow, Jr., who was campaign manager for U.S. Rep. John Y. McCollister's 1974 campaign. McCollister is considered a likely Senate candidate in 1976. The retiring Herman is campaigning against a new federal truck brake regulation and decided his political and business roles might conflict. Former U.S. Rep. David Martin (R-3rd) had earlier called for Herman's resignation, but Herman denied that he had been affected by Martin's demand.

● "GOP Touts Rep. Carter for Governor," by Ed Ryan. Louisville Courier-Journal, January 1, 1976. The Kentucky GOP would like U.S. Rep. Tim Lee Carter (R-5th) to run for governor this year, but the 64-year-old congressman is not interested. GOP party leaders, including former Carter foe Louie Nunn, have agreed that Carter would make the party's strongest party candidate. The leaders are convinced that Carter could easily run without damaging his standing in his rockribbed Republican district. Even a strong losing race would significantly boost the party. A party search committee met in January to find a candidate, but only State Sen. Eugene Stuart of Jefferson County is still interested. Republican leaders think a Carter candidacy would be heavily backed by 5th C.D. Republicans hoping for a shot at Congress if the incumbent won a new office. The GOP also believes that the upcoming primary between Gov. Julian Carroll and Jefferson County Judge Todd Hollenbach may give the emaciated Republican Party an outside chance at victory this year.

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in District of Columbia, chapters in fifteen cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of subchapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions and revenues from its publications and contract work.

THE RIPON FORUM is published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices. Contents are copyrighted © 1975 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)

In publishing this newsletter the Ripon Society seeks to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well-researched proposals and for a spirit of criticism, innovation, and independent thinking within the Re-

publican Party. Articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of the National Governing Board or the Editorial Board of the Ripon Society, unless they are explicitly so labelled.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are \$15 a year, \$7.50 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$5 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

Robert D. Behn, Chairman
Robert H. Donaldson
James Manchon

Tanya Melich
Robert G. Stewart
Ralph Thayer

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

Technical Editor: Brian McCarthy

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices.