

RIPON FORUM

With Senators
MARLOW COOK
and
CHARLES GOODELL

AUGUST, 1969

VOL. V, No. 8

ONE DOLLAR



Goodell: Will they love him in Gotham as they did in Chatauqua?

By Charles O. Ingraham



A Month in the Life – A Statehouse Diary

By Rep. Martin F. Linsky

**Plus Election Situationers in New Haven,
Wyoming, Idaho, and Atlanta**

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL —3

CITIES AND STATES

A compendium of reports from our state correspondents. In **New Haven**, **Richard Zimmer** details the efforts being mounted by young Yale admissions officer **Paul Capra**, to gain control of city hall after 16 years of bulldozer government under Mayor Richard Lee. —4

In **Wyoming**, the times they are a-changin' as the traditional mineral-railroad-stockfarming oligarchy crumbles. Correspondent **Jack Fairweather** details the process and the emerging GOP moderate coalition that stands to inherit that part of the earth with a little bit of luck. —5

Rightwing **Idaho** Governor **Don Samuelson** will face strong liberal opposition from moderate **Elton "Dick" Smith** in next summer's primary, according to our special correspondent, who describes the preliminary salvos and the probable strategies of the battle to come. —14

Meanwhile, in **Atlanta**, a very important contest is being waged for the seat being vacated by enlightened **Ivan Allen**. The man who would best fill the shoes is GOP progressive **Rodney Cook**. **Henry H. Perritt, Jr.**, an assistant campaign manager for Cook, describes the campaign and the current odds. —16

STATEHOUSE DIARY

State Representative and FORUM contributor **Marty Linsky** at our request kept a diary of his hectic schedule

for a month as an experiment on what a state legislator does all day. He now publishes the result of that survey, along with some revealing glimpses into the tribulations and rewards of that branch of public service. —7

PROFILE

One of the big surprises of the past year has been the performance of **Senator Charles Goodell**, who appeared to bring a set of decidedly conservative credentials to the New York Senate seat Governor Nelson Rockefeller appointed him to. Correspondent **Charles O. Ingraham** profiles the new senator everyone underestimates and describes his sometimes lonely political fight. —9

LETTERS —19

14a ELIOT STREET —19

GUEST EDITORIALS

This month, **Senator Charles E. Goodell** of New York replies to the FORUM's appraisal of VISTA. —20

And **Marlow W. Cook** of Kentucky reveals how one United States senator felt the night after the ABM vote. —20

RIPON CHAPTER PAPER

The Ripon Society of Philadelphia has taken a look at the housing crisis in its own city and has come up with an imaginative solution to the problem of getting market forces to bear on solving the housing crisis. —centerfold

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 Cambridge, Massachusetts, chapters in ten cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of sub-chapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications and contract work. The Society offers the following options for annual contribution: Contributor \$25 or more; Sustainer \$100 or more; Founder \$1000 or more. Inquiries about membership and chapter organization should be addressed to the National Executive Director.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BOARD

Officers

- *Peter J. Wallison, Chairman of the Board
- *Christopher T. Bayley, Chairman of the Executive Committee
- *Howard F. Gillette, Jr., Vice President
- *Robert L. Beal, Treasurer
- *Frank E. Samuel, Jr., Secretary

Cambridge

- *Terry A. Barnatt
- Howard L. Reiter
- Sam Sherer

Chicago

- *George H. Walker
- John A. Bross, Jr.
- Benjamin C. Duster

Dallas

- *Neil D. Anderson
- Howard L. Abramson
- Robert A. Wilson

Hartford

- *Nicholas Norton
- Alvin Dozeman
- William S. Glazier II

Los Angeles

- *Melvin H. Bernstein
- Edward H. McAniff
- Richard J. Werd, Jr.

New Haven

- *William E. Craig
- Paul C. Capra
- William H. Jeffress, Jr.

Ex-Officio At Large

- Robert D. Behn, Research Director
- Michael F. Brewer, Political Director
- Bruce K. Chapman, National Director
- Clair W. Rodgers, Jr., Executive Director
- A. Douglas Matthews, Editor of the Ripon FORUM
- * National Executive Committee member
- ** Past President or Chairman of the Board

New York

- *J. Eugene Marens
- Robert L. Musser
- Judah C. Sommar

Philadelphia

- Richard R. Block
- Paul Niebenck
- Roger Whittlesey

Seattle

- *Thomas A. Alberg
- Camden Hall
- William Rodgers

Washington

- *Patricia A. Goldman
- Stephen E. Herbits
- Linda K. Lee

At Large

- Christopher W. Beal
- Richard E. Beeman
- Thomas A. Brown
- Richard M. Conley
- Carter G. Ford
- Emil H. Frankel
- *Lee W. Huebner
- Phillip C. Johnson
- William J. Kilberg
- Robert C. Kirkwood, Jr.
- Mertin A. Linsky
- W. Stuart Parsons
- Thomas E. Petri
- **John R. Price, Jr.
- **John S. Saloma III

THE RIPON INTELLIGENCE UNIT provides political research on a contract basis to Republican office-holders and candidates and to non-partisan community leaders. All inquiries are kept strictly confidential. Write the National Research Director.

THE RIPON FORUM is published monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Second class postage rates paid at Boston, Massachusetts. Contents are copyrighted © 1969 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the Editor is welcomed.

In publishing this magazine 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 Republican 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 \$10 a year, \$5 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$10 extra. Advertising rates on request.

Editor: A. Douglas Matthews

Associate Editor: Evelyn Ellis

Assistant Editors: Janet Beal, Nancy G. Kelm, Suzanne van den Wymelenberg

Technical Editor: Janet Beal

Contributors: Christopher W. Beal, Duncan K. Foley, Robert W. Gordon, Peter Iseman, Philip C. Johnson, John McClaughry, William D. Pheian, Jr., Howard L. Reiter, Paul Szep, Andrew T. Weil.

Correspondents

- Mrs. Barbara Mooney, Connecticut
- Maggie Nichols, California
- Alex M. Helmeyer, N. California
- Mrs. Anne C. Johns, Delaware
- James F. McCollum, Jr., Florida
- Cullen Hammond, Georgia
- Michael McCrery, Idaho
- Blaine Edwards, Idaho
- J. Kenneth Doka, Indiana
- Burton Southard, Indiana
- Terrence Dwyer, Iowa
- Gary Scott Nunley, Kansas
- William A. Merrill, Massachusetts
- Don Fowler, Maine
- Richard Ober, Jr., Maryland
- Terrence Dwyer, Michigan

- Douglas C. Watson, Minnesota
- James L. Robertson, Mississippi
- John Evans, Missouri
- Arthur F. McClure, II, Missouri
- William Harding, Nebraska
- Charles O. Ingraham, New York
- William K. Woods, Ohio
- Eric R. Blackledge, Oregon
- Donato Andre D'Andrea Rhode Island
- Bruce M. Selya, Rhode Island
- William H. Linder, South Carolina
- Stanford M. Adelstein, South Dakota
- T. William Porter, Texas
- Robert R. Murdoch, Virginia
- W. Stuart Parsons, Wisconsin
- John R. Lazarek, Southern States

EDITORIAL

Cocktail waitresses get asked, "What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this?" Members of the Ripon Society are asked, "Why are you a Republican?" The most frequent sources of this latter inquiry are liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans. Recently, a reviewer of the Ripon election analysis, *The Lessons of Victory*, after admitting his Democratic leanings, excused a generally favorable review of the book by saying ". . . there seems no obvious reason why these bright young aspirants to the political life should be Republican at all."

Well, the President provided a partial reason to the question in his speech to the nation on Friday, August 8, 1969. In that speech the President accepted two principles of government for the 70's that the Ripon Society has advocated almost from its founding. The first of these was the negative income tax, a feasible plan for which was published in the FORUM in April, 1967. The President, of course, did not call his program a negative income tax; in fact, rumors are that the program was leaked to the *Washington Post* a day in advance of the speech to prevent that paper from calling it such, as it had been doing for a week. But whatever the labels applied to placate more conservative members of Congress and the administration, the fact remains that the program contains the two essential elements of a negative income tax — a Federal poverty floor and incentives in the form of increased income for those on welfare who work.

The second of these principles was that of revenue sharing among the states. In July, 1965, the Ripon Society and the Republican Governors' Conference jointly proposed such a program in order to strengthen local responsibility, begin to deal with the fiscal crisis of state and local government, and make available to those governmental entities a portion of the tax most tied to an expanding economy, the Federal income tax.

The first acceptance of these principles was made by a Republican administration, not the Democrats. More important, it is probably true that only

a Republican administration could have broken this ground. Lacking the free-spending image of the Great Society, the Nixon administration stands a better chance of convincing the Congress and the public that welfare reform must be begun now and of selling a Federal floor program. Certainly, tax sharing could not have been accepted by a Democratic administration wedded to an organized labor leadership fearful of seeing power flow from Congress, where it has great influence, to state legislatures, where it exerts far less influence. In the face of the inability of the Democrats to move in these areas, during the last eight years, Hubert Humphrey's characterization of the President's program as "nothing new, nothing startling," is more than uncalled for. It smacks suspiciously of sour grapes.

None of this is to say that the President's program is perfect. The feature requiring mothers to work is on the face of it pretty odious. Already Nelson Rockefeller has complained that the formulas worked out short-change the industrial states. Also, there is substantial ambiguity at this stage about the program's administration and some aspects of its financing. However, these questions will be fought out in Congress, which will also decide the ultimate level at which the program will be funded. But whatever the outcome, that fact remains that a Republican administration has proposed new programs representing desperately needed departures for dealing with the fiscal crises of our state and local governments and that these are solutions that Democratic administrations would not, or could not, accept.

All this demonstrates once again that American political parties are not social clubs populated by people of identical backgrounds and views. They are broad-based and complex coalitions whose particular constituencies allow them to respond to some problems and prevent them from responding to others. Ripon members believe the Republican Party to be more responsive on a number of great issues. The President's initiatives should do much to persuade those in search of a party with constructive answers to the American crisis of the same thing.

NEW HAVEN: GOP moderates unite behind Capra to wrest mayoralty after 16 years of Lee

"If New Haven is a model city, God help urban America," Mayor Richard Lee used to say in mock deprecation. But Lee's lament, coined by a man secure in his political base and unchallenged as an urban trail-blazer, has an entirely different ring this season as he prepares to leave City Hall after 16 years as Mayor to prepare for a last try for his long-sought goal of state-wide elective office.

Notwithstanding the unanimous adulation of the national press, Lee (an ex-public relations man) leaves New Haven severe problems, many exacerbated by his own widely-emulated urban policies. His skyline-making urban renewal and highway building have leveled over 4,000 more units of housing than have been built to replace them; school construction has been emphasized while educational standards have deteriorated from neglect; the city's flashy anti-poverty agency is condemned by all elements of the community for being top-heavy, inefficient and unresponsive.

But Lee's most damaging political legacy to New Haven — a legacy dramatically illustrated by his withdrawal from city politics — is his failure to use his tremendous political popularity to nourish political institutions and political leaders capable of uniting a diverse and volatile city as it faces the stresses of the 1970's.

APRES HIM THE DELUGE

No sooner had Lee announced his decision not to run for reelection than the political structure of New Haven shattered in a political implosion that resulted in a six-man race for the Democratic mayoralty nomination. New Haven's all-powerful Democratic Party was split not just into its ethnic and ideological components but into bitterly competing factions within those components themselves. John Daniels, a 33-year-old black who inherited the backing of Lee's *apparat*, was publicly labeled a Tom by backers of Henry Parker, the candidate of the city's broadly-based Black Coalition and the remnants of the McCarthy reform movement. An Italian-American club run by Democratic Town Chairman Arthur Barbieri was the scene of a fistfight between supporters of the mayoralty ambitions of State Sen. John DiRienzo and backers of Aldermanic President Bartholomew Guida (including Barbieri himself).

With the party so badly split, the nomination of the August 2 Democratic convention was assured for Bart Guida, a stolid, colorless, 22-year veteran of

the board of aldermen and the choice of the conservative Democratic machine that Lee had consistently chosen to bypass rather than reform. But Guida's candidacy is simply unacceptable to many elements of Lee's coalition, who promise to take their fight to the September 25 primary and perhaps to the general election itself.

The Democrats may have been hurt by Lee's withdrawal, but the Republicans have been virtually eradicated by his incumbency. Since 1963 the GOP has failed to elect even one out of the city's 30 aldermen. Once a closely-balanced two-party town, (Lee lost his first two mayoralty bids to a Republican) New Haven now has more than four registered Democrats to every Republican.

Yet, oddly enough, the battered GOP has presented New Haven with the candidate best able to reunite the broad coalition that gave Lee his big electoral victories. That candidate is Paul Capra, a 30-year-old admissions officer at Yale.

CAREFUL GROUNDWORK

By shrewdly corraling the support of all the major figures in the New Haven GOP before Lee's withdrawal, Capra managed to avert the type of scramble for the nomination that has maimed the Democrats. Capra was without much of a track record in City politics: a creditable but losing 1966 state Assembly race in a safe Democratic district, authorship of a sound, imaginative but virtually unnoticed platform for the 1967 GOP municipal campaign, and management of New Haven's state legislative races in 1968, a year when the Nixon-Agnew-May ticket dragged every Republican legislative candidate in Connecticut's four largest cities to defeat.

But Capra had paid his dues and had relatively little trouble securing the dubious honor of challenging Lee. Strongly advocating de-emphasis of commercial redevelopment and highway building and an increased commitment to adequate housing, education and neighborhood self-determination, Capra drew shrieks of a "New Left" takeover of the New Haven GOP from his opponents within the party, but gained scant public notice even after Lee's withdrawal. All the action is with the Democrats. But the action is following a familiar scenario, the scenario of Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York City. The race issue is polarizing the party. Even if the blacks (a quarter of the population but an eighth of the vote) plus the liberals

have the numbers and the unity to prevail in a primary, they can't hold their fellow Democrats or the independents in the general election.

But Capra could conceivably put the pieces back together again. Italian, but an articulate proponent of black self-determination, Republican but liberal, Yale-affiliated but opposed to Yale's frequently self-centered civic attitude, Capra could construct the kind of coalition that can effectively govern the city. After the bitter bombast of the coming Democratic primary, his soft-spoken, genuinely concerned approach — he was once an assistant university chaplain — might be a welcome balm to many Democrats and independents.

Capra's biggest problem, however, is the built-in credibility gap borne by every New Haven Republican. The voters have come to expect the GOP mayoralty campaign to be a cheaply-produced ritualistic sacrifice, with carping negativism as its only discernible theme.

It will take lots of money for his young, unpartisan staff to convince the electorate that this campaign is for real. But local money will be hard to get before the late-September primary and hard to spend effectively if raised afterwards.

DEJA VU

There are other problems, of course. Capra is the youngest candidate ever to run for mayor and he bears the stigma of Yale in a city renowned for its tempestuous town-gown relationships. A riot this summer in the ghetto or this fall on the campus might shatter any hope of municipal reconciliation. Capra must still be rated a clear underdog. But there are some people in New Haven who remember another tyro politician, scarcely past thirty, burdened with his Yale affiliation, who decided to challenge the entrenched machine of the opposition party. His name was Richard Lee. —RICHARD A. ZIMMER

WYOMING: As feudalism crumbles, a progressive broad-based Republicanism emerges

Politics in Wyoming, while dominated by the GOP, has been traditionally more compatible with the conservatism of the southern Democrats than with Eastern and big city Republicanism.

But this is changing. In a state in which, until this decade, an economic-political trilogy comprised of the Union Pacific Railroad, the mineral industry and organizations representing Wyoming stockgrowers and sheepman ruled the political system, there is now talk of developing the state's vast store of natural resources and thousands of miles of potential recreation areas in a manner that will benefit Wyomingites. Through economic necessity and the emerging concept of state government involvement in industrial and social development, new Republican leaders in Wyoming now face squarely the inevitable population growth and the problems to come with new people and new industry.

ROSTOVIAN STAGE

Governor Stan Hathaway, an unassuming, pragmatic moderate says, "Wyoming is standing on the brink of unprecedented growth." The Wyoming Chief Executive, a former county and state party chairman, and a group of young, progressive administrators and staff personnel have shown a readiness to involve themselves with people in every segment of the state's society and economy.

Not until this year's biennial session of the Wyoming legislature was it obvious that economic necessity and a new public awareness of state level problems were beginning to overcome obstacles created by geographic location, a sparse, widely scattered population and economic and political tradition.

Hathaway has undertaken an energetic but cautiously paced program of state government re-organization aimed at ending a system wherein maximum duplication of effort and spending was matched by minimum productivity and public service.

Both Houses of the legislature were Republican-controlled and Gov. Hathaway's embryonic streamlining project should have had clear sailing. However, his program for state government re-organization, labor legislation enacting a long over-due Industrial Health and Safety law, his recommendation for a bill to insure restoring of the natural surface after mining activity, and his call for an educational television system were among recommendations which faced determined opposition from a powerful bloc of rural-conservative Republican State Senators and Representatives. Through the actions of these interests in the Joint Ways and Means Committee and in the two Houses, ETV and a great deal of labor legislation was defeated.

Reorganization, Industrial Health and Safety, and a 1% tax on the state's mineral industry were approved only by the careful planning and dedication of a number of new, moderate young Republican legislators — plus public pressure.

From territorial days, development of Wyoming's natural resources was accomplished in direct proportion to the amount of time, effort and money expended by private industry; the expenditures ruled in turn by the potential for profit in any specific undertaking.

Though the UP railroad brought fast transportation to the West and laid track from Wyoming's

KICK THE SECOND CLASS MAIL BAG!

Give Your FORUM a First Class Ride*

We need willing, informed, and productive correspondents to keep an eye on the GOP in the following states:

Alabama
Arkansas
Hawaii
Delaware
Illinois
Louisiana
Mississippi
Montana
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Mexico
Tennessee
Texas (Austin, Houston)
Utah
Vermont
West Virginia
Wisconsin

*(You will be rewarded by getting your FORUM by first class mail days before anyone on your block — yea even your state. Other status considerations include the admiration of your peers, press credentials, and journalistic patronage.)

For more information, write to Evelyn Ellis, Associate Editor, 14a Eliot Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

capitol city of Cheyenne in the extreme southeast corner of the state to Evanston, 400 miles away on the southwestern border, it tied up millions of dollars in minerals along its right of way.

Later the petroleum industry, followed by producers of uranium and other minerals, found their niche in the power structure where the stockgrowers and sheepmen were already firmly ensconced.

Until the 1962 election of rancher Cliff Hansen (now Wyoming's Republican U.S. Senator) and, in 1966, attorney Stan Hathaway, the state's elected officials, regardless of party affiliations, evidenced a bland "sameness" in attitudes toward fiscal matters, the federal government, social and education needs — and hail-fellow camaraderie with lobbyists protecting the interests of the ruling trilogy.

An objective observer viewing gatherings of GOP chieftains from around the state and the omnipresent routine of oilmen, mineral producers, cattlemen and woolgrowers could not help but give some credence to periodic charges that Wyoming's Republican party was, boiled down to the nitty-gritty, a commercial undertaking. Privately, moderate and liberal Republicans began to pay grudging heed to a few outspoken critics' claims that the UP and the mineral industry, with the tacit cooperation of the stockmen and woolmen, had created a fiefdom out of Wyoming.

HATHAWAY AND 208

Political observers generally agree that the decline of the ruling trilogy and its allies as an all-powerful political force began with Hathaway's 1966 primary election victory over millionaire rancher-businessman M. Joseph Burke and continued with the passage of House Bill 208.

A vicious, lobbying battle in the 1967 session of the State Legislature between UP supporters and Allied Chemical Company over House Bill 208 served to focus public attention squarely on the question of whether what was good for the "establishment" was necessarily beneficial to Wyoming and its citizens. The bill allowed mineral producers to pass over or under land owned by another company in order to carry out exploration or production activity. The legislation's target was land owned by the Union Pacific Railroad . . . land through which Allied Chemical had to pass to develop rich deposits of uranium and other minerals along the UP right of way. The state's press and the public won the battle for the chemical company. After a good deal of pressure from pro-UP forces, Hathaway, who early in the controversy stated he would abide by the wishes of the legislature, signed the bill into law.

An additional blow was dealt the establishment in this year's legislative session with passage of the 1% severance tax on minerals, the Industrial Health and Safety Law, a measure requiring restoration of the

Please turn to Page 13

Higoodtaseeyahowsitgoin? or What I Do All Day

By Rep. Martin F. Linsky

You know you have entered the hallowed halls of the Great and General Court of Massachusetts (as the Bay State Legislature is formally called) when you hear some version of the above repartee cascading steadily through the Boston State House corridors, providing a verbal cushion above which more substantive conversation must rise in order to be heard. For a "Rep" in Massachusetts, hardly an hour passes without an instance or more of this convivial tribal exchange which identifies you as a superficial blood brother and enables you to disregard — for the purpose of negotiating through a corridor or down an aisle — the generational, party, ideological, and ethnic gaps which pervade the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

At the minimum, the Massachusetts House *is* representative. My colleagues range in age from a 72-year-old Irish Democrat from Worcester to a 26-year-old Irish Democrat from Brockton. In between, there is at least one delegate from every major and minor age, sex, occupation, and ethnic group which can make even the slimmest of claims to representation. The 240 members represent at least 240 different stripes on the ideological continuum.

Some groups, however, are over-represented. Democrats for one — there are 172 of them. Lawyers for another — 58 of them plus another dozen or so who are part-time law students. And 10 funeral directors, making this time-honored profession the fourth largest represented.

SHORT SHRIFT

Other groups are under-represented. Republicans for one — a scant 68. In addition we share space with only four women, two blacks and no doctors or dentists. Ethnicity is a hallmark of Massachusetts politics. While assorted minorities are sprinkled liberally through the membership, the all-Irish-American Democratic leadership and the all-WASP Republican leadership fairly represent the complexion of the center of their respective parties as a whole and the clear majority of the members that they lead.

As for this modest chronicle, I can present no

glamorous and charming Plimptonesque perspective based on a quick leap in and out of the fray followed by long hours at the typewriter translating one man's business into another man's best-seller. On the contrary, the day-to-day routine in the House is perhaps best understood as a series of domestic Hamburger Hills where the same battles are fought and won or lost over and over again and progress is determined by a set of irrelevant criteria the least of which is that things are no worse off today than they were yesterday.

No attempt to understand the legislative process in Massachusetts could be complete without attention to the written and unwritten rules of the game.

The written rules distinguish us from most of our counterparts in other states. First of all, we are large — the second largest in the country at 240. Also, in a unique constitutional feature, Massachusetts citizens have the right to free petition (thus the name "Great and General Court") and over 7000 bills a year are filed in this manner. Each of them has to have a public



Meeting with Constituents

— Sok.
Please turn to Page 11



PROFILE: Senator Charles Goodell

Will they love him in Gotham as they did in Chatauqua?

Charles Goodell, the 43-year-old ex-Congressman from Jamestown, New York, selected by Governor Nelson Rockefeller to complete the term of the slain Robert F. Kennedy, does not look like a man in crisis. Although his days always seem one step from chaos, ("We're pretty much on a full campaign schedule here," he says, "and we will be until after the 1970 election"), he moves from place to place with steady deliberation. McLuhan would call him "cool" — he plays with his unlit, but ever-present pipe, and leans forward to speak in measured, even tones. Driving from his office in the New Senate Office Building to the State Department one morning soon after his trip to Biafra, he is already twenty minutes late; but he shifts the battered, family VW sedan slowly. He answers questions in rambling, thoughtful phrases, almost talking to himself at times. If a question amuses him, the Senator may prevent the interviewer from moving on to other areas for long minutes.

His mind is top notch — incisive, analytical, quick (at Williams he was Phi Beta Kappa; he has both a law degree and a M.A. in government from Yale). His political skills within the House were well known in the Washington inner circle. (Goodell was one of the progenitors of the "Ford Rebellion" in 1965, for which he was given the chairmanship of the spanking new Policy and Research Committee for Republican House members). His legislative talent is sound — (his maneuvering with Minnesota's Albert Quie during the mid-sixties to present a Republican "alternative" to the War on Poverty was the high point in this regard). He is athletically built (he turned down a professional baseball contract for Law School and although he plays rarely, boasts a 9 handicap in golf); has an attractive family (tall, blonde wife and five sons); and prides himself on his self-development through the past ten years (he has inconspicuously visited almost every large ghetto in the country, for example). In a normal state, Charles Goodell, after two years of exposure as United States Senator, would be a good bet for election in his own right.

A MATTER OF DEFINITION But New York is not a normal state. It is a political jungle of the first rank. And Charles Goodell is in trouble.

In a State which elects state-wide figures like Nelson Rockefeller, Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits, Goodell is saddled with a past record which is relatively conservative. He smarts a bit when questioned about it; contending, with some justification, that the press tends to over-classify. "I was never as conservative as most make me out to have been," he explains, "and my development to more constructive positions has been gradual and steady through all the years I've been in Washington." He points to the fact that by 1962 he was taking independent approaches on many issues. He was one of the first House Republicans to begin the search for constructive alternatives ("back in 1962, you know, 'constructive alternative' was a dirty word among Republicans and it was pretty lonely sometimes").

Thus, he concludes, by the time he was selected to fill the Senate slot, he was already a progressive Republican with modern approaches and with an outlook amenable to the large urban centers in New York State. But while he may have been "over-classified" in his early House career, Goodell in turn oversimplifies his posture during the past four years.

The Goodell who campaigned almost recklessly during the summer of 1968 for Nelson Rockefeller with full knowledge that that same Rockefeller would soon be naming a Senator was not quite the same Goodell who six months earlier was whispered about by Rockefeller campaign personnel as one of the few House Republican members in New York who might be questionable in his loyalty. The Goodell who celebrated the first weeks of his Senate position by sniping at Richard Nixon was not the same Goodell who voted against the stronger House bills in education, poverty, rent supplements and food inspection. And the Goodell who flew to Biafra in February and returned with urgent pleas for more efficient and concentrated assistance to save hundreds of thousands of starving Africans was not the same Goodell who joined other Republicans and Southern Democrats in ignoring the original effort to pass a comprehensive program to control rats.

There are good reasons why the two Goodells are not identical. The Goodell in the House was a man whose ambition it was to be Speaker; and no one becomes a Republican Speaker by rocking the

boat inordinately. The Goodell in the Senate now has very different ambitions to pursue and a dramatically different constituency to please. In any event, the changes make good political sense. Jacob Javits was winning the state by a million votes in November, while Richard Nixon was losing by 500,000. The lesson is clear enough. But it does create strains.

SOME THINGS TO ALL PEOPLE These strains are implicit in his schizophrenic posture since the appointment. In his office there are pictures of African kids, strewn casually on desks, and over the receptionist's desk is a picture of the Beatles. The Washington Office is "with it." But his newsletter, geared to an upstate Republican mailing list, has Goodell ponderously puffing on his pipe and pictures him shaking hands with Richard Nixon and introducing his son to Everett Dirksen. In the Senate, he speaks of the "protein crisis" in Biafra and warns of potential genocide. He introduces legislation on "clean elections," community self-development and federal revenue-sharing; on the Senate floor he urges fine points about the Commodity Credit Corporation and urges strong restrictions on the military's use of chemical biological warfare weapons.

But in a pre-election speech before the Women's National Republican Club in New York City, Goodell comes across like a high school orator in an American Legion speaking contest: "With positive priorities as our program, with party harmony as our banner, with victory as our goal, let every Republican woman and every citizen who cares about our country make this election a crusade for a new and better day in America." And at an upstate GOP dinner in mid-March, the Senator began his speech by saying: "Isn't it great to be meeting here tonight with a Republican administration in Washington!", and via complaints about taxes, interest rates, inflation, and disregard for God and country, proceeded to go downhill from there.

The problem is not merely trying to pacify upstate Republicans while trying to build bridges to Democratic New York City in a state where Democrats hold a substantial registration edge. Every name Republican in New York State has to make that effort and Rockefeller, Javits and Keating made it successfully (it took Robert Kennedy, a force unto himself, to defeat Keating). The more basic problem is that Goodell has moved almost too quickly — he has yet to find his personal niche. The psychological aspect of taking the seat of his predecessor contributes to this. How *does* someone react who is trying to pick up broken dreams left behind by a slain Kennedy? Efforts are made to be accepted in the same places where Robert Kennedy, and few other white men, could walk safely. Efforts are made to appeal to the young — by capitalizing on the almost Mc-

Carthy-like coolness of the man.

Yet one of his staff complains openly of the self-consciousness of it all. Waving a recent press release, she exclaimed, "He's trying to sound like McCarthy. It just isn't him. When will he realize that he's better than McCarthy? He doesn't have to apologize to anyone for his seat!" In an emotional moment, she was getting at the core of it all. Goodell's strengths are much different from those of a Kennedy or a McCarthy. He is not an ideologue; he lacks the gut appeal of a Kennedy. But he is an incredibly hard-working, open problem-solver with limitless potential for growth. The rub is that sometimes this feature does not sell with an electorate which, like all others, often prefers form to substance.

NEW VIEWS ON OLD JOKES There are other difficulties for the new, pressured Senator as well. A Senator from a large, urbanized state has to have a considerably different personal focus from a Congressman from a generally rural area, such as Chatauqua County, from which Goodell comes. He looks back at his House career with some affection and enjoys dividing up the House conceptually into four groups — those who are representatives (who come to Washington to mirror their district and serve their constituents only); those who are legislators; those who are politicians; and those who come to the House to retire. Goodell looks upon himself as having been a legislator (others point out that he was also very much a politician) — these divisions do overlap after all. He talks with pride of the legislative work that he was able to do personally while in the House. Now he finds little or no time for such luxuries ("There used to be a joke when we were in the House that in joint conferences we never met with Senators, we always met with their staffs; now I see that it has to be that way . . . I really miss digging into the things I vote on") Goodell recognizes that one of the major problems is that new members of the Senate simply are not adequately staffed for the job. Senior Senators are assigned considerable staff help from their committees, but the newer members must rely on their office staff itself. Goodell does not have the resources to remedy this himself. ("I use my salary to live on; a lot of Senators use it to hire more staff") and his committee preparation suffers as a result. ("Sometimes four or five subcommittees meet at the same time here, and you are on so many more committees than in the House . . . you just can't keep up with things . . . there is so much more legwork to do in the Senate.")

And this, in itself, is only one small part of the problem. A Senator has many more political demands on his time than a House member. Goodell receives some 200 speaking requests every week

Please turn to Page 13

A Strategy For Solving The Housing Crisis

I**N** housing, as in so many other areas of pressing need in America, Republicans to date do not bear the responsibility for what has been done and what has not been done; since the beginning of the depression the party has rarely controlled either the national or many city governments. The priorities that have been laid down for this country are essentially those imposed by Democrats.

The Nixon Administration does, however, bear responsibility for the future; consequently, Republican leadership in Washington must free itself from established modes of thought and bureaucratic practices and consider what Republican alternatives make sense for the housing problem as the nation enters the 1970's.

Philadelphians have already felt the effects of the nation's priorities. Public monies spent on highway proliferation and military programs have done relatively little to improve the city's well being. In fact, "The City of Homes" has a full blown housing crisis.

Perhaps in comparison with other major urban centers, Philadelphia stands high in the ranks of the most successful home builders. Yet while twenty thousand homes sit vacant in sections of the city — particularly Germantown, West Philadelphia and North Philadelphia — a housing gap of an estimated 120,000 units exists. If you are black, have a low income, and rent your housing in Philadelphia, the chances are three-out-of-four that your housing is substandard. Similar horror stories can be told about the other major cities in America.

Clearly, the mentality of the New Deal — still with us in the form of the Democratic programs — can no longer suffice. Republican alternatives are necessary, alternatives that do not take the form of a call for "further study" or simply a demand to abandon or cut back the present set of programs.

The hour is late. The social impulses that are being felt and expressed in urban America, impulses that are fully compatible with Republican principles, must be given expression by the Nixon Administration.

By The Ripon Society of Philadelphia

This research and policy paper was prepared for the Ripon Society of Philadelphia by **Paul L. Niebanck**. The final draft was prepared and edited by a committee of Philadelphia Ripon members: **Richard E. Beeman, Charles Day, Richard R. Block, Herbert Hutton, Kenneth Kalserman, and Howard Gillette, Jr.**

I. The Democratic Heritage

Despite apparent validity at the time of enactment, most of the housing programs that were developed under Democratic governments have proven their worth only in the most limited sense. Public housing in Philadelphia, for example, has built a total of only 16,000 units in the three decades of the program's life, while private enterprise in the region has managed to build more than that number every year. Those households that have benefitted from public housing have been poor by anyone's standards, but whatever relief of their poverty has accrued to them by the fact of their residence in structurally sound units has been substantially counteracted by a simultaneous loss of dignity and control over their own lives. Strict and specious admission standards have been applied. Rules of behavior have constrained freedom and fostered petty bureaucratic tyranny. Patronizing administrative practices have frustrated or short-circuited spontaneous efforts at community organization. Public projects carry with them a physical image different from and less acceptable than the neighborhoods in which the projects are found. Projects have, because of local political necessity, been confined to a few already overcrowded and poorly maintained parts of the city. Public housing, in its traditional forms, has thus tended to institutionalize poverty rather than to free individuals from their state of poverty. Few Americans would freely choose public housing as it is typically known if they had a real alternative.

URBAN RENEWAL

The record of urban renewal has been no better. Substantial amounts of federal money have assisted Philadelphia's downtown rebirth, to be sure. The major intent of the legislation that created and sustained urban renewal, which was to provide a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American, has, however, been almost wholly thwarted. Indeed, the results have been counterproductive. The renewal program in Philadelphia has been responsible for the construction of just over 2,000 new housing units since 1949, while more than five times as many units have been demolished by the program. And what does manage to get built or rehabilitated frequently contains major flaws in the construction. The Republican District Attorney Arlen Specter has the Philadelphia Housing Authority under grand jury investigation and is disclosing fraud, kickbacks and conflicts of interest throughout the housing machinery; one builder was known to have "rebuilt" walls by plastering over the holes and structural defects.

Furthermore, the new housing that has been built has benefitted not the low- or moderate-income groups but the affluent and the very rich. The families who

have been dislodged have, in the meantime, been the ones in greatest need of housing. To tie the destiny of the rich to the destiny of the poor has positive social merit, but to subsidize the rich at the expense of the poor is another matter altogether.

RECENT PROGRAMS

The more recently enacted federal programs affecting housing have each in turn been acclaimed in Philadelphia, but have performed no better than public housing or urban renewal. Through 1968, for example, only about 3,000 housing units had been built or rehabilitated under Sections 221(h), 221(d)(3), 202 and 220 of the Housing Act of 1949 (as amended). (For an explanation of these laws and other housing jargon, see the Glossary of Housing Terms.) The slow progress made under these programs and under the more progressive sections of the public housing and urban renewal legislation can be attributed to many things, of course. Local critics have said that "there is nothing wrong with Philadelphia's housing programs except politics, mis-management, inertia, racism, incompetence and a bit of corruption."* The assertions notwithstanding, the incentives and constraints that guide local performance are the creatures of federal policy, and it is at the federal level that the basic failures have occurred.

Finally, the financial and social service programs that must provide the context for any successful housing strategy have been carried forth without sufficient energy and commitment. Public welfare allowances, for example, typically fall short by ten to fifty percent of reasonable income standards in Philadelphia, and tens of thousands of households in need of financial help go without it because of inadequacies within the welfare system. Relocation, code enforcement, and other related programs have similarly fallen short of their mandate. Despite the strenuous efforts by individual citizens and voluntary alliances, and despite the sincerity of many local public officials, progress in Philadelphia has been slow and misdirected. Incremental advances have of course been made, but at the moment discouragement appears to outweigh optimism regarding virtually every program.

THE BUREAUCRACY

At its root, the failure of public efforts in the housing field can be laid at the feet of the attitudes that have long pervaded the federal response to domestic problems generally. The present mosaic of housing programs, scattered as these programs are in terms of origin, intent, design, level of funding and impact, has created a mirage of possible success in a cloud of bureaucratic misunderstanding.

As it stands now, Congress demands that the

*Philadelphia Magazine, April, 1969, V. 60, N. 4, P. 88.

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) concern itself with a multitude of economic and social criteria surrounding recipients of federal housing largess. Local bodies preparing an application to this welfare/housing agency must have extensive professional skill in paper shuffling. The Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation (PHDC) has devoted more than one year's time to "packaging" three program applications. Even in "turnkey" housing which depends upon a maximum of private initiative, it takes seven months between general program approval by HUD and the start of construction on a specific house. And only last year, Congress replaced 221(d)(3) with 236, requiring those builders involved in the construction of moderate income housing to relearn the bureaucratic tricks necessary to both get an application through HUD and make a profit. (The report of the Douglas Commission, *Rebuilding the American City*, notes that "221(d)(3) projects took an average of 376 days from the time of original application just to the start of construction.")

The story at the local level is similar. Even without public subsidy, a building contractor in Philadelphia has an obstacle course of some seven offices to clear in City Hall before beginning his work.

SHIFT OF POWER

The forces that are directly concerned with housing — the consumer, the community, the industry — have altogether too little influence on what is done or how it is done. The public sector, rather than serving needs simply and directly as they arise, has taken the initiative, has institutionalized that initiative, and in the process has inhibited the human impulse towards self-help so deeply ingrained in American culture and so obviously present today in Philadelphia and other cities. Since the Republicans now have an opportunity to make changes in national policy, it is appropriate to indicate the kinds of changes that are seen by Philadelphia Ripon as consistent with the best of Republican principles.

II. Republican Alternatives

For years national housing policy has operated so as to enhance the freedom of one sector of the population and to deny it to another. The national tax structure, programs of federally insured mortgages, and other subsidy devices have tended to liberate the vast middle class from a constrained set of housing opportunities, and to provide individual households the money and services necessary to choose freely how they might live.

Poverty is the state of being without options. And public housing has provided the poor with their only one real option. Indeed, the life style of the public housing occupant has been largely prescribed instead

of chosen. The virtual absence of other housing programs designed to serve the poor, in the face of widespread clearance of existing low-priced housing, has further exacerbated the situation.

RECENT DEFICIENCIES

Recent programs such as Sections 235 and 236, which were initiated by the 1968 Housing Act with the intent of bringing privately-constructed housing within the financial capacity of the low-income homeseeker, have thus far been poorly funded. (Last June, for example, the House Appropriations Committee cut \$384.3 million from HUD's programs, leaving the agency with an appropriation of \$1.6-billion. In contrast, on the same day, the committee cut only \$19 million from NASA's budget, leaving it with a \$3.7 billion appropriation.) Moreover, these new programs, depending as they do on bureaucratically imposed income and cost ceilings, are not responsive to the realities of the individual case. Parsimonious and patronizing, they hardly command new faith in the present federal approach.

The alternative principle is clear, and it is offered here as a recommendation to the Administration:

The Department of Housing and Urban Development should set as its primary housing goal the creation of a housing market wherein all can compete for goods that are produced privately in accordance with consumer tastes without unnecessary artificial restraints on methods of construction in accordance with consumer tastes.

Consumer markets generally operate in this fashion. The producer is responsible to meet minimum standards, but beyond this requirement, the consumer is presumed to be king. So should it be with housing.

Before the low-income housing consumer can improve his competitive position and regain the initiative, three conditions must exist. First, the financial gap between the market price of housing and what the low-income consumer can afford to pay without sacrificing other necessities (usually taken to be 25% of his income) must be closed; in the short run this requires a financial subsidy large enough to close the gap (though in the long run the most desirable approach will be to increase the supply and reduce the construction cost of housing).

Second, real estate, legal and other services must be made available to the low-income consumer, for the fact that these submarkets are not normally open to him usually prevents him from participating in the larger housing market. Third, both the initial desire and the final choice must be his own.

SHIFT OF ORIENTATION

Thus, the proposal means that the entire orientation of the public housing program should be shifted,

from one focused on construction and management to one focused on consumer services and subsidies. The Housing Assistance Administration (an agency in HUD with a title worthy of such a focus) should direct local authorities to engage in the purchase of standard houses on the open market, at market prices, in accordance with the needs of individual households as they queue up for such housing.

As an illustration of this process at work, let us say that a family of five, with a steady income of \$4,000, is "next in line" at a given point. The task of the local authority would be to discover what kind of housing its client preferred, help it locate a set of options, and assist in securing the unit that most closely approximated the consumer's tastes. If the family desired to own its own home, the authority would of course allow such a purchase to occur, and would provide the family with a one-time subsidy in the amount necessary to bring the unit within the family's financial capability. In the case of a rental, the family could be subsidized roughly in the same manner as is presently the case.

Simple in concept, such a change would not be without operational problems. Pressures might emerge, for example, to give one kind of client preferential treatment over another. Certain areas of an urban region, while attractive to the consumer, might be difficult to enter. The determination of the necessary subsidy, quality control on the housing units that are considered, and the possibility of private profit at the margin might all, to a greater or lesser degree, cause difficulty. The overriding principle, however, is that the consumer would be in charge; that is, he would have bargaining power, information and recourse at his disposal in much the same way as the middle-income consumer has at the present time. By fact of the consumer being sovereign, it is projected that the entire process of providing houses for low-income households would be expedited; costs would be reduced; and most important, consumer satisfaction would be greatly enhanced.

ANCILLARY BENEFITS

A shift in orientation such as the one put forward here would have significant ancillary benefits as well. Private production and rehabilitation would be stimulated, especially if a steady stream of funds from Washington is assured and the size of a local authority's annual program is announced in advance. Local housing programs would be largely freed from federal stereotypes and guidelines. Public-private cooperation and mutual faith could be greatly enhanced. Consumers as a group would have more "muscle" in the housing market than they presently possess.

Furthermore, if modified somewhat, such a program as this could serve many family types, not simply those presently deemed eligible for public housing.

IV

If a household in the queue proved to be in need of and able to purchase a home under Section 235 for instance, the authority could locate a suitable home and negotiate with FHA to have the transaction approved. Indeed, Philadelphia Ripon supports the notions of consumer initiative and a "turnkey" approach on all low-income housing programs and an eventual merger of the federal agencies that currently subsidize the low-income housing consumer. An orientation such as this would inevitably lead to closer working relationships among the agencies at the local level that are involved in housing, and possibly their integration into a single local housing agency. In Philadelphia, to the extent that such integration has occurred, it has brought about an improvement in the city's overall housing effort.

THE SUBSIDY QUESTION

One should avoid being repulsed by the concept of a subsidy to low-income families, for as noted above the federal government already provides a large subsidy to support the housing habits of the middle class. Indeed, the largest single direct subsidy for housing in America today is the federal income tax deduction for mortgage interest payments. In one recent year, the government spent \$820 million to subsidize housing for the poor — roughly the bottom 20% of the population — while it granted more than twice as much, \$1.7 billion in housing deductions to the top 20% of the population. Unlike tax deductions, subsidies for low income housing are publicly visible and must compete annually for Congressional authorization and appropriations against other national programs with large, aggressive and effective constituencies. Nor should one forget that the FHA mortgage insurance program has in thirty-five years subsidized over seven million middle income home buyers.

III. Local Code Enforcement

The national goal of "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family" has in its literal sense gone virtually unattended and unnoticed in the twenty years since it was first enunciated in law in the 1949 Housing Act. Last year, in the Housing Act of 1968, the legislative and executive branches of the federal government again rededicated the nation to this goal, stating that it should be "substantially achieved" within ten years. However, unlike the national goal of placing a man on the moon in a decade, the national housing goal has not been funded at anything close to adequacy.

For example, for fiscal 1969 the National Homeownership program was allotted a mere \$75 million nationwide and received an actual appropriation of only one-third of this authorization level. Funds to support broad-scale code enforcement programs have, moreover,

been almost wholly lacking from the basket of federal housing subsidies.

SINE QUA NON

Yet the principle of consumer sovereignty cannot be made fully operational until the consumer is protected by assurances that all goods on the market bear a reasonable relation to modern standards of health, safety and welfare. To maintain the housing stock at standards supportive of human health and safety and to rid the urban scene of debilitating and uneconomic uses of land have long been established as worthy social enterprises, but local municipalities have simply lacked the resources necessary to accomplish the task. It behooves the Nixon Administration, therefore, to embark on a massive program in support of local activities in the areas of code enforcement, housing maintenance and housing improvement.

Among the steps that should be taken is the provision of federal money to local code enforcement agencies that demonstrate the need and desire to improve the services they perform. As a positive response to the growing interest in local law enforcement generally, the federal government should support local programs of staff training, code revision, housing services and code management. Perhaps of more crucial or immediate importance is the provision of loans and grants to owner-occupants and other owners of residential real estate throughout the city, for the express purpose of substantially improving their properties. Federal money must be made available to local code enforcement agencies for this purpose. Until such an approach is taken, local agencies will have, at best, the "stick" without the necessary "carrot" to raise the housing stock to adequate levels of quality and to keep it at these levels.

Again, the gap between need and performance is great, and the prospects for early goal achievement are slight. In Philadelphia alone, upwards of 100,000 housing units are in need of substantial rehabilitation or repair, and large numbers of additional units are on the verge of structural decline or obsolescence. Nevertheless, the steps suggested above, if taken immediately by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, can arrest further decline and can help to upgrade the substandard housing stock.

MIGHT HAVE'S

The federal neglect of code enforcement as a device for accomplishing stated national policy is exemplary of the insufficient and misdirected federal response to the urban housing problem. It would seem quite logical that, if the government had been seriously interested in a "decent home . . ." it would have long ago invested in direct means towards the achievement of that goal. Code enforcement and rehabilitation would together have constituted a logical response. The federal government might, as is recommended

here, have offered local agencies financial aid in the form of operating revenues, and it might have offered property owners loan guarantees or outright grants for rehabilitation. It might have had sufficient faith in local government to enable each municipality to develop its own modern code or to adapt a model code to its needs. It might have been willing to invest in the rehabilitation industry at an earlier date. It did not, and it is time for a Republican Administration to turn the tide.

IV. Community Action

A logical extension of the principle of consumer sovereignty is that of community control. Middle-class areas, by and large, already possess such control, and public actions that are taken in such areas are generally initiated by either the residents themselves or by political leaders representative of their interests. In cases where larger regional needs call for intrusion upon the principle of consumer control, the agent of change is required to compensate the communities it affects for the hardships caused.

With this knowledge, many of the federal programs that affect housing have paid official homage to the term "citizen participation." Commencing with the "Workable Program" requirements that were built into the urban renewal legislation of 1954, the notion has now been extended to reach public housing management procedures, the Model Cities Program, and non-profit housing sponsorship. The progression towards participatory democracy has been painfully slow, however, and many of the administrative directives that have to do with citizen participation are devoid of operational meaning.

It is proposed here that the Department of Housing and Urban Development evaluate its renewal policies with respect to the communities that are most directly affected:

The goal of this evaluation should be to develop procedures whereby the neighborhoods themselves are ensured of full control once they are chosen as urban renewal areas.

As a correlate, a second set of simplified procedures should be developed that allow communities and neighborhoods direct access to the federal renewal pipeline. As in the case of individuals seeking market information or housing subsidies, communities and other non-profit groups would be encouraged to queue up for funds, and would be allowed to develop their own projects in their own individualized ways. Only a simplified audit should be necessary to satisfy federal standards of control. Present administrative precautions, which add to project costs and often cause long delays, rather than sifting out the incompetent, tend to discourage the vigorous. A Republican alternative should call forth the vigor in each community and encourage the hesitant to learn from the successes and mistakes of the hardy.

PHILADELPHIA GROUPUSCULES

Philadelphia has moved to the brink of what is sought here. Groups such as the Young Great Society, the Wister Neighborhood Council, and the North City Congress have been formed and are fully desirous of managing their own affairs. They have organized themselves, drafted plans, and set standards. Groups like these should be encouraged to step forward and to seek renewal funds on the merits of the needs of their individual areas, independent of irrelevant and dehumanizing bureaucratic procedures so customary of the federal guidelines currently in use. It is, when all is said and done, the capacity of individual citizens and voluntary groups of citizens that makes or breaks a renewal effort. Wishful thinking and self-deception on the part of the federal bureaucracy will not make it happen.

The principle of community control can be extended to the much confused and distorted social issue that has been polarized into the schools of "suburban integration" and "ghetto rebuilding." Both of these positions have their origins in the white, not the black, community, and both demonstrate a lack of understanding on the part of the former. To the extent possible, such presumed "alternatives" should be removed from the lexicon of public policymakers. Voluntary alliances of persons, whether based on a geographic community or otherwise, should be free to engage in what they themselves decide is in their own best interests, and should be encouraged by federal housing and renewal policy to do so. Some groups may wish to develop communities in suburban areas, of course, and in such cases as in all others, the specific set of actions should be subject only to the independent choices of the persons involved.

As elsewhere, no panaceas are in view here. What is requested of the Nixon Administration is not, therefore, a set of simple and rigid formulas, but an open and forthright attempt to make contact with leaders within the minority communities and to move beyond confrontation, to reconciliation, consensus and common effort. Campaign oratory gave evidence that the President possessed such a desire; it is now an appropriate time to act upon that desire.

V. State Activity

With few exceptions, the several states have been passive observers in the nation's efforts to revitalize its cities and to improve the living environments of its citizens. In part, this has been the product of inertia and abdication of responsibility by the states themselves. There is ample evidence, however, that it is also the result of the fact that the federal government, with its vastly greater resources, has left the states with little or no leverage or financial power to intervene creatively on their own.

Since there is now in Washington an administration that asserts a loyalty to the federal system, it is timely that the states be afforded an opportunity to become full participants in the planning and development of their urban areas. Philadelphians are conscious, for example, of Pennsylvania's desire to establish a housing development corporation, which would be empowered to act on behalf of the Commonwealth to engage in land banking, act as a sponsor of development, and provide seed money and technical assistance to local developers of all kinds.* Such state efforts as this should receive the full support of the federal government, in the form of tax sharing plans, which could give the states financial leverage. Washington should also refrain from direct involvement in areas of activity which more efficiently might be handled by state government.

CLEAR AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY

No sharp distinction can or should be made between what is logically a state concern, as opposed to a local or national concern. Some areas of activity, however, clearly demand attention by the states. Among these are land development patterns, codes and standards, market research, and legal rights and remedies. The responsibility of the states to enter these areas derives from the fact that often they are in the unique position of being distant enough from local problems to maintain a degree of detachment and to protect the interests of minority groups, and at the same time close enough to appreciate the distinct needs of local situation. As such, they have a unique role in planning urban growth and in satisfying statewide and regional housing needs.

Even in the case of state activity, the federal government must take a lead, albeit a minor one. The Nixon Administration must provide evidence that it has no desire to pre-empt all of the possible action and that state initiatives will not be thwarted or encumbered by federal action. The partial transfer of power from the federal to the state level is highly desirable, but only a painstaking effort will bring it about. Decades of inaction cannot be overcome without additional decades of patience and persistence.

VI. Industrial Revolution

It is abundantly clear that the private homebuilding industry will require every possible support if it is to perform at the levels necessary to move the nation substantially towards its housing goal: the construction of 26 million housing units over the next decade. Unfortunately the current rate of production is only 1.5 million units per year, a figure that is representative for the 1960s. Consequently, unless housing production increases sharply in the very near future, America will

*See report of Governor Shafer's Housing Task Force, available from the Department of Community Affairs, Harrisburg.

fall short of its goal by almost forty percent.

The Philadelphia experience, while not entirely representative of the nation, has demonstrated the need for a dramatic breakthrough in two related areas: rehabilitation and advanced housing technology. Philadelphia has gained a great deal of experience with rehabilitation during the course of the past few years, particularly through the operation of the public housing "used house program" and the semi-autonomous Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation. This experience has shown that the rehabilitation industry is sorely in need of advanced technology and management systems.

If, as it anticipates, Philadelphia becomes a locus for the national Bi-Centennial Celebration in 1976, it will be highly desirable to have mobilized the home-building industry in such a way as to present a slum-free face to the world. Of course, it will have been necessary also to develop a whole range of supporting services and maintenance systems that demonstrate that the face that is presented is not without substance.

FEDERAL ROLE

Federal financial assistance — and patience — is crucial here. Sustained efforts must be made to develop the technological capability to rebuild the city efficiently, to the highest standards of taste and environmental quality. The new federal program known as Operation Breakthrough, introduced under the leadership of HUD's Secretary, George Romney, is worthy of full support here. The national Administration must take the "long view" with respect to housing technology, and prepare the way for the breakthroughs that are possible once the setting is provided and the new systems are tested. Scattered experimentation and partial involvement will not suffice. Rather, the nation must commit itself to the kind of concerted activity now common in the areas of space exploration and military research — to develop prototypes, test materials, and invent new systems. Sustained work in a very few cities, with deep and continuous evaluation of progress is the better alternative.

Philadelphia would of course hope to become one of the cities where intensive effort is brought to bear, especially if it is chosen for a major role in the 1976 Celebration. But the overriding national concern in the first instance should be to move in an intensive rather than an extensive manner, unlike the Model Cities program, so that the second round of activity stands a greater chance of succeeding on a large scale. This would mean that Philadelphia, like other cities, must take its chances on being selected.

VII. Some Caveats

Philadelphia Ripon warns that housing cannot and must not be treated in isolation from larger social issues. While the quality of the housing supply, its cost, and its distribution through space are matters of real

concern, the overriding problem involves the bargaining strength of the individual consumer. As a long-run response to the housing problem, only a straightforward national system of adequate income guarantees will suffice. Only then will every citizen be in a position to choose freely from among the housing alternatives that are available to him according to his own valuation.

This caveat, however, is not simply that income is, in the last analysis, more important than housing. Rather, it must be simultaneously recognized that the income standards for a "moderate" life style are rising very rapidly in the United States. To be in a relatively secure financial position in Philadelphia, for example, a family of four currently requires an annual income over \$7000.* This standard puts to rest the \$3000 "poverty line" that has commonly been used, and indicates that unless public policy acts to counteract the widening gap between the middle class and the poor, our nation may change from one based on equality and social mobility to one in which class inequality is a dominant factor. Republican policy must move against this trend.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Underlying this appeal to Republican principles has been the matter of responsibility and accountability. The federal government has, in most areas of social concern, been loathe to defer to lower levels of authority. Rhetoric notwithstanding, the Democratic Party has likewise failed to follow through on its expressed faith in the individual. Republicans now in Washington must not fall into these same bureaucratic and philosophical pitfalls. Responsibility for planning and development, it is asserted here, should revert to those most directly concerned. The federal government should attend more to decisions regarding major priorities, and less to specific guidelines for local or individual action. This is not to say that the federal level has no responsibility for program review. Indeed, it cannot make reasonable allocative decisions without knowledge of performance. The primary responsibility for both planning and delivery, however, should lie with those most directly concerned, and the leadership that will be necessary must be developed at that same level.

None of the suggestions offered in this paper is wholly without precedent. At the same time, none of them has been seriously considered as major policy alternatives at the national level. Democratic leaders are likely not to think in these terms, if the historical Democratic distrust of private enterprise, private individuals and voluntary alliances persists. Thus it is that Republicans are called upon to bring their principles up to date, ally themselves with the social innovators whose points of departure are consistent with Republican principles, and act aggressively before their opportunity is lost.

*As estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A Glossary of Housing Terms*

(Many housing programs are commonly referred to by their section number, referencing a section of the Housing Act of 1934 as amended. The most common are briefly described below, with the date of the program's enactment indicated.)

Section 203

Conventional Home Mortgage Insurance: This program provides Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage insurance at market-rate interest for individual home mortgages. Structures containing one-to-four-family units are eligible for the Section 203 mortgage insurance, although the program is most frequently used to finance the purchase of one-family houses. Indeed, this is the program with which individual Americans are most familiar.

Section 207

Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing 1934: Similar to Section 203, Section 207 provides FHA mortgage insurance at market-rate interest for mortgages obtained to finance the development of rental housing. Projects must consist of eight or more units of new construction or rehabilitated housing.

Section 213

Mortgage Insurance for Cooperative Housing (1950): This program provides for FHA mortgage insurance at market-rate interest on loans to finance housing projects which will be owned and occupied by members of nonprofit cooperative corporations.

Section 220

Mortgage Insurance for Housing in Urban Renewal and Code Enforcement Areas (1934): Designed to eliminate slum conditions and prevent the spread of blight, Section 220 provides FHA mortgage insurance at market-rate interest to investors, individual home builders, and sponsors of multifamily housing to finance new construction or rehabilitation of existing housing in federally-aided urban renewal and code enforcement areas.

Section 221 (d) (3)

Mortgage Insurance for Moderate Cost Rental Housing (1961): Rental and cooperative housing projects which will serve moderate-income families and individuals can be built with FHA insured loans under this program. Mortgages may be insured at a below-market interest rate or at a market interest rate as follows:

Below Market Interest Rate: Qualified nonprofit and limited dividend mortgagors were eligible for a special low interest rate of three percent during the period of mortgage amortization. Upon final endorsement of the project by FHA, the mortgage was purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association. This was the basic federal program to aid the development of low income housing, before it was phased out in favor of Section 236 which was adopted in 1968. Between 1961 and 1968, this program built approximately 65,000 units of moderate income housing (rent of \$100-\$120/month for 2-3 bedrooms).

Market Interest Rate: Under this program mortgages are insured at market rate interest up to six and three-quarters per cent by the FHA.

Section 221(d) (4)

Mortgage Insurance for Moderate-Cost Rental Housing (1961): This program provides FHA mortgage insurance at market-interest to finance proposed or rehabilitated housing for families of moderate income. Projects developed under this program must contain five or more units in detached, semi-detached, row, walk-up, or elevated structures. Among families who qualify by need and income, preference is given to those displaced by urban renewal or other governmental action.

Section 221(h)

Home Ownership for Low-Income Families (1966):

This program provides FHA mortgage insurance at below-market interest rates to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of substandard or deteriorating housing units for resale to low-income families. Mortgage insurance under this program is available first to nonprofit corporations and second, upon sale of the individual units, to the low-income purchasers. Holders of individual mortgages may be eligible for home ownership assistance payments under Section 235 which can reduce the mortgage interest rate to one per cent.

Section 235

Home Ownership Assistance Payments (1968): Section 235 was authorized in the 1968 Housing Act to provide mortgage assistance payments and/or mortgage insurance on behalf of lower-income home owners and cooperative members. The aim is to bring home ownership within the means of low-income families by making interest subsidy payments on home mortgages. Depending upon the income of the home purchaser, the subsidized interest rate can be as low as one per cent.

Section 236

Interest Reduction Payments for Rental and Cooperative Housing (1968): Replacing the 221(d) (3) program, Section 236 provides periodic interest reduction payments on behalf of sponsors of rental or cooperative housing designed to serve lower-income families. The goal of the program is to bring decent private housing within the means of families with the lowest possible incomes. Interest reduction payments — of such an amount that they subsidize the interest down to one percent — are made to the mortgagee of lower income housing projects. The basic difference between 221(d) (3) and 236 is that under 221(d) (3) the government owned the mortgage, while under 236 it merely subsidized it.

Section 202 (of the Housing Act of 1959)

Direct Loans for Senior Citizen Housing: This program provides low interest loans from the Housing Assistance Administration (HAA) to private nonprofit corporations, limited profit sponsors, or public agencies for financing the development of moderate-cost rental or cooperative housing for the elderly or handicapped.

Section 312 (of the Housing Act of 1964)

Direct Loans for Rehabilitation in Urban Renewal and Code Enforcement Areas: Under this program, HUD provides direct, low-interest rate loans for the rehabilitation of residential and nonresidential property in federally-aided urban renewal or code enforcement areas, or in areas designated in need of rehabilitation by their local governing bodies.

Turnkey Public Housing

Section 10 (c) of the Housing Act of 1937 (as amended by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) permits local housing authorities to enter into agreements with private developers for the purchase of new or rehabilitated housing units for use as low-rent public housing for families and elderly. This program was designed to reduce the time, effort, and expenditures entailed in the traditional methods of developing public housing units. Under the Turnkey program, housing authorities are allowed to negotiate directly with private developers for completed units. Where this method has been used, the construction time and construction costs have been reduced even though the costs include developers' profits. This program has recently been expanded to include contracts for private management of public housing and purchase of public housing units by the tenants.

* Most of these definitions were obtained from two volumes on "Federal and State Assisted Housing Programs" prepared by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, 44 School Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

A Month in the Life

(At the FORUM's request, Representative Linsky kept notes on how he spent a typical month. It happens to have been May, 1969, but could have been just about any other. Ed.)

For a member of the Massachusetts House, 54 hours and 11 minutes on 16 separate days in May were spent in session, an average of three hours and 23 minutes a day. We met as usual on Monday through Thursday, except for Monday, May 26, on which we again asserted our national leadership by celebrating Memorial Day four days before the rest of the nation, having adopted a Monday Holiday Law which took effect a full two years before the national law passed by Congress. During May we took 98 roll calls on matters ranging from the budget and abolition of the death penalty to building a new court house in Chelsea and paying an annuity to one Dora Walsh. Four of these I missed. During two of them I was at a meeting at the State House and was not called in time. The other misses occurred when my car broke down between meetings.

A legislator punctuates his life by meetings and appointments. In May, my schedule looked like this:

— 37 meetings with legislators, drafters, interest groups, and constituents on specific legislation, including three of the Committee on Urban Affairs to

which I am assigned.

— 17 appointments which dealt essentially with political matters.

— 10 gatherings loosely grouped as civic and philanthropic.

— two talks with the governor.

— 10 events as main speaker, four of them political and six civic.

— three events as a panelist.

— two TV news tapes.

— two radio news interviews.

— innumerable daily consultations with constituents.

I spent dinnertime and evenings at home on two of the 30 days in May. Nine started with a meeting at breakfast or earlier. Of the session days, only one was clear of a social, political, or legislative business lunch scheduled far in advance. I turned down invitations for 15 civic, 12 legislative, and three political functions, but very few of these were ones in which I was to have a prominent role.

The vital link in this mad chain is the telephone. An average of 15 major outgoing calls a day and 15 more coming in, each taking at least five minutes, rounds out to a staggering two hours and 30 minutes on the phone, or about one-sixth of your waking life!

—M.F.L.

Linsky from page 7

hearing before a legislative committee, all bills have to be acted upon by the committee, and all bills must come before the full House in some form.

These obvious rules are just one part of the way the game is played. Legislative activity here is a reflection of the concept that the legislature is a club, an exclusive one whose members owe an allegiance to each other and to the institution which goes beyond the mere merits of a particular piece of legislation. It is this principle, we are told, which must govern our conduct, control our criticism, and keep the fires of discontent from smouldering into the open.

AMEN, POLONIUS

It was hardly three hours after I was sworn to my duties in October 1967 when a senior member of the House, a veteran of tough urban Democratic politics took me aside. Making it clear that our common legislative membership and common ethnic background overrode our differences in party allegiance, he put his arm around my shoulders, guided me into a corner of the chamber and in a soft, almost paternal tone gave me my first legislative lesson. As best as I can remember, it went something like this:

We have to stick together in here. The people don't understand how the legislature works. Don't

make any trouble. If you want something for your District, do your work in the Committee and not on the floor of the House. Don't take the microphone and debate. The Members are your best friends, so don't embarrass them. Don't hang around with the young guys who are always stirring things up. You'll never get anywhere in here if you do.

Finally, a fact of geography sets the Massachusetts House apart from its counterparts. We are virtually alone among the states in that our capital city is also our most significant city in terms of culture, sports, population, sin, food, and fun. (Boston may not seem like the Left Bank to you, but have you ever spent any time in Erving or Plainville?) This subtlety is not to be passed over lightly. Jefferson City, Frankfurt, Harrisburg, Columbus and Augusta are nice places to visit perhaps, but one deals with them most satisfactorily when one does one's business as quickly as possible and returns home to St. Louis, Louisville, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Portland. One should not be surprised that these are not among the eight states with both annual and unlimited sessions.

Not in Massachusetts. With no deadlines on our annual sessions, we managed to meet all but four months in the period from January, 1965 through July,

1968. In addition, having the state capital in a major city means that the state legislators are constantly being examined by the TV camera and the big papers. State political news is daily news in Massachusetts, unlike most states where the influential dailies and television stations have to cover the State House from afar. Anyone familiar with the political animal does not have to be convinced that the heat from the TV lamp and the poison of newspaper ink can profoundly affect legislative events.

For most of us in the legislature, "business time" is divided between constituent service and legislative matters. As the junior member and only Republican from the upper middle class town of Brookline, I face a far lighter service load than do my Democratic colleagues from the big cities.

NOT EXACTLY BOSS TWEED

In a way, this is a lucky thing since, being a Republican, I have no legislative office. I am privileged to share a five-girl secretarial pool with my 239 colleagues, I answer my phone calls in one of a row of telephone booths lining one side of the House Lobby and discuss personal matters with constituents in a large waiting room which doubles as a corridor between the phones and the Chamber. And so in an atmosphere of privacy comparable to Boston Common during the lunch hour, I discuss welfare checks, jobs, getting speakers recruited, retrieving suspended driving licenses and conduct a bit of informal psychiatry. Such are the perquisites of power.

There is really no typical legislative day, because the life style of the members of the Massachusetts House varies so widely. Over 75% of the members have substantial outside business interests, which means other major responsibilities to attend to. Less than 50 of the members regularly sleep over in Boston. Legislative hearings are generally held in the morning but regular committee hearings are poorly attended and, at any rate, completed before the first of May.

The rush from meeting to meeting ends for most of us at 1:00 when the session begins. Physical concentration is moderate to heavy during debate after the first roll call of the day has been taken, but mental concentration is light. Thus the announcement of the roll call is the signal for a mad rush to inform oneself of the politics and merits of both or all sides of the issue in the few minutes between the time the roll call is ordered and the time the electronic roll call machine is opened. Some merely check with their party leadership, some dash madly from proponent to opponent to try to put the pieces together, and some simply slide behind their desks and wait until the roll call is open, casting their votes on the basis of what others are doing. (If Smith is for it, Jones is against it, etc.) Colleagues from the same or neighboring communities keep a

careful eye on each other's vote and the party leaders stride up and down the aisle in an effort to bring back those who have strayed from the fold.

As much as I can love this job and the legislative process itself, the life is irrational at best. Working conditions limit the use of research. Lack of staff makes debate and deliberation often uninformed. A large House and small districts give disproportionate weight to the service function of the Representative, contributing to disposal of legislation on the basis of power and not merit. Confusion replaces reason when we vote on bills which are not yet in print, hide major changes under innocuous titles, and consider critical legislation during the wee hours of the morning in the last week of the session. Lack of a seniority system, two year terms in both Houses, and relatively weak committees all lead to a tragic abdication of the critical legislative responsibility to exercise review over the Executive branch. In an effort to defeat a proposal to reduce the size of the House to 160 which is backed by reformers including young members of the House and the League of Women Voters, the new Speaker — to his credit — is struggling to improve the legislative image and make sense out of the system.

And yet, when all is said and done, the Massachusetts House of Representatives — the oldest continuous deliberative body in the land — does its job. Out of this chaos have come laws which have been national models. The Massachusetts truth-in-lending law served as a basis for the law ultimately passed by Congress, and our mental health reorganization law was followed by sister states from coast-to-coast. Many more similar cases could be cited, but so can many from the other side.

THE LOBBIES

The Hamburger Hills of 1969 are ones which we have seen before. Lawyers and doctors join the insurance industry in fighting to preserve the present automobile insurance system under which Massachusetts motorists pay highest-in-the-nation rates and our courts are clogged because of our inordinately high claims consciousness. To the benefit of a thriving illegal abortion industry, moralists in the wrong arena continue to keep unjust birth control laws on the books at the expense of the increasing number of out-of-wedlock and unwanted children who spend their youth in a foster home. The road builders and their friends keep the Massachusetts highway fund inviolate long after the public demand for reallocation of resources in favor of mass transportation has been made clear.

Interest groups like cemetery owners, Elks and Moose fight for state-granted tax advantages which put increasing burdens on the financial structure of the cities and towns. Occupational groups, from chiropractors to auto mechanics seek "protection" which more

often than not gives them an unearned and unfair advantage over both the public and others legitimately seeking to compete with them.

Success comes most often to those who lobby for the status quo. Resistance to change is almost always better organized and better financed than its opposition. Those who are "making it" under the present rules are well aware of what they will lose if the game is altered; whereas those who advocate reform and experimentation find their constituency unorganizable and apathetic.

Wholly separate from all of this, the pride in the institution is very real. The indignities of the job are great, starting with working conditions and public opinion, but there is a kind of independent power which comes only with the awareness that you are responsible to no one but an entire constituency — and yourself. You have no office, no staff, no prestige, no privacy, no overriding power, but you have one vote — that is the same allotment as anyone else in the Chamber and no one can take that away or cast it for you.

For all this, the most poignant new fact of the Massachusetts House of Representatives is the disappearance of the two-party system as a guarantor of legislative check and balance. A Republican minority of 68 out of 240, 13 members shy of enough to even sustain a Governor's veto, is powerless to serve its his-

torical function as a conscience for the majority. The leadership is decent but weak, and not really representative. The Republican leadership troika averages 58 years old and averages over 17 years in the House. The Republicans as a whole average just over 46 years old and just over 6 years in the House. A most hopeful development is that new coalitions, especially among young members on both sides of the aisle — representing a range of ideology — arise and threaten the seat of power, but rarely and then only momentarily are they successful in toppling those who reign. (The current minority leader has weathered three major efforts to unseat him over the past six years but maintains his grasp.)

AN OPEN QUESTION

A smaller House, with office space, and personal and committee staff will help, but a rational legislature requires an adversary process which flows from a competitive two-party system. Whether we Republicans can meet this challenge is an open question. The costs of failure will be great and will be felt far beyond the limits of our party. The decade of smug satisfaction stemming from our ability to retain key statewide offices while our numbers in the legislature dwindled steadily must end.

Goodell *from page 10*

(twenty times what he received during his last year in the House) and harsh reality demands that he be in New York two, three or even four days during the week. Goodell freely comments on all this and knows more staff would help but refuses to be unnerved about it. He views staffing as a practical problem, not a theoretical one.

The same pragmatic approach is revealed when Goodell turns his attention to other areas. While some are suggesting that federalism itself is failing, the Senator suggests that different stresses are necessary. ("This Administration will be helpful in this regard," he insists. "We are saddled now with horribly anachronistic tax structures and the most regressive taxation is conducted on the local level, where the need is biggest. State government has to be revitalized, following New York's example. County governments have to be strengthened. We're going to have increasing reliance on regional approaches among states in a particular area of the country. And most of all, we have to develop a much more sophisticated way to compute federal aid formulae.") Goodell becomes almost excited, in his steady way. He is talking about big problems and that is very much "his thing." He'd certainly rather be doing that than digesting chicken dinners on the circuit and going through the motions at innumerable county meetings.

ROOT OF ALL CAMPAIGNS But he also has to win a statewide election in 15 months. To do so he needs to surmount large obstacles. The biggest is money. Goodell needs lots of it; he has almost none. The situation cries out for a state-wide organization in the field *today*; Goodell is so strapped for finances that he cannot even afford to have a staff member accompany him on many of his trips from Washington to New York.

Very recently, efforts were begun to piece together a group of individuals residing in various parts of the state to act as eyes and ears on a part-time basis for the Washington office; but even this modest effort is taking painfully important months to organize.

Another problem is recognition. After his trip to Biafra in February, Goodell made a major speech to the National Press Club — reporting his findings and announcing the Nixon Administration's promise of future transport assistance to starving civilians there. In the *Washington Post* it was front page news. In the *New York Times*, where, for him it really counts, there was not even a one-line mention of the story.

Fortunately, the dry season may be coming to an end. A minor, but perhaps significant victory occurred last month when the *New York Times* referred to Goodell as a "liberal Senator" in the midst

of a front-page story. One casual mention does not create a new image, but when the mention comes on the front page of the *Times*, it sure helps. And as an escape from Summer doldrums, the Senator took on none other than the venerable Everett Dirksen; a ripple which was highlighted in the Evans-Novak column and resulted in some meaty stories over the wire services on three or four different days. Just as important as the actual publicity was the fact that Goodell clearly came out on top; his criticisms serving as the catalyst for numerous complaints from other Republican Senators about Dirksen's erratic, grumpy leadership this year. But there are still millions in the State who don't recognize Goodell's name. Partially because of this, polls show him far below others in popular recognition state-wide (and, not without definite connection, show him running 2-1 behind Arthur Goldberg in popularity).

Thus, almost inevitably, there are rumblings about a primary battle. State Senator Edward Speno has expressed possible interest, Congressman Ogden Reid is conducting polls, and some State leaders have even suggested pushing Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson into the 1970 contest. But such ideas are speculation at best. It can be argued at least as persuasively that the Party will go to some extreme to avoid a bitter primary.

The last thing in the world Governor Rockefeller needs on the eve of his bid for an unprecedented 4th term (which comes along next year as well) is a bloody and divisive primary, which, especially if the Conservative Wilson opposes Goodell, could turn into a free-swinging replay of the Lindsay-Marchi fight in New York City. The Governor has worked mightily over the past year to straddle the State

Party's middle (thus the 1969 State Legislature's veer to the right and Rockefeller's reluctant endorsement of Marchi in the New York City mayoralty race); and he can hardly desire that the wounds be reopened over the Senate seat held by the man he himself appointed.

But even if no serious primary opponent does appear, well known Democrats are on the horizon. Besides Arthur Goldberg, potential nominees Theodore Sorensen, Howard Samuels, Stephen Smith and Robert F. Wagner are being mentioned.

But things will get better. Goodell may be having some trouble getting together with himself, but he also is a gifted man with extraordinary personal talent. And, importantly, he is a decent individual with the potential to be a dynamic source of ideas and energy in the Senate.

One close associate summed him up this way: "Charlie will be a creative legislator if he can get elected in 1970. He doesn't have the time now, but if he can get returned, he'll be dynamite. Everywhere he has gone in his adult life he has given life to a new corps of leadership. With time, he'd even make a superior candidate on the national ticket. But right now, he needs all the help in the world just to survive." Another associate added glumly, "no one north of Westchester County can make it on his own, and he is going to be very much on his own for the next year and a half."

But, then again, problems are not alien to Charles Goodell; and if New York Republicans will wake up to the calibre of their newest Senator he may not be alone much longer.

—CHARLES O. INGRAHAM

IDAHO: Moderate "Dick" Smith prepares to topple Reaganesque Samuelson in primary

Strong liberal opposition will confront Idaho Republican Governor Don Samuelson next year when he makes his expected bid for renomination as the GOP's gubernatorial candidate.

Moderate GOP forces, who lost control of the state party in 1966 when then-Governor Robert E. Smylie was mutilated by Samuelson in the primaries, are expected to attempt a comeback behind the banner of Eldon W. "Dick" Smith, a prominent Rexburg, Idaho

dry farmer and former legislator long active in political circles.

Smith, considered by many a liberal Republican, has long been disenchanted with Samuelson's ultra-conservatism and has been canvassing the state for some time, laying the groundwork and strategy for the coup d'etat he hopes to pull off at primary time next summer. So far he has managed to avoid being the target of criticism that he will be opposing a party incum-

bent — the precedent set by Samuelson in 1966 is all too familiar for Samuelson supporters to make such an allegation against Smith.

A member of the State Board of Education and Board of Regents and until recently its chairman, Smith has frequently made headlines as an uncompromising and outspoken foe of what he considers efforts by the governor to condemn education in Idaho to mediocrity.

In normally conservative Idaho, education is of prime concern to the voters, who a few years back approved a referendum for a three per cent sales tax from which the proceeds were to be used towards better standards, equipment, and expansion of state schools. Primary and secondary education is recognized as woefully inadequate, and state institutions of higher learning are notoriously underfinanced. Since taking office Samuelson has re-directed sales tax monies to other areas of the budget and left education with the short end of the stick.

MONEY FIGHT

During last winter's legislative session, Smith and Samuelson engaged in a much heated battle over education. At that time, Smith denounced Samuelson's budget as inadequate and stingy and became a rallying point to progressives in both parties and to educators. As it turned out, the legislature appropriated \$48.15 million for higher education, \$2.2 million less than Smith wanted but \$3.7 million more than Samuelson had asked for. Public education got \$18.65 million, close to the \$19 million asked by the board and the Idaho Education Assn., and several brackets above the meager \$15.5 million endorsed by Samuelson.

As such, Smith's crusading endeavors were considered by many to have played a large part in getting more adequate appropriations than the Samuelson administration had demanded. At the same time, the unwillingness of the pro-Samuelson GOP majority to accede to Smith's more progressive requests propelled him into the image of a gut fighter not afraid to fight a losing cause for what he believed to be right. Over-

night Smith became acclaimed as a strong friend of education.

The question of alleged campus radicalism, in the face of such upheavals elsewhere as Berkeley and San Francisco State, has further focused the education issue.

Last fall, when a Boise State College student organization sponsored an appearance of folk singer Pete Seeger on campus, Samuelson joined with right-wing groups in blasting the alleged use of education funds to promote "radical" (the implication being "Communist") causes. The governor has also harassed and tormented educators, and is at particular odds with Dr. Ernest Hartung, president at the University of Idaho and Dr. William E. "Bud" Davis of Idaho State University. Not long ago, in what may have been an effort to silence (or force the resignations of) the two presidents, both of whom have been adamantly against his administration, Samuelson suggested an audit of state university expenses on the grounds that funds were misappropriated and mismanaged.

COUNTER ATTACK

This brought a sharp counter attack from Smith, who charged Samuelson with making wild and emotional statements without having the facts. Obviously irritated, Smith opined that he had no reason to question the integrity of the educators, and challenged Samuelson's own integrity by demanding that he document his allegations. Since that time the matter of an audit has been conveniently forgotten by Samuelson.

While education is one of the prime issues upon which Smith will base his campaign, it is considered that he will broaden the issues to include party philosophy. It will be Smith's contention that Samuelson's leadership (or lack of it) has held the state back, and that the governor has arbitrarily coerced department heads and commissions to follow his every whim or else face reprisals, such as no reappointments or other favors.

Smith's big problem at the moment involves getting a spot on the primary ballot. To do so he will have

Wyoming *from page 6*

natural surface after mining activity, and certain governmental re-organization steps. The press registered unanimous editorial support for these measures and recent action by the State Tax Commission in rescinding a 35% tax exemption for uranium producers.

Since the closing days of the 1969 Legislature, when it was clear that the influence of the allied forces of the Party's old guard ultra-conservatives and the economic-political trilogy was waning, individuals and groups identified with that coalition have pursued two courses: the UP railroad has embarked upon an expensive, well administered public relations campaign on a statewide basis which depicts Wyoming and the Union Pacific as "Partners in Progress" . . . while

other individual and corporate members of the trilogy have remained silent, voicing occasional comments at conventions and other gatherings to the effect that Hathaway and other young moderates are "traitors" and have "sold out." To whom is not clear. Should Governor Hathaway decide to stand for election to a second 4-year term in next year's Republican primary he will almost certainly meet stiff opposition from an "establishment" candidate.

But the progressive trend has been set, however, and moderates and liberals within the ranks of the Wyoming GOP now see a glimmer that the party will stick with Hathaway and the more broad-based Republicanism he represents. —JACK FAIRWEATHER

to overcome at least some of the apprehension towards his more progressive views that can be expected from at least a portion of the conservatives. He also has to worry about the possibility that Lt. Gov. Jack Murphy, considered a middle-of-the-roader, may likewise declare himself a candidate. If both Smith and Murphy go on the ballot against Samuelson, the moderate vote will undoubtedly split and Samuelson could receive re-nomination by plurality. At this juncture it is not believed that Murphy will declare himself, though it is possible that Samuelson backers will try to get him to do so in the event they consider Smith a serious threat.

CROSSOVERS NEEDED

In any case, Smith will have to demonstrate a strong enough cross-sectional appeal so that some of the Democrats will cross over for him in the primaries. If they do not, it is possible that the radical right, strong in Idaho and particularly in the GOP, could give Samuelson the edge he needs. A lot will depend on whom the Democrats run. The presence of a strong progressive Democrat in the primaries could deprive Smith of the support that could put him over the top, and which undoubtedly helped Second District Congressman Orval Hansen in the primaries a year ago.

Another problem will be the Samuelson mystique. In the minds of a goodly portion of both Democratic and Republican legislators, the governor is a vindictive and antagonistic personality, of the type that Lyndon Johnson became at the height of his unpopularity. But to much of the rural vote in Idaho, Samuelson appears as a good-hearted Samaritan — naive — but honest and sincere. This notion, which is held by even some of his enemies, is fostered largely by the loveable teddy bear-Buddy Hackett-type performance that Samuelson sometimes affects together with his generalizations about protecting "the little people." In his own way, he has managed to protect himself, as a sort of populist champion of the downtrodden, over-taxed, politically uninformed lower class whites. This segment of the electorate, numerous in Idaho, is what elected Samuelson in 1966, despite almost solid opposition to his

candidacy by the populous city areas and the moderates.

There are other reasons as well why Samuelson will be no pushover. Although Smith is rated as a better potential vote-getter than Samuelson, it is Samuelson and not Smith who is in tune with the GOP bosses who run the party. State GOP Chairman Roland Wilbur and National Committeewoman Gwen Hartnett are both known to be hostile toward Smith's intentions. Idaho's GOP Senator Len Jordan and Congressman James McClure and Orval Hansen — all of whom have much stronger political bases than Samuelson — are not likely to jeopardize their more moderate support by coming to the governor's defense. But neither are they likely to line up behind Smith, a move which would put them in dutch with the conservative Republican hierarchy. Nor is there any doubt that the right-wing's extensive financial contributions for Samuelson in 1966 will again be available — despite the fact that some of this money will be siphoned off for a conservative splinter candidate that the American Independent Party plans to run.

NO PUSHOVER

And although Smith is considered a strong opponent for Samuelson, most observers do not concede him an easy task of getting the Republican nomination. Considered more of an activist than former Gov. Smylie, who never seriously challenged the conservative inner-structure of the Idaho GOP, Smith is viewed with far more apprehension by the Right than Smylie ever was. And whereas under Smylie moderate leadership of the GOP was more or less titular, Smith would probably favor a more thorough shake-up. His dilemma, then, is not an envious one.

But if Smith does not succeed in his efforts to oust Samuelson, not only will progressive Republicanism have been dealt a severe blow — but the largely one-party state of Idaho could continue to be held back by the forces of stagnant conservatism which presently dominates the GOP. It will be a contest to watch.

— from *Our Special Correspondent*

GEORGIA: Rodney Cook fights hard to assume the mantle of Atlanta's Ivan Allen

Atlanta is electing a new mayor. Shortly after the first of the year, Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., for seven years a widely respected spokesman for "the New South", announced that he would not seek a third term. The news ended a six-month period of guessing by pundits, planning for contingencies by politicians, and political uncertainty for the city itself. There was concern that racist candidates would abound and would attract sup-

port in an era of backlash and law-and-order victories. There was suspense over emergence of a strong dark-horse candidate. There was considerable apprehension because of the widely-held belief that Allen and his progressive policies were singular phenomena.

As the summer wanes, the concern, suspense, and apprehension have faded. It is reassuring that Atlanta's progress and harmony have not been a function of one

leader so much as a result of moderate citizen opinion. A city which elected Ivan Allen twice, and which has to a great degree become an envied model for creative resolution of urban conflicts and dilemmas, is not likely to foster demagoguery overnight.

By the second week in August, there were six candidates for the non-partisan, October 7, election. Leading the pack were: moderate Republican Rodney Cook, two-term city alderman and county-wide state representative, and liberal Democrat Sam Massell, Allen's two-term vice-mayor. Attracting considerable attention, but less real support, was 72-year old Everett Millican, on the Atlanta political scene for forty years as a Democratic state representative, state senator, and currently city alderman. Millican's principal thrust has been toward law-and-order, particularly law-and-order which would rid Atlanta of its small but growing hippie colony.

Showing surprisingly little strength was Dr. Horace Tate, black member of the city Board of Education, and generally regarded as moderate but relatively bland. Also at the post are Leonard Davis, an unknown black restaurant operator, and Linda Jenness, representing the Socialist Labor Party.

COOK - MASSELL RACE

Although some unexpected increase in racial tensions could change the equation where Tate and Millican are concerned, the race presently is between Cook and Massell. Massell is young and articulate but his record as an office holder leaves him without significant support from centers of power — black or white. His strategy is to build on a favorable mass impression and to tie the Republican noose around Cook's neck in a city which went overwhelmingly for Hubert Humphrey in the 1968 Presidential election. (The rural vote won the state for Wallace.) A substantial family fortune promises ample resources for his attempt.

Cook's problem is altogether different. He has been anything but bland. As a first term city alderman in 1961, he successfully spurred an investigation into the city's bureaucracy which exposed significant corruption in granting of liquor licenses and housing inspection procedures. Shortly afterward he attracted considerable attention by forcing the laggard State highway department to expedite the opening of a major portion of the city's expressway system. In 1966, Cook was one of a handful of state legislators to vote in favor of seating newly-elected Negro Julian Bond. In Republican Party circles, Cook has emerged as a forceful leader of Atlanta-based moderates, and he has from time to time earned considerable enmity from more conservative brethren.

Because of his sensitivity to their problems, and public stands like his defense of Bond's right to be seated in the state legislature, Cook has considerable support from Atlanta's black community. In his 1965 bid for re-election to the Board of Aldermen, he re-

ceived an average of 75% of the vote in black precincts. In 1968, running for re-election as county-wide (Fulton County) state representative, he showed greater strength in black precincts than any other Republican on the ballot. While Nixon was getting an average of 2.5% of the black vote, and Republican Congressman Fletcher Thompson approximately 4%, Cook received almost 30%. Black voters compose almost 40% of the Atlanta electorate.

In general, Cook has had a consistent base of strength in each of his five successful election bids since 1961. Northside Atlanta, which contains nearly 20% of the city's registered voters, is strongly Republican, upper-middle to upper income (one of the area's ten census tracts had an average family income of \$23,000 in 1960), and moderate in its views on racial and economic issues. This has been Cook's strongest area — although Massell showed considerable strength here in 1965 when he was re-elected vice-mayor. Northside Atlanta and Black Atlanta have been Cook's strongest areas — as they were for Ivan Allen. In fact, only Southeast Atlanta, which contains about 10% of the registered voters, has consistently refused to return substantial margins for Cook. This is the only area of the city which went strongly for Maddox in the 1966 gubernatorial election, and for Wallace in 1968. These people don't like Cook's liberalism, or his Republicanism — but they dislike Massell's Judaism even more. These Wallace-Maddox supporters, along with others of similar political bent, are to be found scattered throughout the city. They would normally be expected to follow Millican's law-and-order entreaties. However, one of the imponderables of the campaign is Millican's age. It has been dramatized as an issue by Cook and Massell. This alone might give potential supporters pause, but there is also another very important consideration. The only viable candidate for the vice-mayorality is Maynard Jackson, articulate black Democrat who ran a surprisingly strong primary campaign against "unbeatable" U.S. Senator Herman Talmadge. Although a strong white candidate for Vice Mayor may still emerge before the August 29 filing deadline, Jackson's election seems a good bet. The law provides that the Vice Mayor shall succeed to the Mayor's chair if the Mayor dies in office. Thus the law-and-order crowd are placed in the unusual position of paving the way for Atlanta's first black Mayor if they vote for the septuagenarian Millican.

Thus the political challenge to Cook's campaign becomes clear. He must maintain his traditional strength in Republican areas of the city. He must hold on to at least 30% of the black vote — even if Massell successfully attacks his Republicanism. Finally, his bid will be strengthened to the extent that he can draw the conservative vote to himself as the less evil alternative to Massell, and less risky than the elderly Millican.

To accomplish this, Cook has moved more aggress-

sively and more quickly than his opposition. To backstop a creative media campaign in the last four weeks of the campaign, a strong neighborhood program has been developed. In each of twenty relatively-homogeneous areas of the city, a Cook organization has been established. These organizations are to contact all registered voters, coordinate frequent walking tours by the candidate, and dramatize Cook's concern about neighborhood issues. Cook's theme is aptly summed up by his motto, which appears on all campaign literature: "Atlanta Needs Another Great Mayor: Rodney Cook." Capitalizing on Allen's 85% support (every opinion research effort to date indicates that 85% of Atlanta rates Allen's eight years as either "excellent," or "good"), the campaign hopes to portray Cook as his logical successor. Speaking to issue concerns determined by opinion research (racial relations, traffic, urban growth, are 1, 2, 3 in Atlanta) Cook has attempted to carve out an aggressive moderate approach. "Many of our citizens are concerned about crime and law enforcement. But we will not reduce crime by closing the parks, by closing the city after dark, or by weakening our already inadequate system of justice. We must have freedom from fear of attack, but we must also have freedom from fear of harassment."

At the heart of Cook's effort is a cadre of young Republican moderates. Paul Coverdell, 30-year-old insurance executive who was a complete unknown until his bid for the state senate in 1968, is campaign manager. Coverdell's aim is to stimulate involvement of the young in state and local politics. The author serves as assistant campaign manager. Spearheading the field organization efforts of the campaign are Joe Wilkinson, 1969 graduate of the University of Georgia, one of the most effective young moderates in the Georgia Republican Party, Cullen Hammond, Ripon Correspondent for Georgia, and past Treasurer of the State Federation of Young Republican Clubs, and Pete Boedy, a campaign coordinator for the successful special-election bid of State Senator Earl Patton. Patton is a leader of Atlanta area moderates.

The spirit of the campaign was aptly summarized by Cook's conclusion to his campaign kickoff speech:

So I want to ask your help — not just for the next four months but for the next four years. Help me seek out concerned citizens — not just campaigners, but city builders — of all ages, of all races, from all parts of the city. We have a great task ahead of us, not only to get elected mayor, but to build a great city. That is the challenge for the next fifteen-hundred days.

Rodney Cook might have added that a third challenge of this campaign is building a responsive, moderate Republican Party for Georgia.

HENRY H. PERRITT, JR.

Goodell *from page 20*

The author says that VISTA has, in the past year, taken a number of steps that change the kind of Volunteers entering VISTA service. He points out that the Volunteers are older and more skilled and that Volunteers are being recruited from poverty communities too. Yet, for reasons I for one don't understand, he chooses to interpret these changes as part of an "elaborate shell game." The fact is that VISTA is now actively recruiting Volunteers who bring with them professional skills. (1,400 lawyers applied for VISTA service in the past six months.) VISTA has also successfully recruited business school graduates, architects and nurses. I must admit these steps will not of themselves eliminate poverty either. But they can make a difference.

I have obviously followed VISTA developments in New York City with particular interest. The unskilled Volunteers are systematically being replaced there. Some 55 of the 200 VISTA Volunteers now in New York City are lawyers bringing technical assistance and equal justice to organizations of the poor. Twenty-five black students from Shaw University are working as VISTAs in New York in a junior year of service to the poor instead of the old junior year abroad. Black and Puerto Rican Volunteers from the poorest parts of New York are serving their communities in VISTA.

I submit that this kind of activity is meaningful. Change is measured in little steps; VISTA is part of the solution.

August 12, 1969
Washington, D.C.

Cook *from page 20*

ABM is not automatically a great symbol. It will become an historical watershed only if subsequent efforts are made and do, in fact, succeed. Its chapter in history has not yet been written because its significance is not yet clear. If it is to mean anything at all to future generations it has to be the beginning not the end of our efforts to reduce the military emphasis of our society to a level consistent with a true "national security".

Many other amendments will be offered to the military procurement bill this year. Most, if not all, will fail. But the effort will be made this year and next year and on and on until this country becomes the nation it ought to be. So to all of you who take comfort in the ABM vote as a symbolic success I say gird yourselves for the battle has just begun!

14a ELIOT STREET

• The Ripon Society proudly announces its formal expansion to a tenth city — Philadelphia. With its position paper on housing in this issue a group of Ripon members have fulfilled requirements for chapter status. President of the new group will be **Richard B. Block**, an attorney and candidate for U.S. Congress in Philadelphia's center city last fall. **Herbert J. Hutton**, also an attorney, has been elected vice-president. New National Governing Board members will be **Dr. Paul Niebanek**, Chairman of the Department of City Planning at the University of Pennsylvania, and **Roger Whittlesey**, president of Whittlesey and Associates advertising firm.

• Ripons have been making news during the past month. On Friday, August 15, former Ripon President and current White House speechwriter, **Lee W. Huebner** appeared on National Educational Television's program **Newsfront** with **Kevin P. Phillips**, aide to **John N. Mitchell** and author of **The Emerging Republican Majority**. **Bill D. Moyers**, publisher of Long Island newspaper **Newsday** was the moderator. Phillips and Huebner discussed the direction of the Republican party and a possible Southern strategy. In a deeply moving studio ceremony after air time, Huebner and several assembled Ripons fulfilled Phillips' innermost desire and presented him with a Ripon tie.

• The August 15 issue of **Time Magazine** carried a story on black capitalism, emphasizing Ripon's criticism of the administration's inactivity in this area and the Society's demand for the removal of SBA Administrator **Hilary J. Sandoval, Jr.** (see July, 1969 FORUM)

• On August 14 Evans and Novak chose Ripon member, Vermont State Legislator, and D.C. consulting firm head, **John McClaughry** as their subject for a column attacking the administration for ignoring its campaign promises to black business. McClaughry, one of the creators of Nixon's campaign speech on black capitalism, wrote Atty. Gen. **John Mitchell** to criticize the administration's inactivity in this field. The Attorney General failed to respond to McClaughry's letter.

• Masthead readers may have noticed **Lee Auspitz** absent from his usual place last month. Lee has temporarily left his position as President of the Society to serve as research director to the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization (PACEO). In his stead is acting president **Howard Gillette**. Also roosting in the northeast corner of the Executive Office Building is former executive director **Tim Petri**, special assistant to **Walter N. Thayer**, who is a special consultant to the President on Executive Reorganization.

LETTERS

RIPON'S PROBLEM

Dear Sir:

This past year your articles on the MIC were excellent, but I find your continual defense of national and local "moderates" including Richard Nixon, tiresome. Otepka, Thurmond, Dirksen, the Knowles affair, ABM, MIRV, cutbacks in Job Corps, dismissal of Alexander and other blows to civil rights action — these and many other moves by RMN are condemnable. They are not "moderate". So often you say sweet things about local Republicans (state and municipal figures) who just don't deserve laurels. Perhaps the problem is that the Ripon Society has failed to see (or rejected) the growing mass of young voters like myself who look at a man first and party label last. When I vote, I care not if a man is Republican — that's old politics which, if it did not die in 1968, should have.

Bryant Avery
University of Michigan,
Graduate Student

OMIT CIA

Dear Sirs:

For the record: In the book review which I submitted for your July issue (**Agents of Change: A Close Look at the Peace Corps**) I made no mention of the CIA. And yet, to my surprise, I found the following sentence in my review: "But at the same time, there is a danger that the Peace Corps could become over-structured, over-State-Departmentalized not to mention CIAed, and over 30."

In the review which I submitted the sentence read as follows: "But at the same time, there is a danger that the Peace Corps could become over-structured, over-State-Departmentalized and over 30."

If I had thought there was a serious danger of a CIA link I would have said so. But the Peace Corps has always been extremely careful to avoid even the appearance of proximity to the intelligence community and I

am confident that it will continue to keep its distance. To do otherwise would kill the Peace Corps.

I can only conclude that either the Post Office, the CIA or the Forum editors made this substantive change in my review. I would appreciate an explanation.

DON WOLFENBERGER
Alexandria, Va.

The CIA mention originated in Cambridge on the basis of reliable information gleaned from former Peace Corps volunteers in South America. Sincere apologies are due to Mr. Wolfensberger for the communications oversight in editing, however. —A.D.M.

SUBVERSIVE LITERATURE

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In an experiment recently conducted by the University of Maryland, these words, supposedly familiar to all Americans, were read to 252 U.S. soldiers at a base in West Germany without being identified as an excerpt from the Declaration of Independence.

The GI's were asked to sign the statement if they agreed. The result: 73% refused to sign.

Guest Editorials

VISTA: Part of the solution

The July article, *Can a VISTA Find Happiness Attacking Elephants With a Pea Shooter?*, was compelling in its anguish and a good illustration of the fact that when VISTA Volunteers fail it is not because they care too little, but because they care too much. But while the anonymous author is passionate in his appeal, he is ultimately unconvincing in his argument. He complains the program is both ineffectual and hypocritical. VISTA, he charges, has not eliminated unemployment, poor schools, dilapidated housing. VISTA's mission, as defined by the author, is nothing less than the single-handed elimination of poverty itself.

By Senator Charles E. Goodell

Senator Charles Goodell, coincidentally profiled in this issue, has asked for the opportunity to comment on last month's FORUM article on VISTA.

But is that true? Is that really fair? I have talked at length with senior VISTA officials and have never heard them define the mission for their 6000 Volunteers so immodestly. They know, as we all know, that Volunteers are only one small part of the answer; that the basic problems of deprivation need to be attacked on a massive scale; and that, unfortunately, as a nation, we have not yet made the kind of commitment that is required if the necessary change is to take place.

The article is steeped in frustration — justifiable frustration, for I can well understand how discouraging it must be to accomplish limited objectives when the need is so great (and how tempting it must be to turn on the organization, imperfect like all organizations, that sent you into a difficult situation!). But does that mean that those objectives, however limited, are not worth accomplishing? I don't think so.

Of course, massive social and economic reforms are urgently needed. Of course, Volunteers are only part of the solution. Of course, Volunteers and the organizations they work with sometimes fail. Of course, failure breeds frustration. But VISTA and other volunteer programs are nevertheless of real importance. They not only offer a channel for those who care enough to make a contribution; they often do make very significant contributions.

Please turn to Page 18

The night after the ABM vote

I am lying here in bed scratching out this guest editorial on a legal pad. Sleep will be impossible for awhile because too much has reached culmination today to permit immediate repose. This is August 6, 1969, 24 years to the day after the first atomic bomb was dropped upon human beings. I cannot help pondering how history will treat this day which may well be significant in its own right.

By Senator Marlow W. Cook

Senator Cook of Kentucky has quickly distinguished himself during his freshman term as a leader in the fight for a reordering of the nation's priorities. Here he gives his reaction to the outcome of the six-month ABM battle.

We voted in the Senate today, after almost a year of public and Congressional debate, upon the issue of whether to deploy an anti-ballistic missile at this time. On several extremely close votes the decision was rendered and the proposed Safeguard system was approved. This was the first time since World War II that a major item in a defense budget request had been seriously questioned. And on two crucial votes first 50 and then 49 Senators cast their votes against deployment of this new addition to the ever burgeoning family of nuclear weapons. Many Senators showed great political courage in casting their votes with the minority against deployment. Some opposed a President of their own party, others huge defense establishments in their states, and all stood firm against the rising tide of public sentiment for the system aroused by the perennially simplistic and irrelevant cry, "it's necessary for the national security".

The tendency of many who opposed deployment and failed will be proudly to say we fought the good fight, we showed the Pentagon, we proved our point. However, I must caution against being overcome by the euphoria of the moment. I am impelled to remind all of us who fought and lost that we did, nevertheless, lose. ABM is a valid symbol in our efforts to establish new priorities in this country only if it is followed up by bold and courageous action coupled with close scrutiny and a sharp pencil when new defense requests are made. Just because the opponents of ABM deployment gave the establishment a scare on this vote does not mean that weapons systems not in the best interest of this country will cease to be proposed by the Pentagon.

Please turn to Page 18