

Creeping Reaganism

Signs of a serious presidential bid by California Governor Ronald Reagan are multiplying quickly. Reagan may be the "favorite son" candidate of several western states in addition to California. Moreover, well placed Californians say Reagan will enter presidential primaries in Oregon, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire. A number of Reagan's staff members are said to be running him "all out" for the presidential nomination. The former actor has also received the choice assignment of Republican spokesman at the annual Gridiron Club dinner in Washington, D. C., a role traditionally reserved for "the brightest light in the party," according to press observers. The Harris poll of GOP voters shows him in third place behind Romney and Nixon, a distant third, but still ahead of Rockefeller or Percy.

SIMPLE DOCTRINES Reagan is one of the few politicians on the scene who appears to deal with simple ideological doctrines. His recent controversies have allowed him to play to the hilt the role of tough, lonely conservative. His staffers view these brawls as definite pluses — for, policy details aside, the Governor has received national television exposure which in some weeks has been greater than that of even the President.

Since 1965, the Ripon Society has reminded fellow moderates of the serious threat of what it termed "Creeping Reaganism." Many have laughed at the implausibility of Ripon's argument — much as they laughed at the prospects of a Goldwater candidacy four years ago. But others support the Ripon analysis: The front page headline in a recent Sunday's *Washington Post* tells us, "After Spectacular 7 Weeks — Reagan Credited with Rising Presidential Hopes." These hopes, says *Post* staffer David Broder, "reflect a fact of major significance for national politics."

Reagan has followed his lustrous performance at the Colorado Springs Governors Conference with impressive showings before Lincoln Day audiences. In the crucial state of Oregon he was enthusiastically received at public meeting and at closed door sessions for wealthy and influential king makers.

What impressed Washingtonians most was Reagan's performance at a D.C. fund raising gala in early March. Reagan drew considerably more laughter and applause than Governor Romney, enough so that many spoke of the event as a turning point in their comparative fortunes. Nevertheless, it seemed that the quality of their jokes and the reactions of a largely conservative audience could scarcely be termed a fair test of the two men.

Only two days later House Leader Ford felt compelled to describe Reagan as "qualified" for the Presidency.

BANDWAGON PASSENGERS New passengers on the Reagan bandwagon are said to include Governors Tim Babcock of Montana, Stanley Hathaway of Wyoming, and Don Samuelson of Idaho. Older passengers, it should be remembered, include groups like the American Conservative Union which reports that Reagan has "kept all the doors to 1968 open" and urges him to walk through them.

National Review says that Reagan "would be as strong a candidate as the Republican Party can field." "A GOP inspired by "Liberal" policies is not worth an ounce of conservative support," the publication declares, suggesting that at the very least a large group of Reagan delegates can pull "a man of the center" like Nixon or Rhodes far to the right before consenting to his nomination.

In addition, it is highly probable that southern Nixon delegates, supposedly collected for the former vice president by men like Texas Senator John Tower, would join the western Reagan bloc at the earliest possible opportunity. It is not unthinkable that a convention with more southern delegates than the one which nominated Barry Goldwater, would give its endorsement to the even more charismatic Reagan.

Moderates should not forget how they went hat in hand to Richard Nixon to save them from the Arizonan in 1964. There is a lesson there for any Romney supporters who may hint that they are already prepared to "compromise" on Nixon in 1968.

LESSON FOR CONSERVATIVES And there is another lesson to be learned from 1964, a lesson for those who call themselves conservatives. The reason Goldwater brought the Republican Party to its lowest ebb in history was because his programs, though they appealed to a well organized faction among party stalwarts, were unable to win the confidence of the nation as a whole.

It is a misreading of the election to think that a better manicured man, lacking Goldwater's crusty honesty, can turn the same programs into victory for the Republican Party. Ronald Reagan's presidential ambitions must be taken seriously, not because they are justified by the candidate's own experience or by his vision for America, but because he threatens by the same combination of organizational maneuvering and narrowly based programs to make 1968 another year of disaster and disunity for the Republican Party.

—A. E. I.

FOR THE RECORD: Lesson of the Powell Case

(On March 2, the day after the House voted to unseat Harlem Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, the Ripon Society issued a statement calling for Congressional reform. Only a strong reorganization bill, it argued, would end the crisis of confidence in Congressional procedures that had been heightened by Powell's abuse of power and the Congressional action against him. The full statement is reprinted here.)

The Ripon Society is concerned lest the action of the House in refusing to seat Adam Clayton Powell be construed as a personal vendetta rather than as an assertion of general standards of fair procedure and good conduct. We therefore suggest that it is time to push for basic reforms that will make more general the principles that have been applied to the Harlem Democrat. This is essential if the House is to prove that it was not motivated by particular antipathies toward a particular individual.

There will soon be reported onto the floor of the House an omnibus bill for the reorganization of Congress which will give legislators a chance to institutionalize their standards of individual ethics and to establish safeguards against the abuse of power by committee chairmen and members. The Ripon Society calls upon legislators in both houses of Congress to work for the passage of the strongest possible bill — a bill that will satisfy, among others, the following urgent needs for reform.

POLITICAL NOTES

● Washington State Republicans, who for the first time in fourteen years have majority control of the state House of Representatives, are agitating for long overdue changes in the structure of State government. In an article in *Argus*, an independent magazine serving the Pacific Northwest, new House Majority Leader Slade Gorton proposed bold programs for constitutional reform, regional planning, new approaches to pollution control, revision of property taxation, and increased expenditures on metropolitan transit and education. The Constitutional changes will require Democratic support to receive the required two-thirds majority, which puts the Democrats in a political dilemma: either back Governor Evans and his Republican supporters or get blamed for retarding legislative progress in the booming state of Washington.

● Two Pennsylvanians to watch in coming months are Arlen Specter, the District Attorney of Philadelphia and, at the other end of the state, Mrs. Henry L. (Elsie) Hillman, the recently elected chairman of the Allegheny County Republican Committee. Specter bodes well to become the first Republican mayor of Philadelphia since 1948. He has already won the approval of the Republican organization for the mayoralty primary in May and the race in November. Mrs. Hillman, meanwhile, who is the first woman in Pittsburgh's history to hold the reins of GOP leadership, has been described by local observers as "the best hope progressive Republicans have in Allegheny County."

● When former Congressman Robert Ellsworth of Kansas entered last year's Republican primary against Senator James Pearson, casual observers saw the contest as a moderate challenge to a conservative incumbent. But knowledgeable Kansans said it was not that simple:

1. The establishment of a standing Ethics Committee in both houses with strong powers and independent jurisdiction;

2. The reform of auditing procedures of committee appropriations to guard against the misuse of funds and staff by members of congressional committees;

3. The reform of the seniority system — possibly by election of committee chairmen — to limit the arbitrary powers by which committee chairmen have been able to thwart the will of the majority and the interests of the nation as a whole.

More than the integrity of an individual is on trial here. What is at stake is the esteem with which the entire country holds the procedures and conduct of the members of Congress. Simply to purge one individual from the Congressional system will not end the crisis of confidence. What is needed is fundamental action by the houses of Congress themselves to enact long overdue reforms.

Republicans have taken the lead — both in the research of its Task Force on Congressional Reform during the past two years and in the recent report of the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization — to formulate strong proposals that would subject members to clear legal stands rather than to spasms of congressional indignation.

Now is the time to turn these proposals into law.

Ellsworth, despite his prominence in the House Wednesday Club of GOP liberals, had close ties with conservatives at home, and had always resisted any "moderate" label. Pearson, on the other hand, had good relationships with former Governor Alf Landon and other moderate Kansans.

When Ellsworth declared himself a Nixon for President man last month, many observers were stunned. Some, like columnists Evans and Novak saw the moves as a major Nixon coup, a breakthrough into the heart of the moderate camp. But those who knew Kansas politics said they were not surprised by Ellsworth's decision, nor by the strong support which Senator Pearson continues to give to Governor Romney.

Nixon has, of course, strengthened his forces by adding a man of Ellsworth's abilities. The former Congressman is presently accompanying the former vice president on spring tours of Europe and Asia.

● This month's quote: "As the GOP gained in state after state, an astonishing new fact soon became apparent: that with an appealing national ticket in 1968, Republicans could well make their greatest showing among Negroes since the Reconstruction. . . . It all points to a growing reconciliation between the Republican party and the Negro — the resumption of a courtship that ended abruptly in the upheaval days of the New Deal. . . . Overall however Democrats elected 133 Negroes to state legislatures while Republicans mustered only nine. To the new GOP slogan, 'This is the party with opportunities for Negroes to run for office,' skeptics add, 'And for a Negro who enjoys losing.'" Simeon Booker, "What the GOP Victory Means for the Negro," *Ebony*, February 1967.

Needed: A Republican Idea Corps

The power of ideas has evidently been demonstrated to the satisfaction of professional politicians. It is now accepted that the effective "modern campaign" must have an active research unit, a corps of idea men, and a steady output of white papers on important issues — all testimony to the electorate's sensitivity to the quality of a candidate's proposals. The remarkable fact is that this idea-generating process is not adequately extended beyond the biennial scrap for control of government on every level.

Business, big and small, long ago realized the value of research and development in keeping products in step with changing needs. Many corporations have their own staffs for this purpose, whether for innovation, market analysis or product modernization. In defense planning we now see the development of whole enterprises — RAND Corporation, for example — which produce nothing but the output of their employee's concentrated thought.

What has been missed or ignored in politics is that programs and ideas for democratic change are as much the product of a political party as the automobile is the product of General Motors. If our parties really competed in this field, their very survival would depend upon an ability in the long run to adjust their programs to the changing needs of society. In turn, this would require a sensitivity to solutions at least as strong as the parties' current sensitivity to grievances.

MORE THAN RHETORIC Ideas are not at all scarce in America. Tax-exempt foundations and universities subsidize projects that turn out a flood of material on diverse subjects. To a political party or a candidate, ideas in economics, regional development, government organization, education and the like — expertly researched and prepared — are a priceless commodity. Yet there is no formal agency for gathering these thoughts and translating them into concrete programs. It is simply not enough to gather a group of experts two months before an election to draw up proposals to supplement the usual campaign rhetoric.

What is needed is a relatively small group of political scientists, economists, architects, educators, sociologists and lawyers—which for convenience, we will call an Idea Corps. They would keep a receptive Republican Party abreast of developments in the world of policy-outside-politics, and they could develop on their own the kind of winning issues that are imperative for the Party's future.

IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Having suggested that much, however, we immediately confront difficulties of implementation. The easy solution is to suggest that the GOP invigorate the task forces of the Republican National Coordinating Committee or that it establish a division of policy development at the National Committee level. Although this meets the obvious problem of financing and close contact with the logical body for policy formulation, it jeopardizes at least two other indispensable elements: objectivity and independence.

History suggests that political parties tend to become the captives of their past successes (although one can certainly argue that the Republican Party has shown a tendency to be captured also by its defeats.) The Democrats, for example, discovered more than thirty

years ago that the federal solution was well adapted to the problems of the Depression Era.

Now, however, when the nation's difficulties are of an entirely different order, the party of the New Deal continues to press blindly for the same old conceptions, ill-fitted for the local needs of a complex, pluralistic society. Thus, if an Idea Corps is to have long-term value it must be left free to shift its ground as the needs it perceives intensify or disappear. Too tight control by the National Committee would bring about an unhealthy subservience to a reigning clique.

ADVANTAGES OF INDEPENDENCE Moreover, certain advantages for the National Committee can be seen in an independent arrangement. First, it would allow the Party to take an interest in areas which might compromise current policy if undertaken by an official Republican organ. Similarly, it avoids the possibility of appearing officially to favor one presidential hopeful over another by putting more resources into a study he favors rather than that of his rival.

Second, an independent and objective group — even a nominally independent one — has considerably greater access to information and councils than would be available to a formally partisan organization.

Third, some extremely capable people feel themselves unable to associate publicly with a down-the-line partisan group; their services and talent, on the other hand, would not be denied to a group with a more maverick character, even though its fundamental aim would be policy assistance to the Republican Party.

LOCAL NEEDS Besides, the national party would not be the only client for an Idea Corps. Local candidates daily grapple with issues of purely local magnitude. Their idea sources, moreover, are painfully restricted. Is a candidate in upstate New York able to discover that a California community with a transportation problem similar to his own solved it with a traffic study carried out by a group at Berkeley? At the same time, can it be doubted that his campaign would be helped enormously by proposed application of the California community's solution?

Local candidates, too, should have access to the idea-gathering facilities of the Idea Corps. Once again, however, tight control by the National Committee would restrict the scope of the unit's activities. Support from the Republican Governor's Association and the Republican State Legislators Association would be more appropriate here.

The solution, then, must be a more independent status for the Idea Corps than direct control by the National Committee. It would have to be set apart from official Republican forms but working to assist GOP candidates on all levels.

CONTRACT UNIT This is not so hard to establish as it may seem. The National Committee has frequently contracted with independent groups such as advertising agencies and public relations firms to undertake specific tasks for the Party. It is only a step from this to set up an on-going unit which will keep the GOP informed of new ideas and proposals that are capable of political application. A long-term contract — a five-year obliga-

(turn to page 7)

Tax Sharing: Opportunity for the G O P

In July of 1965 the Ripon Society and the Republican Governors' Association jointly issued a call for unconditional sharing of Federal tax revenues with state and local governments. In the intervening nineteen months revenue sharing has gained substantial support. On January 19 of this year in the Republican State of the Union Message House Minority Leader Gerald Ford made tax sharing an important part of the GOP Legislative Program for the 90th Congress.

Revenue sharing is not an entirely new proposal. Various members of Congress including House Republican Conference Chairman Melvin R. Laird have been interested in this type of approach for several years. The idea first gained widespread attention, however, in 1964 when Walter W. Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, suggested that the growth in Federal tax revenues expected in the late 1960's would make such a plan feasible from an economic standpoint and argued that it could provide the basis for a substantial revitalization of our state and local governments. The proposal attracted much favorable comment in Congress and in the press and was dubbed the Heller Plan. The President rejected it, however, and left the field wide open for the Republicans.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM

Professor Heller's prediction of large Federal revenues in excess of the needs of existing programs has failed to materialize due to the fiscal demands of the Vietnam War, but Heller and most other economists agree that once the Vietnam conflict is terminated the situation he foresaw will indeed confront us. The opportunities offered to the nation and the Republican Party by this development are great. Republicans have the chance to promote what Heller calls "creative federalism," and thus take the initiative on an issue which is of immense importance — helping the beleaguered state and localities meet their responsibilities.

Heller sees the attractiveness of the revenue sharing plan as transcending merely economic considerations. It would be extremely helpful in restoring vitality to local levels of government. As Heller writes in his new book, *New Dimensions of Political Economy*, "There are . . . positive reasons why the states and their subdivisions should have a stronger role. Creative federalism requires diversity and dissent and innovation. Yet these cannot simply come down from on high. They have to well up from below. The danger if they do not is that the central government will grow stronger in authority and weaker in ideas."

GOODELL'S PLAN

Republicans are rapidly making tax sharing a key element in program planning for the 90th Congress and for the 1968 Presidential election campaign. During the 89th Congress Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) took a leading role in promoting the idea. During the current Congress Representative Charles Goodell (R-N.Y.) will push a bill calling for the return of three per cent of the federal income tax receipts to the states and localities. The percentage would gradually be raised to five per cent. Half of the funds would go to the states, forty-five per cent to the localities, and five per cent could be used to improve state executive and managerial functions. Ninety per cent of the funds would be allo-

cated on a per capita basis and the remaining ten per cent would be used to up the allotment of the seventeen poorest states.

The particulars of the Goodell Plan may be subject to some revision but essentially it embodies the approach recommended by the Ripon Society. Support for the plan cuts across the ideological spectrum of the party and the Congress. Representatives Ford and Laird join Goodell in enthusiastically backing revenue sharing.

Despite the Administration's opposition, such a plan has considerable bipartisan support. Both Senators Kennedy have endorsed the concept as has Congressman Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.). Democratic support may melt away, of course, as the plan becomes increasingly identified with the GOP.

OPPOSITION

It should be noted as well that despite widespread enthusiasm for revenue sharing in Republican ranks in Congress there remain important skeptics. Congressman Thomas B. Curtis (R-Mo.), a member of the Joint Economic Committee, expressed strong dissent from the idea in a supplementary statement included in the Minority section of the 1966 Joint Economic Report (see Ripon's interview with him on page 5). Likewise, Congressman John Byrnes of Wisconsin, who is the ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, is less than enthusiastic about revenue sharing. A further obstacle may be the opposition of Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas.

These obstacles aside, revenue sharing remains a highly attractive proposal for Republicans. In rejecting it LBJ seems to have seriously misread public sentiment. A Gallup Poll released at the end of 1966 shows that seventy per cent of the American people favor such a plan while only eighteen per cent oppose it and the remainder are undecided. The GOP has in tax sharing an initiative which is both politically salable and of great merit in helping the nation to solve the problems of our decaying urban centers with their diminishing tax bases and our much maligned states which all too frequently must face rapidly increasing service demands while having a relatively inelastic tax base to rely upon.

—T.E.D.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON TAX POLICY

Break, George F., *Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in the United States* (The Brookings Institution, 1967).

Heller, Walter W., *New Dimensions of Political Economy* (Harvard University Press, 1966).

Netzer, Dick, *Economics of the Property Tax* (The Brookings Institution, 1966).

Pechman, Joseph A., *Federal Tax Policy* (The Brookings Institution, 1966).

The Ripon Society, *Government for Tomorrow: A Proposal for the Unconditional Sharing of Federal Tax Revenues with State and Local Governments*, (Ripon Society, 2nd Printing Nov., 1966).

Curtis on the Property Tax

In an attempt to report all aspects of the debate on Federal-State revenue sharing, Robert D. Behn, Research Director of the Ripon Society's Boston Chapter interviewed Congressman Thomas B. Curtis (R.-Mo.), a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, who believes other methods better serve the purpose of providing adequate revenues to meet local expenditures.

RIPON: Congressman Curtis, we understand that you feel that the plan providing for unconditional rebates of Federal Tax revenues to the states is inappropriate for the solution of states' monetary problems.

CURTIS: Correct. There are three basic fallacies in the Heller plan, as this concept is generally known. 1) That the Federal Government actually has a surplus to return to the states. It does not. 2) That the Federal Government can pass revenues back to the states without guidelines. Some guidelines are essential. 3) That the property tax is worn out; this tax still has the capability of producing the revenue necessary to finance local expenses such as education.

RIPON: Would you please elaborate on these. You state that the Federal Government has no surplus revenues, yet don't income tax revenue increase by \$6 billion each year?

CURTIS: Yes, but Federal expenditures still exceed income. The evidence is quite clear; there are no dividends to declare. Even with the tax cut in 1964, the Federal Income Tax is beyond the point of diminishing returns.

RIPON: With respect to the guidelines, do you believe that the states would make improper use of monies returned without restrictions?

CURTIS: This, I feel, is not the issue; a federal legislator cannot—if he is to be responsible to his own constituency—give funds to the states or any spending authority, without imposing some restrictions to its use. It is essential that we stipulate how the money is to be spent, if only in a general way. Dr. Heller is fully aware that there must be some form of guidelines. The question is how much Federal control, not whether there will be any or not. I believe that Washington should be removed as far as possible from the control of local expenditures as is possible; but it is still we in Congress who hold the basic responsibility for the taxes we collect.

RIPON: We understand that you have made a study of the property tax, and believe that it provides the best method for financing local budgets. Since those who advocate tax-sharing assert that the states have squeezed all the funds available from the property tax, how do you justify your belief in the adequacy of this form of taxation?

CURTIS: When I joined the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1953, I knew, because of the seniority system, that I would be on this Committee for the remainder of my political life. Consequently, I have attempted to become a student in depth in the area of taxation. I have taken a hard look at the property tax, and encouraged others to do so. The Brookings Institute published a book, *Economics of the Property Tax*—partially, I think, as the result of my needling—in which it stated that this was the first comprehensive study on the subject in thirty years. This demonstrates the lack of scholarship on this topic. I have, however, attempted to collect all material pertinent to the property tax, and it appears that it has responded since World War II more effectively than any other form of taxation. From 1950 to 1960, the expenditures by states for education tripled, and it was the property tax which financed this expansion. The Federal Government contributes less than 4% to our governmental educational effort. Nor are real estate taxes exhausted. The expenditures for education have produced new and greater wealth resulting in an increased potential for future revenue.

In fact, I would go so far as to state that the property tax is the finest tax we have on the books, for it actually increases the tax base. The expenditure policies associated with the property tax are directed towards the building

of roads, the improvement of the secondary educational system, and the providing of other local services for the tax district, thus increasing the value of the local real estate. Note that this is in contrast to the Income Tax which actually dampens the tax base since it depresses the economy by removing money from circulation.

RIPON: But doesn't the property tax overburden the homeowner from the lower-middle income bracket, whose entire wealth is invested in his home?

CURTIS: One of the basic misconceptions held by those who have not studied the property tax is that it is regressive. When determining whether a tax is regressive or progressive, we cannot separate the taxation from the expenditure of the funds. The monies collected by the property tax are spent for schools, streets, sewers, police protection, thus making it progressive towards the lower incomes.

Also, in discussing the progressivity of the property tax it is essential to expose another myth—that the real estate tax relates essentially to home ownership. Actually in a properly zoned community, with proper assessments and building codes, only 25% of the taxes will result from homes. The remainder is derived from industry, utilities, and commerce.

RIPON: But this isn't true in many of the suburban communities?

CURTIS: Look at Crestwood, Missouri, a town of 12,000 people in my own Congressional district. At first glance, it looks like a typical St. Louis bedroom community, yet an inspection of the assessment books shows that over 25% of the property tax revenue comes from industry. The town is so well zoned that you don't notice the industry. An economically viable community must consist not only of homes, but industry and commerce as well. Those communities which insist on excluding all business must pay the price of higher property assessments.

RIPON: It appears that you envision a property tax different from that which currently exists in some areas.

CURTIS: There certainly are many improvements to be made in the application of the property tax. Probably the basic area of reform is in the area of assessments and the relation of improvements to raw land. A good real estate tax must be based on honest assessments, realistic zoning laws, and modern building codes. For instance, I am of the school which advocates taxing raw land at a heavier rate than improved property. This provides an incentive for utilizing land to its greatest economic potential, for the owner cannot afford to permit his property to remain unproductive. The consequence of such a policy is an enlargement of the tax base.

Also, re-assessment must occur at sufficiently frequent intervals to insure fair taxation of improvements. The heavy inflation following World War II (from 1946 to 1952 the value of the dollar was halved) damaged the equality of the property tax. Since property is assessed at the time of improvement, real estate improved before this inflation was assessed at the pre-inflation dollar, while equivalent improvements made after the inflation were placed on the books at a much higher tax rate. To prevent a bias against new improvements properties must be re-assessed periodically, though I am aware that this is difficult both mechanically and politically.

RIPON: Could the Federal Government help speed real estate tax reform?

CURTIS: There is one area of property tax reform which the Congress could implement. Presently, the Federal Government pays no local taxes on either its land or installations, while it does benefit from the streets, sewers, police and fire protection which such taxes provide. Repeal of the exemption of federally owned properties from local property taxes would improve federal expenditure policy and discipline federal bureaucrats. Currently the Federal Government buys the prime land in a community, removing it from the local tax rolls, when property off Main Street or outside of town would certainly be adequate. Implementation of this proposal would also provide an incentive for Washington to sell those properties which

(over)

no longer serve a useful function. This is not a revolutionary idea — property formerly owned by the Federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation now pays local taxes — but it would provide approximately \$1 billion per year to local communities.

RIPON: Are there any methods of reform that can be implemented at the state level?

CURTIS: Yes, equalization of revenue income throughout the state is necessary to insure funds that adequately provide local services in areas of low wealth. In fact, in St. Louis county itself, equalization laws are needed. Some states have adopted a sales tax as a method for equalizing local income within a state, for though there may be inequalities in wealth, education and other services are important to the whole.

RIPON: To return to the tax-sharing proposal, if there is need to equalize tax income within a state, isn't this also necessary at the national level?

CURTIS: This common argument for the federal rebates is based on the assumption that we have some poor states. In reality this is not true, for the per capita income is not an appropriate measure of the wealth of a state. Admittedly this statistic is low for Alabama and Mississippi, but one should remember that at the local level the tax base is not income but wealth. I know of no poor

states, with the possible exception of Alaska. Those states in the south which are commonly termed poor, are the ones with undeveloped and unenforced property taxes, with a considerable amount of absentee ownership, and with assessments on real estate which hardly match the true value of the land. These same states are further crippling themselves by waiving property taxes for a period of years to entice businesses to locate within their borders. The motivation behind this is — I believe — that having the payrolls will provide these states with a better tax base than one based on property wealth. Surely, this is regressive thinking for the 20th century.

Let me conclude by observing that we hear a great deal about the need for land reform in underdeveloped countries abroad — and I could not agree more — but how many people associate sound government fiscal policy based upon sound real estate taxation as being the foundation upon which any meaningful land reform must be based — that indeed developing a sound real estate tax is land reform itself and the most important and basic of any land reform?

RIPON: That is an important and thought-provoking question with which to leave us. Thank you for giving us your views on the property tax, which we find of intrinsic interest, regardless of one's views on tax sharing.

OUR READERS WRITE

NEGRO ARMY?

Gentlemen:

The NAACP Youth and College Division, at the direction of the Association's 57th Annual Convention, has been examining possible alternatives to the selective service system, with its inherent and actual inequities and injustices to minority group citizens. Although no formal policy statement has been made, one alternative which I believe appeals to most NAACP youth leaders is a volunteer army, such as I see you have already proposed in your December, 1966, issue.

However, unless affirmative measures are incorporated into the design of this volunteer army, it seems more than likely that it will become a predominantly black army.

Your report notes this possibility, but I believe you discount it much too quickly. It may very well be claimed that an individual's personal motivation for volunteering need not be the concern of the Federal Government; but when the critical factors which are the basis for enlistment go beyond the individual into the society, and when individuals volunteer for military service because of the poor social and economic conditions to which they are subjected due to group membership, then it becomes incumbent upon the society to control the influence of these factors as well as to undertake to change them. Simply put, a black volunteer army would be intolerable to the NAACP.

There are, however, three steps which could be taken to prevent the black army and save the goal of voluntary service which both Ripon and the NAACP find highly desirable.

The first of these steps would be to link the creation of the volunteer army to the massive extension of voluntary national service programs which would structure young Americans' desire to improve their country by direct social action. Such programs should have as one major aim the elimination of the ghetto and impoverished conditions which would make such a disproportionately high percentage of Negroes volunteer for military service.

Second, as your report suggests, many support positions currently regarded as military could be redefined as civilian functions. This would not only decrease the size of the army, but it would also open a tremendous number of jobs to the civilian population, something that would be advantageous to minority group citizens.

Thirdly, the military machinery itself should develop programs to insure an integrated armed force. One simple measure that could easily be instituted would be extra recruitment efforts in predominantly white areas of the country.

If proposals for a volunteer army would incorporate these three steps, then I believe the 60,000 members of the NAACP Youth and College Division could join the Ripon Society in calling for its creation.

MARK ROSENMAN, Director
Youth and College Division, NAACP
New York, N. Y.

CONGRESSMAN HALL'S INITIATIVE

Gentlemen:

I have just noted your article in the February issue entitled "The Rights of the Mentally Ill."

It's an excellent article, but just about three years late. The undersigned introduced legislation in the field three years ago, and has resubmitted Bills in subsequent Congresses, the 90th included.

Incidentally, the only Federal agency to submit a Report on my Bill in the last session of Congress, the Judicial Conference of the U.S., recommended passage of the Bill.

DURWARD G. HALL, M.C.
(Republican, Missouri)

(ED. NOTE: Congressman Hall's bill, listed as H.R. 785 in the 89th Congress, proposes amendments to the United States Code to protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill in commitment proceedings. Many of the pioneering proposals of Congressman Hall (who is a qualified physician) anticipate the Ripon article by Messrs. Petri and Smith, though their focus is on state rather than Federal measures.)

RIGHTS OF THE RETARDED

Gentlemen:

The Ripon report on "The Rights of the Mentally Ill" (FORUM, February 1967) was excellent. I only wish you had added to it the cognate and almost equally serious (although not as well documented) problem of the commitment of the high-grade mentally retarded.

Individually, a number of cases quite as shocking as the "Perroni" case can be cited in treatment of the retarded in Massachusetts, Maine, Delaware, Maryland (and Saskatchewan) from my own contacts; and I suspect the whole picture is nearly as bad, maybe even worse for states which commit "defective delinquents."

DR. LEWIS A. DEXTER
Belmont, Mass.

(Dr. Dexter is the author of *Tyranny of Schooling: An Inquiry into the Problems of 'Stupidity'*, Basic Books, 1964)

Training for Leadership ?

Five hundred Young Republicans from forty-seven states flocked to Washington February 15-19 for an ambitious "Young Republican National Leadership Training School." The four-day program, in the words of the invitation sent out to YR's across the country, was designed to "provide you with the necessary tools needed in order to be an effective, professional leader and organizer for our Party."

To its credit, the program was completed without the storms of fury that have often characterized past YR affairs and have produced more bad publicity than good works. Beyond this, however, it is difficult to say that the Leadership Training School accomplished much in the way of training future party leaders.

SKIRMISHES With the Young Republican National Federation Convention in Omaha scheduled for June, the Leadership Training School became the site of preliminary skirmishes in the battle for the Chairmanship of the Federation. The current Treasurer, Jack McDonald of Nashville, Tennessee, had his troops out in force boosting him for the top job. Fulton Lewis III in a newsletter dated December 7th, 1966, indicated that McDonald, "a staunch conservative," had been selected by the present YR leadership in a caucus in Denver as its choice to succeed Tom Van Sickle.

But a second candidate also emerged at the School. James Betts, the current Young Republican National Committeeman from Ohio, was busy seeking support among the state leaders present. Betts noted his concern over the question of whether the Young Republican National Federation would "continue to be the vehicle through which the Republican Party seeks to enroll the youth of this country" and argued that it "is time for all of us to join together in building the Young Republican movement into a respected and integral part of the Republican Party." MacDonald, on the other hand, is said to favor an independent role for the YR's, which would include severing its financial ties to the National Committee.

SPEAKERS While the time devoted to politicking at the LTS probably took up the largest number of hours, listening to the numerous speakers ranked a close second. In four days the delegates heard from fourteen major speakers including three Senators (Baker, Tennessee; Dominick, Colorado; and Tower, Texas), six Congressmen (Ford, Michigan; Ashbrook, Ohio; Goodell, New York; Whalen, Ohio; Lukens, Ohio; and Laird, Wisconsin), as well as Gov. Shafer of Pennsylvania, Bo Callaway of Georgia, Ray Bliss, Barry Goldwater, and Curtis LeMay.

The scheduling of these speakers was revealing. The few liberals and moderates were bunched together on the Wednesday morning program. This left the featured lunch and evening slots almost exclusively to the conservatives: Lukens at Thursday lunch, Callaway on Thursday evening, Tower at Friday lunch, Goldwater on Friday evening, Shafer (the lone exception) at Saturday lunch, and LeMay on Saturday evening. Thus, the delegates were treated to repeated calls for achieving victory in Viet Nam by escalating the war even if it became necessary "to destroy every work of man in North Viet Nam" (LeMay).

TRAINING Amidst all the speechifying, politicking, and party-going there was scant time for the actual business at hand: training in practical politics. Three major training devices were used: 1) an Idea Fair, a general exhibit which presented ideas on everything from organization to fundraising from clubs all across the nation; 2) a seminar program — eleven panel discussions covering such subjects as publicity, finance, precinct organization, and computers in politics; 3) lectures to all the delegates on certain facets of leadership and the use of ideas.

Participants from Texas, Ohio, Tennessee and elsewhere complained that not enough time was devoted to seminars and lectures. The average time in class over the four day period was only three hours per day.

A second complaint was that the quality of the seminars was not consistent. Though the seminar on the use of computers in politics was very worthwhile, others were platitudinous, or worse. At a seminar on the "Value and Use of Non-Partisan Political Organization in Partisan Politics," for example, General Lane of the Americans for Constitutional Action spent ten minutes attacking the Republican Party for its "failure to preserve the constitutional principles on which this nation was founded." This was followed by a dull recitation of the material available from the Chamber of Commerce and a sales pitch for the National Right to Work Committee. Result: one wasted hour for most concerned.

GLUT OF RHETORIC The Leadership Training School could be made more effective fairly easily. The organizers need only cut the glut of rhetoric, make a stronger and better planned effort to obtain speakers of all factions within the party, and increase the amount of time spent in the classroom. Greater selectivity, greater breadth of representation and greater emphasis on high-quality classes and seminars could turn the Leadership Training School into an institution worthy of its name. —W.R.

Idea Corps (continued from page 3) tion, for example — would insulate the Idea Corps from the vicissitudes of intraparty squabbling.

The financial obstacles to such a project are not insuperable. It is estimated that several millions of dollars will be made available to the two parties as a result of the new "presidential campaign contributions tax check-off" under consideration by Congress. It would be a crime if all this money were spent on over-priced singing television commercials, when a small percentage of it would suffice to set up a research organization of permanent value to American political debate.

The great illness of the Republican Party is not, and has not been, a chronic lack of organizational strength. Rather it is that the GOP with slogans, cliches, and outworn dogmas, has cut itself off from the mainstream of American political thought. An Ideas Corps for the Republican Party is only a part of the remedy required, but it is a very important part.

—PETER J. WALLISON

MR. WALLISON, a former editor of the *Ripon FORUM*, is now associated with a New York law firm.

P.O. BOX 138: Speakers Galore

NEW HAVEN

The Connecticut Ripon organization used February for an intensive series of meetings with Republican officeholders. On February 10 it met with Congressman Sherman Lloyd of Utah. On the 13th it hosted Governor John Love of Colorado, Chairman of the Republican Governors Association. The next day Robert F. Ellsworth, former Congressman from Kansas, met with the Chapter. On the 16th Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper discussed foreign policy on a panel with Bradford Westfield, Professor of International Relations at Yale. Cooper's verdict on a cessation of bombing over North Vietnam: "It's worth risking a halt."

On the 20th the New Haven Chapter and the Yale Young Republicans co-sponsored a panel discussion of the national economic outlook with economists James Tobin (Yale), Joseph Pechman (Yale) and Charles Whalen (Ohio Congressman) as participants. The next day the group spent a delightful hour with Senator Howard Baker, Jr., of Tennessee.

There will be more visitors in March, notably Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York at a fund-raising meeting on the 9th and Attorney General Elliot Richardson of Massachusetts, who will participate in a panel discussion of local government with Connecticut Senate Minority Leader Frederick Pope and Wesleyan University's Richard Goodwin.

NEW YORK

The Ripon Society is now incorporated in New York State as a membership corporation. Acting Chairman John R. Price announced early in February that election of officers would soon be held. In the interim Ripon's Wall Street contingent has conducted an active research and fund-raising program. A February 15 program at the Chemists' Club featured the State Constitutional Convention. Participants included Roswell B. Perkins, Chairman of the New York City Bar Association

Committee on the Convention, and Robert MacCrete, Chairman of the State Bar Association Committee on the Convention. Donald Christ of Sullivan & Cromwell moderated the discussion. The group has scheduled a March meeting with Gerard Piel, publisher of *Scientific American*. Research director J. Eugene Marans informed the National Governing Board that work on New York's project on "Ombudsmen — Government Service Centers" is nearing completion. The group will meet in New York with Governor Romney's staff.

BOSTON

Boston members spent the evening of February 16 with George Lodge, formerly of the U. S. State Department, unsuccessful candidate for the U. S. Senate (Mass.) in 1960, presently a member of the faculty of the Harvard Business School (and, of course, son of the Ambassador). Mr. Lodge stressed the need for Republicans to articulate "doctrine" in formulating national purpose.

The Boston chapter will meet in ensuing weeks with Mayor John Lindsay, Governor George Romney, Senator Mark Hatfield, and Representative Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (Md.). Elections will be held on March 16th.

CALIFORNIA

The Southern California Chapter has nearly completed a study of the 1966 election in the state. It has also designated Maggie Nichols as FORUM correspondent for the Chapter.

FORUM

Paid subscriptions to the FORUM rose eleven per cent between the mailings of the January and February, an unusually high monthly rise. During the period same month, nearly two hundred college newspaper editors who had been sent copies of the December, 1966, issue asked to be put on the FORUM press list, which gives the FORUM a new press outlet for the communication of its ideas. —W.S.P.

BOOKSHELF: The Obsolete Draft

If the recommendations of Simon and Schuster's recently-published book, *The Wrong Man in Uniform: Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft and How We Can Replace It*, seem familiar to FORUM readers, there is a good reason. The author, Ripon member Bruce K. Chapman, lent his findings to the Society during the preparation of its position paper (see "Politics and Conscriptio: A Ripon Proposal to Replace the Draft," December 1966, FORUM).

In his new book, Chapman (co-author of *The Party That Lost Its Head*, Knopf, 1966) details the deficiencies of the current draft system and outlines a method for its abolition. He tells why the proposed alternatives of a lottery, universal military service, or "national" service, are no better and probably worse than selective service. He argues, convincingly we think, the ethics, economics, and effectiveness of a volunteer military.

One can hardly review the figures and testimonies Chapman marshalls for his critique of military manpower procurement systems. But as *The New York Times Review* (Sunday, January 29) stated, Chapman "raises many troubling questions that demand answers from the National Advisory Committee on Selective

Service. . . . As the author asserts, the draft is a serious threat to the liberty and lives of young men. The burden of proof should rest with its defenders. . . . The book shows that previous studies of the subject have been shoddy and cost-estimates inconclusive." —T.A.B.

THE RIPON SOCIETY is a Republican research and policy organization composed of young members of the business, professional and academic communities. The Society seeks to rally the energies and talents of thinking young people to the cause of constructive Republicanism. It strives to generate creative discussion which will produce a bold and persuasive Republican policy posture.

Forum only: \$5 (\$3 for students)
Subscriber: \$10 annual contribution.
Contributor: \$25 or more annually.
Sustainer: \$100 or more annually.
Founder: \$1000 or more annually.

All members will receive the Forum, Ripon books and frequent research papers. Won't you forward your subscription today?

THE RIPON SOCIETY

P.O. Box 138, Cambridge, Mass. 02138
(Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Josiah Lee Auspitz, editor, Ripon FORUM.)