YAF Dumps GOP, Nixon

HOUSTON — YAF, never an explicitly Republican organization, dropped all pretenses to party affiliation last week and voted 1459 to 41 to dump President Nixon.

Holding their national convention here over the Labor Day weekend, YAF repeatedly applauded a speech against busing by Senator Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.), the Majority Whip, who generated more enthusiasm than any other speaker. When asked how he felt addressing a dominantly Republican audience, Byrd replied that he did not feel ill at ease in a group with congenial ideological convictions. YAF national chairman Ronald Docksai declared that the group should eschew "entangling party affiliations."

Pseudo-Conservative

The mood of the convention was epitomized by Kevin Phillips, who assured the assembled delegates that his so-called Southern strategy was still valid, since Nixon's 1970 campaign had been only "pseudo-conservative." Phillips urged YAF to support men "who were conservatives first and Republicans second."

On Saturday afternoon, YAF voted to suspend support of Nixon in the same stilted language, but without the affirmation of personal respect, used by William Buckley and 11 prominent conservative intellectuals almost two months earlier. When Nixon was finally nominated that night at the mock convention (following speeches for such stalwarts as Joseph Coors, Attila Capp and Washington State Senator Sam C. Guess, "the only candidate who has not sold out to the Ripon Society"), the group greeted the President's name with a resounding chorus of boos and cries of "dump Nixon."

On the second ballot (Reagan led on the first) Vice President Agnew was chosen as the presidential nominee, with Senator James Buckley as his running mate. The convention also voted to appropriate up to $750,000, the approximate amount of YAF's entire 1971 budget, in support of Agnew.

S. D. Power Play Fails

HURON, S.D. — A power play by the GOP State Chairman, U.S. Senator Peter Dominick and the GOP Senate Campaign Committee to stop a progressive Republican Senatorial candidacy in favor of a right winger, ended in complete failure here early this month.

As a result, Thomas Reardon, 56, a lifelong Republican whose opposition to the war led him to support Senator George McGovern's reelection in 1968, is emerging as a likely GOP candidate to succeed the ailing Karl Mundt.

Reardon, a personable Sioux Falls businessman and close associate of former Governor Frank Farrar, serves as a member of the 12-man National Advisory Council to the Federal Reserve Board. His support in the party and his ability to appeal beyond it made him the most formidable opponent for the likely Democratic primary winner, liberal Rapid City Congressman James G. Abourezk.

The Republican Senate Campaign Committee, however, was unwilling to let matters take their course. Senator Dominick, who reportedly had a candidate of his own, dispatched his staff director Buehl Berentson to help State Chairman Robert Burns contrive a "candidate selection committee" meeting of 15 county chairmen, dominated by backers of two right wing candidates.

Clams Dominick Backing

One, Charles Lien of Rapid City, with a business in Colorado, is a military spending zealot who returned from Washington recently claiming Dominick's support and Campaign Committee pledges of some $80,000; another is Robert Hirsch, the State Senate majority leader, who has already announced with the support of the Mundt organization.

Berentson and Burns proceeded with their plans for a selection committee despite protests from Reardon and his declared refusal to appear before it.

But public outcry, led by five of the state's daily newspapers and a key television station, as well as private entreaties from some leading Republicans, thwarted the Burns-Berentson effort. The candidate selection plan was dropped and Berentson apparently restricted himself to a speech before a GOP dinner.
THE LIMITS OF NEP

The President, in one of his more dubious political accomplishments, has transformed John Connally from an ex-Governor of unsure prospects into one of the nation's most promising politicians. As predicted, the Texas Democrat with the oil industry credentials has emerged as the Man Who Weasels the Star in the Nixon Administration. Yet while the U.S. automobile industry joins oil, aerospace, textiles and steel in the lineup for benefits and while Republicans and businessmen everywhere celebrate their new prospects, it seems unlikely that Connally, with his repertory of short-order salves and subsidies — the oils and greases of the Service Station State — can do for the economy what the President has done for him.

Let us grant that the President and the Secretary have won a great political triumph. Let us further acknowledge that a political triumph in economic policy was vitally needed, not only by the Republicans but also by the economy. The crisis of faith in the Administration's financial management was in itself an economic fact that undermined growth and stability. It is thus largely irrelevant for the moment to scrutinize too closely the Nixon-Connally package — or to point out that it is mostly rhetorical wrapping paper, resourcefully designed to create confidence, gratify prejudice, and conceal the continuing fact that no federal Administration has yet presented a coherent economic policy responsive to the real crisis in world and American capitalism.

The new economic plan, like the similar but more timid approaches of the Democratic Administrations which created our economic predicament, is programmatically self-contradictory: a proposal to fight inflation and restore U.S. competitive fiber that begins by raising prices on most imports and excluding competition; and an employment program that begins by reducing federal jobs. As an exercise in what we have described as the New Mercantilism, the policy impotence, the short-term U.S. economic adjustment on poor consumers in the United States (who will be deprived of cheaper foreign goods) and on the poor countries overseas (who will be deprived of the wealthy American market). Trade preferences for the developing countries, one of the Nixon Administration's most important nominal commitments, become ever more remote. The United States, moreover, has in fact been about as protectionist as the rest of the world and all Connally's rhetoric cannot suppress the grim laughter that greets our posture as an innocent victim of world economic predators.

Beyond the New Economic Policy, as desirable as it may be as a short term fix, must come long-term statesmanship. Our prosperity ultimately depends on global growth of the capitalist system. In the trade and monetary negotiations which are in prospect the United States must push for arrangements that do not exclude and exploit the developing countries and thus induce them to despair of free economic policies. Similarly in devising domestic programs it is imperative at last to relieve the consumer of the chief responsibility for subsidizing politically sensitive corporations.

Finally it must be said that on these issues the country must look chiefly to the Republicans for leadership. For big labor, centered in relatively declining industries and in the Democratic party, is exploiting a near monopoly position for short-term gains at the expense of U.S. growth and total employment. It has become, in large part, economically reactionary: a leading voice, with John Connally, of the New Mercantilism.

WHY WAIT FOR THE COURTS?

In turning down an appeal by the state of Georgia, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has opened the way for other suits to force the Republican and Democratic parties to change the number of national convention delegates assigned to each state.

Georgia sought to compel the parties to adopt a one-man-one-vote system, based only on population. The court decided this was not a rational method — given that party strength varies from state to state — but in effect encouraged other plaintiffs to offer practically any other rational system for determining delegate allocation. The court ruled that the question was justiciable and that a court could frame judicially manageable standards to provide relief — only the method proposed (allocation based solely on state-wide population) was faulted.

The Republican procedure for 1972 delegate allocation, adopted by the '68 convention, results in gross discrimination against larger states. For instance, the eleven most populous states get 221 fewer delegates (of a projected total of 1337) than they would if allocation were based on the GOP vote for President in the last three elections. Also, based on the present formula, a delegate from Alaska would represent 3,133 votes for the Republican presidential nominee in 1968, whereas a delegate from California would represent 40,796 votes, a discrepancy of more than 13 to one. While we do not suggest that Presidential vote is the only appropriate standard of allocation, such discrepancies do point to a serious problem.

Even if the courts fail to uphold the arguments based on such analysis, however, the National Committee appears to be vulnerable to suit in terms of its own regulations. Rule # 30 (B) specifies that Congressional districts which failed to produce 12,500 Republican votes in the 1968 Presidential or 1970 Congressional contests receive more than two delegates; yet the five such districts all have been erroneously assigned two. More significantly, rule #30 (B) bases delegate assignments on electoral performance in 1968 and 1970 races; yet in practice the National Committee has granted additional delegates on the basis of the 1970 census reapportionment, thus giving California 10 additional votes, for example, while taking 4 from New York.

These errors are easily correctable, of course, and the National Committee should act expeditiously. Other reforms will be more complicated since they require alternative criteria. The question, however, is whether the party will act now to reform itself in accord with its own criteria, to some extent already articulated in its Delegates and Organizations (DO) Committee report; or whether it will await the initiation of new suits, perhaps already in preparation, that may induce court-ordered reforms.

The Republican party, exempt so far from displays like the 1968 Democratic Convention, has a relatively good record in maintaining internal democratic processes and accessibility. The National Committee should not allow its reputation to be sullied now by highly publicized litigation.
People in Politics

A 30-year-old Ripon Republican has won the Presidency of the Minneapolis City Council in a move that has made him the city's hottest political property.

Attorney John Cairns gained the council leadership last week by working with his GOP colleagues and voting with the Democrats to organize the council on August 13. His goal is coalition government, with committee chairmanships divided equally between Democrats and Republicans, an arrangement that greatly diminishes the power of any one party. He expects his colleagues to come around to it if they realize it is the price of coalition politics.

More in sorrow than in anger, Cairns criticized some "tunnel-vision partisan Republicans" who don't see that "the party that is most open to change is the party that will win in the future." 1970 marked a Democratic sweep in Minnesota.

As for himself, Cairns will remain Republican. "The Republican Party in Minnesota is open to everyone," he said. "It will remain so even if no new Republicans sign up to run against the old professionals force a fight," he said.

Former Governor Robert E. Smylie, 56, once of the nation's leading progressive Republicans, has declined his candidacy for the U.S. Senate in Idaho favoring instead a second term as Secretary of Interior, the man he appointed in 1962. Smylie, a former Chairman of the Republican Governors Association, was defeated in a primary by Bircher Don Samuelson in 1966 after 12 years in office. Kirk, his hike forgotten, lost the governorship in 1970 to Reubin Askew who said recently: "...busing certainly is an artificial and inadequate instrument of change. Nobody really wants it...yet the law demands and rightly so that we put an end to segregation in our society."

Recipient of a framed and mounted doodle from HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson last week - said that Richardson's removal was a "moderate" attack by Agnew on the Democratic National Committee, promoting a similar Rural Development Bank and other rural programs. In exchange for this consideration, Talmadge reportedly gets Humphrey's support on all other issue committees.

Monday, the Republican National Committee's answer to Human Events, has done it again. Its August 30 issue is devoted to whelping it up for none other than Vice President Spiro Agnew. We read a lengthy attack by Agnew on the Democratic National Committee on page 2, Agnew's "insight" into George Meany on page 4, and a wordy exchange between the Vice President and Howard K. Smith on page 6.

Could the rightists who run Monday be part of the repressive effort to keep Agnew on the ticket next year?

John Lindsay's first major speech since switching was at a "Register for Peace" rally in Pittsburgh September 9. Joining Lindsay on a decidedly bipartisian stage were Representatives Shirley Chisholm, Pete McCloskey and Don Riegel, plus Al Lowenstein and John Kerry.

There's a Nixon running in Middle America this fall. His name is George Nixon and he is the Republican nominee for the office of Mayor of Muncie, Indiana. Nixon is facing an uphill battle against an incumbent Democrat, and a black minister, nominee of the Poor People's Party. Though Nixon's campaign has barely gotten underway, it's the prelude to a billboard slogan "Let George Do It." The local press calls Nixon a "moderate" and George terms the Nixon in the White House a "powerful President." He says his nominal link with the Chief Executive should help his campaign.

The pressing issues of the day in Muncie, population 70,000, are similar to those in any other U.S. metropolis: taxes, unemployment, voter alienation. Nixon would like to bring "politics back to the people" and use the Department of Agriculture to serve as the major federal advocate for the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of substate ranking.

Arthur Fletcher, the ebullient Assistant Secretary of Labor, will shortly be moving to the UN as alternate representative in the U.S. delegation. One of the prime authors of the Philadelphia plan, where applicants for federal contracts must meet minority hiring specifications, the former Baltimore Colt tight end is eyeing a political career in Washington state. In 1968 he got 49 percent of the vote in a lieutenant governor race.

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women who are interested in influencing the intellectual leadership of the Republican party. Information is always available for interested individuals from the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of substate ranking.

Co-Chairmen of the Ripon Society are former Governor Norbert Tiemann of Nebraska and former Democratic Governor Edward T. Breathitt of Kentucky. Included on the large board of directors are a number of leading Republicans, including former Governors Winthrop Rockefeller (Arkansas), Daniel Quayle (Indiana), Harley Smith (North Dakota) and Dewey Bartlett (Oklahoma), and GOP National Committeeman Robert O. Anderson (New Mexico). The board also includes several former governors, business leaders and regional economic development leaders.

With the increasing concentration of people — and problems — in the nation's metropolitan areas, there appears to be growing advocacy for directing the nation's future growth into underutilized rural areas. The new organization will work for that end through lobbying and public relations efforts. Introducing ORA at the Washington press conference were Republican Senators Patrick J. Leahy of Vermont and Ed Slayton of Illinois.

Hubert Humphrey, meanwhile, is making rural development a major theme of his re-election campaign. Once a strong advocate of an Urban Development Bank, he is now barraging the country on a $250,000' budget from Herman Talmadge's Senate Agricultural Committee, promoting a similar Rural Development Bank and other rural programs. In exchange for this consideration, Talmadge reportedly gets Humphrey's support on all other issue committees.
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NEW YORK — John V. Lindsay's drive for party realignment is making little headway here.

Within the Mayor's Administration, only the overly political aides — Deputy Mayor Richard Aurelio, Lindsay's 1969 campaign manager, and Administrative Assistant Sid Davidoff, Aurelio's deputy in '69 — have followed the Mayor into the Democratic party. Aurelio had originally been a Democrat before he worked for Senator Javits several years ago.

Also switching are the leaders of the 'John V. Lindsay Associations' in four of the city's five boroughs; one, Highways Commissioner Vince Gibney of Staten Island, is an Independent, and will remain so.

As of now, the only significant grassroots move came when 250 members of the pro-Lindsay faction of the Bronx Republican organization switched. This group, headed by Dominick Fusco, has been feuding with the "regular" Republicans for years, and supported Arthur Goldberg over Governor Rockefeller last year.

On the top level of the Administration — the Supreme Court's Burger — Finance Administrator Richard Lewison, Transportation Administrator Constantine Sidamon-Eristoff, Commissioner of Investigations Robert Ruskin, Corporation Counsel J. Lee Rankin, and Housing and Development Administrator Albert Walsh have all indicated that they will remain Republicans. However, Model Cities Administrator Joseph B. Williams, one of the highest blacks in the Administration, has changed, registering Democratic.

The Mayor has not succeeded in dragging his fundraisers with him, either. A few individuals who bankrolled the Mayor's previous campaigns and who did not wish their names divulged said that they would be "hesitant" about supporting Lindsay against Nixon next year. A longtime friend and confidant of the Mayor's, who has the title of "Confidential Assistant" and a dollar-a-year salary, Harvey Rothenberg, will remain a Republican, and notes that the Mayor asks for the formation of a broad urban-oriented coalition that must include liberal Republicans.

Only time will tell whether this coalition is capable of propelling John Lindsay to the White House. If, however, he chooses not to run for the Presidency, or fails to get the nomination, he has definitely pledged himself to a very active role in New York state legislative races next year. A pro-urban shift in the legislature's makeup would make it smoother going for Lindsay on his way to the governorship in 1974.

Richardson Given Bus Line

WASHINGTON — On August 3, President Nixon seriously undermined the credibility of HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson by "disavowing" HEW's desegregation plan for Austin, Texas. But if Richardson were to explain that, nothing could have prepared him for the ritual abasement that took place on August 31 at San Clemente.

Trotted out before a throng of reporters, with White House mouthpiece Ron Ziegler monitoring his responses, Richardson parroted the President's "neighborhood school" philosophy. Was he in "total and complete agreement" with the President's policy and statements on busing? someone asked. "That is correct," Richardson replied.

How then, Richardson was asked, did he account for his Department's submission of a plan for Austin that required extensive busing? Unconvincingly, the Secretary explained that the plan, formally submitted to a Federal court, was in "total and complete agreement" with the President's policy and statements on busing. Someone asked, "Is that correct?" Richardson replied.

How then, Richardson was asked, did he account for his Department's submission of a plan for Austin that required extensive busing? Unconvincingly, the Secretary explained that the plan, formally submitted to a Federal court, was in "total and complete agreement" with the President's policy and statements on busing. Someone asked, "Is that correct?" Richardson replied.
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