

RIPON FORUM

CONTENTS

Politics	1-4
Commentary	5-7
Duly Noted	7-8

FEBRUARY 15, 1974

Vol. X, No. 4

50 CENTS

POLITICS: REPORTS

CALIFORNIA

SACRAMENTO — The decision of California Attorney General Evelle Younger (R) to seek re-election rather than the GOP gubernatorial nomination leaves only two Republicans in the race: Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke and Controller Houston J. Flournoy.

Reinecke, the heir to conservative support now that Younger is out of the race, made a thinly-veiled challenge to outgoing Gov. Ronald Reagan shortly before the attorney general withdrew. Reinecke told a *Sacramento Bee* reporter that if Reagan did not abandon his neutrality in the gubernatorial race, Reinecke just might be neutral in the 1976 presidential race. Reinecke was originally appointed to his post by Reagan.

The lieutenant governor virtually challenged Reagan to endorse him, asserting that Reagan needs Reinecke as governor more than Reinecke needs Reagan's support in the primary. "If (Reagan) doesn't carry his own state in 1974, he is in a really volatile position for 1976," said Reinecke. "This is an opportunity for Reagan to show some leadership. He needs to inject himself in the primary — even at the risk of being called a kingmaker."

Former Lt. Gov. Robert H. Finch (R) has completely removed himself from consideration for nomination as either governor or senator. "If I had run for dog catcher, every question I'd have had would have been on Watergate," said the former White House counselor.

Flournoy supporters are encouraged by the elimination of Younger from the gubernatorial race. They hope that in a one-on-one situation with Rein-

ecke, Flournoy's superiority will be clearly evident to voters. The Reagan protégé was set back in December by the resignation of Lyn Nofziger as his campaign director. Nofziger, a former aide to Reagan, had repeated differences with Reinecke over campaign strategy, leading finally to a resignation letter in which Nofziger wrote, "You and I just are not on the same wave length." Reinecke further suffers from his association with the ITT-Republican National Convention mess. Reinecke, however, has led in the polls and would be the natural favorite of Republican conservatives.

San Francisco Chronicle columnist Herb Caen has reported, "In Sacramento, the knowledgeable would no longer be surprised if Houston Flournoy emerges as the Republican nominee, now that Dave Packard (former Defense Department official) is backing him."

The Republican race for lieutenant governor has apparently narrowed to a contest between conservative Sen. John L. Harmer, chairman of the Sen-

ate GOP Caucus, and moderate John Veneman, a former under-secretary of HEW who now is a San Francisco business consultant. Elliot Richardson, Veneman's ex-boss at HEW, is due in Los Angeles February 27 for a Veneman fundraising dinner. With Flournoy running for governor, the Republican nominee for controller appears likely to be moderate State Assemblyman William Bagley. State Director of Consumer Affairs John Kehoe seems to have backed away from the race.

Having failed to attract any prominent Republicans to run against Sen. Alan Cranston, a prominent Democrat appears ready to challenge the state's senior senator. S.I. Hayakawa, the controversial former president of San Francisco State College, changed his registration to the GOP in preparation for making the race; he will, however, have to challenge a law requiring candidates to belong to their party for a year prior to seeking office. Dr. Earl Brian, secretary of health and welfare in the Reagan Administration, has resigned to also seek the GOP nomination.

Part of the blame for the GOP's loss of a "safe" Republican Senate seat in a recent special election is attributed to a fundraising party hosted by Gov. Reagan in his official residence. The party was seized by Democrats as a campaign issue. Despite the fact that State Assemblyman Jerry Lewis, the Republican Senate candidate in the race, attempted to disassociate himself from President Nixon (and even Gov. Reagan at times), the impact of Watergate on the election's outcome was obvious. Some of Lewis' supporters were calling for Nixon's resignation by the time the votes were tallied. Republicans had hoped to retain the seat and thus keep their precarious 20-20 balance with Democrats in the State Senate. In fact, Democrats had charged that the special election was an attempt to avoid a Democratic



Ronald Reagan

victory in the district in 1974.

The Democrats now control the Senate 21-19 and, according to the *California Journal*, are likely to continue to do so after the 1974 elections. Analyzing the State Assembly races, the *Journal* concludes: "36 safe Democrats, 9 leaning Democratic, 25 safe Republicans, 2 leaning Republican, 8 doubtful." The magazine forecasts that the Democrats' 49-31 majority should not be in much jeopardy. There is still a possibility, however, of a court appeal of the recent court-ordered redistricting.

State Sen. George Moscone (D) meanwhile has withdrawn from the Democratic gubernatorial contest leaving Secretary of State Edmund G. Brown, Jr., as the popularity leader for the Democrats, with San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto as "number two" and still trying. Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti gained from his leadership of the opposition to Reagan's 1973 tax initiative, but he still trails in the polls.

Gov. Reagan has set March 5 as the primary date and April 2 for the special election to choose a successor to the late U.S. Rep. Charles M. Teague (R) in the 13th C.D., which includes most of Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. State Sen. Robert Lagomarsino (R) announced his candidacy after apparently ascertaining that Santa Paula Mayor Alan Teague, son of the late congressman, would not run.

The nomination of U.S. Rep. William Mailliard (R) to be ambassador to the Organization of American States further clouds the future of Mailliard's seat, which was made much more heavily Democratic as a result of court-ordered redistricting. If a special election is held immediately, the GOP would have a better chance to keep the post behind State Sen. Milton Marks, a progressive San Francisco Republican. The special election would be held under the old district lines, giving Republicans a chance to field an incumbent in the fall election. The likely Democratic candidate is Assemblyman John Burton, the Democratic state chairman. There are no party lines in special elections in California, although runoffs are provided for in the event that no candidate receives a majority. ■

OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA CITY — If the stink of political corruption hurts any Democratic governor this year, it ought to smell out Gov. David Hall (D), whose present and former executive assistants have both been indicted by grand juries on charges involving kickbacks on state contracts.

In December, Joe Carter, a former aide to Democratic National Chairman Robert Strauss and then executive assistant to Gov. Hall, was indicted on perjury charges by a county grand jury. Also indicted by another grand jury were A. W. "Sunny" Jenkins, a former aide to Hall who quit in June; Lynn D. "Bunny" Hall, former chairman of the State Board of Affairs; and three construction company executives. Hall has testified that he rejected bribe offers from construction company officials but did collect about \$10,000 a month from these companies for use by the governor.

Hall, who defeated Sen. Dewey Bartlett (R) for re-election to the governor's post in 1970 by only 2,000 votes, won election with heavy rural support. (Rural Oklahoma is a Democratic bastion, whereas urban areas — Oklahoma City and Tulsa — are more Republican.) Hall's Highway Death Trap Elimination Program was one way of distributing the state pork barrel to reward rural support.

The December indictments compound the troubles of Democrats hit earlier this year by federal indictments of State Treasurer Leo Winters (D), a former lieutenant governor, as well as John V. "Mike" Rainbolt, chairman of the state highway commission, and 12 others on charges involving the mishandling of state funds.

The logical Democratic beneficiary of Hall's problems is Attorney General Larry Derryberry, a 34-year-old former state representative elected to his current office in 1970. But Derryberry was slightly tarnished by the earlier federal indictments and would seem politically ambitious if he pressed indictments against the governor's office too hard.

Freshman U.S. Rep. Clem McSpadden (D), who served in the State

Senate from 1954 to 1972 before taking over the congressional seat abandoned by former U.S. Rep. Ed Edmondson, has already announced he will seek the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. So has State Rep. David Boren, a 32-year-old attorney.

The leading Republican contender for governor is State Sen. Denzil Garrison, who combines popularity with both Democrats and conservative Republicans. State Sen. James Inhofe is another likely aspirant, however, and former Attorney General G. T. Blankenship has also considered the race. Blankenship was defeated for re-election in 1970.

Sen. Henry Bellmon (R) is the favorite for re-election despite the Democratic candidacy of Edmondson, who lost the 1972 Senate election to Bartlett by a 52-48 percent margin. Bellmon, though a long-time Nixon supporter, has been sufficiently independent of the President recently to avoid tarring by a Watergate brush. Differences among Bellmon, Bartlett, and GOP State Chairman Clarence Warner have been patched up sufficiently to keep the party in one piece.

The GOP's sole chance at picking up a House seat is in the 1st C.D. where Democrat James R. Jones succeeded Republican Page Belcher in 1972. Jones, a 34-year-old attorney who won 54 percent of the vote in 1972, may face attorney Robert Rizley, who lost the GOP nomination in the last election. Despite the Republican nature of the district, Jones will be tough to beat. ■

SOUTH DAKOTA

PIERRE — The South Dakota Supreme Court has reversed the decision of a lower court barring Gov. Richard F. Kneip from seeking a third term as a Democrat.

The court decision opens the possibility of a gory, bruising battle for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination between Gov. Kneip and Lt. Gov. William J. Dougherty, who represents the same wing of the party as Attorney General Kermit Sande (whom Kneip

once tried to dump from the ticket) and Sen. James Abourezk (who has challenged Kneip's leadership of the party on two occasions).

Prospects are for "one hell of a fight," according to one Republican official. The GOP hopes to slip through the Democratic disarray with former highway administrator John Olson, now executive director of the influential Rural Electrification Association.

The parties reverse positions in the senatorial race, where the Republicans are headed for a primary. Sen. George McGovern, despite his close association with Dougherty in the past, appears to have deftly maintained his neutrality in the current dispute.

The former Democratic presidential nominee has also transferred a large chunk of residual funds from his presidential campaign to operate no less than 14 field offices in the state. South Dakota Republican chairman E. Steeves Smith has questioned McGovern's transfer of \$332,500 in presidential monies to operate these offices, which McGovern claims are designated to provide better services for his constituents. Ostensibly, the offices are "official" and not "campaign" facilities.

Watergate has wiped out a number of McGovern's campaign handicaps and perhaps eliminated the GOP's opportunity to oust the prairie populist. There are two announced candidates for the post: former Lt. Col. Leo Thorsness, a POW Medal of Honor winner, and Al Shock, a businessman whom Republicans have long wanted to run for office. Shock was an early favorite but may be falling behind the rapidly-accelerating effort of Thorsness, who appears to be attracting some strong organizational support. A third candidate, former federal Civil Service Commissioner Barbara Gunderson, has not yet officially announced. ■

NEW JERSEY

TRENTON — New Jersey's new Republican state chairman is 74-year-old Webster Todd, who fills the vacancy created by the sudden death of John Spoltore.

Todd had been state chairman from 1961 to 1969, during which time he gained a reputation as a party moderate and staunch supporter of the presidential ambitions of Nelson A. Rockefeller.

When William Cahill won the 1969 gubernatorial primary, he unceremoniously dumped Todd and replaced him with his friend, John Dimon of Burlington County. When U.S. Rep. Charles Sandman beat Cahill in the 1973 primary, he in turn replaced Dimon with Spoltore and prevailed upon Todd to return to statewide politics by becoming chairman of the Republican State Finance Committee. Sandman's move was a shrewd one.

In addition to his moderate credentials, Todd brought to the finance job his close contacts with the wealthy "horse country" Republican families of Morris, Somerset, Hunterdon, and Warren counties who traditionally have comprised the financial base of the New Jersey GOP. In addition, Todd had often contributed substantial amounts from his own pocket to needy GOP organizations.

At the time of his death, Spoltore was desperately trying to retain the state chairmanship in the face of demands to reshape the party after the shattering defeat of Sandman by Brendan Byrne in the general election.

Two of the most vocal critics of the Sandman camp became candidates to succeed Spoltore upon his death. They were Monmouth County GOP Chairman Benjamin Danskin and Essex County GOP Chairman Frederic Rem-

ington. Danskin, the favorite, found his position completely undermined when an odd coalition of right-wing Sandman allies and "horse country" state committeemen prevailed upon Todd to become a candidate.

Money was a major issue in the chairmanship race. Danskin and Remington did not want the state GOP to assume Sandman's enormous campaign debt, the bulk of which was owed to conservative South Jersey developers and bankers. ■

RIPON SUIT

WASHINGTON, D.C. — The Ripon Society has announced it will appeal a recent U.S. District Court ruling regarding delegate apportionment to the 1976 Republican National Convention. Ripon will ask the Court of Appeals to "determine the constitutionally permissible standards" for a formula "which is fair to Republicans throughout the United States. We seek a formula," Ripon asserted, "which accurately reflects each state's share of the Electoral College vote and each state's Republican strength."

Although the court ruled in favor of Ripon on the major issue of a uniform victory bonus, the court also held that the delegate apportionment formula may include a proportional victory bonus. In the context of the formula adopted at the 1972 Republican National Convention, the proportional victory bonus is equivalent to approximately a 20 percent bonus for each state carried for the 1972 Republican presidential nominee.

While only one state, Massachusetts, would be penalized in 1976 as a result of the court's ruling, Ripon argues that such a bonus system in a normal election year could discriminate against Republicans in many more states. ■

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

THE RIPON FORUM is published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, Inc., 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing houses. Contents are copyrighted © 1974 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, \$3 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

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

Tanya Melich
Robert G. Stewart
Ralph Thayer

Contributing Editors: Clifford Brown, Glenn Gerstell, William A. Koelsch, Daniel J. Swillinger, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Richard W. Rahn, John A. Rehfuess, and Thomas A. Sargent

Assistant Editor: M. Victoria Golden

Art: Leslie Morrill and Annie Greene

Advertising Manager: Deborah Bowen

Staff Assistant: Nelson Millet

POLITICS: PEOPLE

● House Minority Leader **John J. Rhodes** (R) has shown admirable restraint and tact in his new job, particularly on the subject of Watergate. Rhodes, who is respected in Congress for his openmindedness, commented in a recent issue of the RNC's Monday: "Based on a high standard of past leadership, the GOP has every reason to look forward to a long and healthy existence within the American political system. But first things first: We must conduct ourselves responsibly during this time of confusion and distrust. We cannot hope to stop 'wallowing in Watergate' until Watergate is resolved, as it will be by the processes provided in the Constitution of the United States. As a party, we must not simply observe the nation's inevitable emergence from Watergate; we must help to lead it, candidly admitting blame where blame is deserved and staunchly defending ourselves where blame has been misplaced."

● Rhodes' statesmanship on Watergate contrasts with the rhetoric the White House supplied to Rhodes' predecessor, Vice President **Gerald Ford**, when Ford spoke to the American Farm Bureau Federation in Atlantic City January 15. Ford blamed impeachment efforts on "a few extreme partisans" and a "relatively small group of activists." Although both Ford and Rhodes both wisely advocate a quick resolution of House impeachment proceedings, Ford's rhetoric was undignified and columnists **William White**, **Robert Novak** and **Rowland Evans**, and *Newsweek's* **Kermit Lansner** said so. Even Ford's hometown newspaper, the *Grand Rapids Press*, was critical, but the White House was so enthusiastic that it mailed copies of the speech to editors across the country.

● **David Trask**, the "fish man of Thomaston," is running for governor of Maine. The inmate of Maine State Prison at Thomaston, known for his collection of 1,400 tropical fish, says of his candidacy, "At least everybody will know I am a crook right from the start."

● The Wisconsin GOP voted at a special convention January 12 to continue the party's policy of preprimary endorsements. The GOP rank and file had voted last year to discontinue the endorsements — over the opposition of the party leadership. All factions of the leadership united behind the endorsement policy, however, and exerted sufficient pressure to win the balloting this time. As U.S. Rep. **William Steiger** (R) summarized the situation in the *Milwaukee Journal* prior to the meeting, "Should the party retain its important voice — the mandatory preprimary convention endorsement — or, in the guise of reform, should delegates invoke the option of silence whenever the choice of competing candidates is difficult?"

● It may be relatively easy for a "safe" incumbent to set a \$100 limit on individual campaign contributions. U.S. Rep. **Barber B. Conable, Jr.**, is himself now "safe," having won 68 percent of the vote in 1972, but since 1964 when he first ran for Congress, Conable has accepted only contributions of \$50 or less. Self-restraint in fundraising is admirable in an incumbent, but even more commendable in campaigns where the challenger is a distinct underdog.

● New Hampshire Gov. **Meldrim Thomson** (R), sometimes called the "Reagan of the East," has endorsed California Gov. **Ronald Reagan** (R) for President. Thomson made the announcement while Reagan was in New Hampshire to speak at a fundraising dinner. Earlier in the month in Chicago, Reagan told a group of Republican state chairmen that the GOP is still "a majority party in terms of philosophy." Reagan must not read the Gallup polls.

● An independent poll conducted by the Atlanta-based *Darden Research Corp.* has shown that Lt. Gov. **Lester Maddox** (D) is not invincible in this year's gubernatorial election. Although Maddox apparently has the hard-core support of about 40 percent of the Georgia electorate, the poll indicates it may be hard for the former governor to attract a majority. Although in the poll he easily beat two likely Democratic candidates, State Rep. **George Busbee** and former State Highway Commissioner **Bert Lance**, and the 1970 GOP candidate, **Hal Suit**, his percentage in each case was nearly the same, about 41-42 percent. In 1970, Maddox won only 51.3 percent of the vote in his race for lieutenant governor.

● Maine industrialist **Robert A. G. Monks** announced his decision January 22 not to run for the GOP's gubernatorial nomination. Monks' decision left three men in the race: State Senators **Wakine Tanous** and **Harrison Richardson** and former Attorney General **James S. Erwin**. Monks said his polls showed that 70 percent of his support would move to Erwin after his withdrawal.

● Former Vermont Gov. **Deane C. Davis** (R) said recently that he intends to endorse a gubernatorial candidate in this year's primary. The announcement reopened 1972 campaign wounds. Lt. Gov. **John Burgess**, one of about five gubernatorial possibilities, said subsequently that Davis ought to stay neutral; Davis' support for **Luther F. Hackett** in 1972 divided the party and contributed to the loss of the governorship. Discussions have been under way to head off a gubernatorial primary among former Attorney General **James Jeffords**, Lt. Gov. **John Burgess**, and House Speaker **Walter "Peanuts" Kennedy**. Kennedy drew praise last year from an unusual source, former Gov. **Philip Hoff**, now state Democratic chairman. Hoff said Kennedy stands "head and shoulders above all others" in the GOP. Should Sen. **George Aiken** (R) decide not to seek re-election, former Gov. Davis might be a candidate for the post.

● U.S. Rep. **Paul N. McCloskey** faces a tough fight for re-election to his 17th C.D. seat in California. McCloskey, who won a primary against two conservatives in 1972 with 44 percent of the vote, may face a single conservative in this June's primary. Wealthy businessman **Gordon Knapp**, who ran as a conservative write-in candidate in the 1972 general election, may be the sole opponent to McCloskey. In announcing his candidacy, McCloskey said he would accept contributions only up to \$100, and supporters fear that the progressive incumbent may be outspent 2-1 in the primary campaign.

● Republican National Committee Co-chairwoman **Janet Johnston** has resigned effective February 1. Ms. Johnston, who is also California's national committee-woman, had served in her post for less than a year.

COMMENTARY: POLITICS

The Republican Respon- sibility

by Robert D. Bebn

What will Republicans talk about on Lincoln Day this year? Twelve months ago the theme was the emerging Republican majority, at least at the presidential level. Now, that bubble is burst — punctured by John Dean, the tapes, and the real estate and income tax laws — and a new theme must be found. What can Republican congressmen — who must vote on impeachment within several months and who, by all accounts except those of George Bush and Ronald Reagan, will have trouble at the polls next November — take as their lesson from Lincoln when they travel the country in February to raise funds from the troubled party faithful?

There will be a temptation to declare that Watergate is behind us, to argue that the energy crisis, inflation, and unemployment are the truly important policy issues, and consequently to quote from President Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address: "With malice toward none, with charity for all . . . let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds." Yet any Republican who asks for political amnesty for the Republican Administration ignores Richard Nixon's belligerent denial of amnesty a year ago when he had the Lincoln-esque opportunity, after a war, to "bind up

the nation's wounds." And any Republican who dismisses Watergate as inconsequential is attempting to hide from the fundamental question of when political leaders should be held accountable for their campaign workers and governmental subordinates. A Republican sermon that assumes today's "great national trial" is over ignores the uncertainties and decisions that face the nation during the next several months.

For guidance from Lincoln in 1974, Republicans would best look to speeches delivered early in his Administration, when the outcome of the struggle to save the Union was still unclear. In his second annual message to Congress, at the end of 1862, Lincoln spoke of the need for wisdom, of the need to accept responsibility:

If there ever could be a proper time for mere catch arguments, that time surely is not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity. . . . The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

Republicans have been hoping all winter that Nixon himself would let them off the hook — hoping that by his resignation the President would save them from their constitutional responsibility of casting a vote, "yeah" or "nay," on an impeachment resolution. But the President, as they all must know by now, will not give them "the easy way." Every GOP congressman will have to cast a vote.

In the House of Representatives, Republicans have a special responsibility — for it is our party that recommended Richard Nixon to the American public as our best man for the presidency. The presidential nomination of the two major parties is the most valued prize in American politics, for 50 percent of those nominated will be elected. The Republicans proposed Nixon in 1968 and 1972 and now, the polls show, the public is holding the GOP accountable for him and for the deeds of his White House staff.

As Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) has stated: ". . . while the Republican Party, and 99.9 percent of its individual members, may not be responsible for Watergate, the party will be, and should be, harshly held accountable if it does not lead the effort to ensure that such gross abuse of public trust is fully and faithfully investigated and prosecuted." U.S. Rep. John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) has put it more succinctly: "It's a Republican problem and we can't turn aside from it." Still, few other Republicans are willing to recognize, let alone accept, the party's responsibility.

Republicans, now, "must rise with the occasion." GOP congressmen "must think anew and act anew." Perhaps Minority Leader John Rhodes should assign one or two House Republicans to act as the President's partisan defenders, as Richard Nixon's attorneys before the grand jury of the House of Representatives. But the remainder of the Republican representatives must "disenthrall" themselves if they are to "save our country."

It serves neither themselves, the party, nor the nation for Republicans to suggest that undisclosed evidence would resolve everything. Sen. Howard Baker, Jr. (R-Tenn.), told the American people that about the plumbers, yet it is not clear why the purloining of classified documents from Henry Kissinger's briefcase to the Pentagon justifies breaking into Dr. Fielding's office. Now, Sen. Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) tells us that the summary of a non-



erased tape proves John Dean is wrong. As Lincoln wrote to Secretary of War Edwin Stanton: "Truth is generally the best vindication against slander."

Nor is the argument that impeachment will destroy the balance of powers between the branches of government or the nation itself worthy of the times. The obverse of this argument is raised on the other side: failure to impeach now, after months of continuing revelations of the Administration's misconduct, will destroy the balance of powers and the nation. "If there ever could be a proper time for mere catch arguments, that time surely is not now."

As they speak on Lincoln Day, Republican representatives must make it clear to the party and to the nation that their impeachment vote will not be determined by partisan loyalties, by their own re-election polls, or by "catch arguments." They must make it clear that they will demand all available evidence before making a final judgment. They must make it clear that they will weigh this evidence both in terms of the effect upon the nation's future if the President is not impeached, and in terms of the impact upon the Union if the House adopts the resolution. They must make it clear to Republicans that the House of Representatives is being asked, under the most generous interpretation of the facts, to determine the extent of a President's responsibility for the deeds of his own Executive Office. GOP congressmen must make it clear that for this decision, which will establish an important precedent for future political behavior, the "dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present."

Finally, Republican congressmen must make it clear to their Republican audiences that all Republicans have a responsibility for the man in the White House, and that Republican representatives — for the first time in over a century — have the judicial responsibility to determine just exactly what are presidential "high crimes and misdemeanors."

"In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity." ■

Robert D. Behn is chairman of the FORUM EDITORIAL BOARD. Ely Peterson, is a former assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee.

COMMENTARY: POLITICS

The Peterson Peace Plan

by *Ely Peterson*

Republicans face real problems in 1974; so does the nation's two-party system. In order to strengthen both the GOP and the two-party system, Republicans need planning as well as rhetoric. Apathy and indifference can hurt the GOP, but a lack of inspiration and proper planning can kill it. To attack the party's debilitated condition, I make the following proposals:

First, the party must drop regional and philosophical differences through 1974 and instead concentrate on retaining present congressional seats and adding new ones where possible. A party with which only 20 percent of the American electorate identify cannot afford infighting. The attention of national and state leaders should be directed to upcoming elections at all levels and not to the unending misery of Watergate. The Republican Party played no part in the creation of this debacle and should not now become enmeshed in its solution to the exclusion of other, more important party tasks.

Second, a series of meetings should be held, first, by the top elected leaders. They should commit their time and effort to fundraising and morale building in the GOP. These elected leaders should also commit themselves to a given number of speeches to party functions — without charge. As a second step, a series of meetings should be held across the country for party leaders which would mix Republicans

from all sections of the country. Rather than rigidifying regional differences, these meetings would seek to promote insight into common problems and set joint priorities. Following these inter-regional gatherings, regional meetings would be held to discuss the reports and settle the implementation of party mandates.

These meetings would be followed up by party assessment squads to analyze what sections of the country rate national assistance. Intensive leadership training courses should then be held for new state chairmen, campaign managers, and other party staff. (The proposed courses are not meant to be the usual "garden" variety of weekend orientations where most participants are filled with generalities and liquor.)

Furthermore, the GOP should begin an ongoing campaign to revitalize the party and attract new activists. Its campaign should include:

- Fellowships for young men and women interested in becoming executive directors and campaign managers, in which the "fellows" would travel around the nation learning practical politics from the grass roots in a variety of organizational capacities.

- High school and college programs to include training programs in politics for political science teachers; preparation of Republicans who could assist professional teachers in the presentation of classes on American politics; and the assemblage of political material for inclusion in libraries to assist students in research and enlighten them on the fundamentals of politics.

Finally, the philosophy and program of the Republican Party need to be taken to the people. If Republicans don't attract large crowds, the GOP should organize speakers to take its programs to civic, business, church, and women's groups.

The Republican Party desperately needs a program to revitalize and train its members for the upcoming campaigns. The party needs to get off its usual philosophical "kick" and concentrate on organization. Almost as important, it needs a dramatic and dynamic program to weed out the so-called "leaders" who contribute little to party success. The GOP needs movers and shakers, not sitters and waiters. ■

● MARGIN RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C. — I don't visit Washington, D.C. very often and all my other habits are good, e.g. I never erase my mistakes.

So when the temperature hit -2 degrees on Breed's Hill and my water supply froze, I postponed my flight to the nation's capital. The President has enough troubles running the country without me.

Despairing that the British would release my water, I finally caught a later flight to National Airport, from where I expected to catch a bus to downtown D.C. Alas, the bus service was discontinued January 1, presumably in accordance with the Administration's support for mass transit.

The cabs were still operating, so I took a taxi to the Old Executive Office where the White House guard instructed me to open my suitcase. He looked askance at my traveling alarm clock but apparently concluded that it would not interfere with the White House tape system. He was equally concerned, it seemed, with the pernicious nature of my toothbrush and the two pounds of mocha-java coffee beans which I was carrying. The national security matter at issue was my sleeping bag, an inoffensive blue affair which is patched and somewhat battered. The guard insisted that I unroll the bag before he frisked it.

I don't know what the guard was looking for, but he didn't find it. The sinister force in my sleeping bag is

very soft and malleable and quite proficient in eluding its pursuers.

With some difficulty, I repacked my coffee beans, toothbrush, and sleeping bag, and padded off down the hallway, sinister force intact and undetected. I didn't stay long. It could have been as short as 5 or as long as 18 minutes. But when I departed, I left behind my sinister force. It goes under various disguises, but its name is "impeachment." db



DULY NOTED: POLITICS

● **"Political Report — Vulnerable Republicans in the House Prefer Ford,"** by Jonathan Cottin and Andrew J. Glass. *National Journal*, January 19, 1974. "One fact that will help decide these vulnerable Republicans on how to act on impeachment is their reading of what the President's continuation in office will mean for their own political careers. Many already have plotted a re-election campaign strategy of aggressive independence from the White House. At the same time, many, after obtaining assurances that they would not be identified, declared that their campaign problems would be eased considerably if Gerald Ford, the new vice president, is in the White House by November 1974. Many of those interviewed said they are under equal pressure from both pro- and anti-impeachment forces. This poses for them a treacherous no-win political dilemma, since it introduces a divisive national issue into campaigns normally fought chiefly on localized issues. No matter how they vote on impeachment, they said, they cannot help losing some support, since there may be as many voters for as against Mr. Nixon's removal from office."

● **"Nixon's Deepening Crisis in His Own Party,"** by Godfrey Sperling, Jr. *Christian Science Monitor*, January 23, 1973. Polling 17 Republican state chairmen after their January meeting of Chicago, Sperling found deepening disaffection from the President. One chairman commented that the participants (except for the southern chairmen) at the January 18 meeting "were saying what Wilbur Mills is now saying publicly — that the President should resign instead of putting himself and the people through this trial. And I agree."

● **"Conservatives Show Dismay on President,"** by Lou Cannon. *Washington Post*, January 26, 1974. "President Nixon was depicted (January 26) by troubled conserva-

tives as a man who had betrayed his principles and permitted the office of the presidency to be abused. These same conservatives warned, however, that even greater damage would be done to the presidency and to the nation by removing Mr. Nixon from office except for the clearest legal cause. They also argued that conservatives will be jettisoning their own political principles if they abandon Mr. Nixon because of anticipated problems in the 1974 political campaign." If the President expected support from the 1974 Conservative Political Action Conference, he must have been disappointed. Some speakers, such as American Conservative Union president M. Stanton Evans, opposed resignation. Others, such as Young Americans for Freedom president Ronald F. Docksai were less certain; Docksai said Nixon should quit if he could not clearly explain the Watergate mess. Loyalty also took a bum rap at the conference. Said U.S. Rep. John Ashbrook, who had presidential ambitions in 1972, "I don't happen to belong to that branch of the sheep family that follows a bellwether over the precipice."

● **"More New Yorkers Turning to the Right,"** by Frank Lynn. *New York Times*, January 15, 1974. "Although New York has the reputation as the most liberal city in America, more city residents today consider themselves conservatives than they do either moderates or liberals. This ideological swing to the right is reflected in strong attitudes among New Yorkers in favor of the restoration of the death penalty, in giving life sentences without parole to drug pushers, in support of crackdowns on pornography, and in opposition to the legalization of marijuana and the busing of children to achieve racial balance in the schools." The *New York Times* survey conducted by Daniel Yankelovich showed that 33 percent of New Yorkers considered themselves conservative; 31 percent moderate; and 27 percent liberal/radical. The figures on conservatives and liberal/radicals were exactly reversed from a similar survey taken in 1970.

● **"Watergate Undertow: SOS from the Republican Right,"** by Jeffrey Bell. *The Nation*, December 24, 1973. "Conservative officeholders are aware that if Nixon remains in office, their own futures are at best clouded. Yet few feel safe in saying so publicly. The one significant group whose confidence Nixon has retained is the Republican Party workers. A conservative Republican who openly breaks with Nixon is risking the wrath of his own most assiduous supporters. The time may nevertheless be approaching when that wrath must be risked. When it will be the subject of much discussion. . . If Nixon stands fast in his determination not to resign, will mainstream Republicans in Congress move toward impeachment? Few people think so now, but by early next year the situation could be very different. For the reasons mentioned above, the mathematics of Republican survival will have sunk in, and it is not impossible that a consensus could develop that Nixon, one way or another, has to go. . . Republican officeholders are not on the whole a daring lot, but there may soon come a time when their inherent discretion works against Nixon rather than for him," writes the former editor of *Battleline*.

● **"A Comfortable District for J.P. Hammerschmidt,"** by Doug Smith. *Arkansas Gazette*, January 13, 1974. "What a strange political phenomenon is (U.S. Rep. John Paul Hammerschmidt). He sneaked into office a few years ago while nobody was watching, and now it appears he's in for life, holding the Third District seat for the Republicans. It must be assumed that he knows his own situation, having mastered it so convincingly, and any frivolous statements he might make about running for the United States Senate should be taken in the spirit in which they were given. Congressmen like a joke, too. If the state's only Republican congressman should give up a safe House seat to run for the Senate, a statewide race, the Arkansas Republican Party might as well call the whole thing off. Some of them weren't pronouncing the words right anyway, having moved in from Illinois or Michigan or Ohio or other places like that better left unnamed." Hammerschmidt's popularity is really limited to his district, according to Smith, and the GOP congressman would lack the popularity among blacks and labor which would be necessary in a statewide race. "Credit must be given to Hammerschmidt. One of his Democratic constituents remarked recently that Hammerschmidt probably would rank at or near the bottom among all congressmen for effectiveness in Washington and at or near the top in maintaining good relations with his constituents."

● **"Berger Declines to Prosecute 2 State Legislators,"** by John L. Carpenter. *Phoenix Gazette*, January 18, 1974. "County Attorney Moise Berger today declined to prosecute two state legislators earlier accused of conflict of interest — Rep. Jack Stuckey, Sr. (R-Phoenix), and Rep. Ray Everett (R-Prescott). Berger based his refusal on lack of 'wrongful intent' on the legislators' part, and upon the fact that Attorney General Gary Nelson had advised them in advance that their contemplated business would not conflict with their legislative duties under the state law. . . It had been alleged that the two legislators sponsored legislation setting up a deferred retirement plan for state employees, and then formed their own company, Arizona Investment Managers, to sell and service the plan." Under Arizona law, it is "illegal for a legislator to engage in activities that would conflict with his duties as a legislator, but the same statute indicates that more than a legislator simply engaging in his profession or business must be proven to make such acts of a criminal nature."

● **"Goldwater Fears GOP Disaster,"** by Jack W. Germond. *Washington Star-News*, January 22, 1974. "Sen. Barry M. Goldwater says he has neither the 'power' nor the desire to force President Nixon's resignation. . . Goldwater said new opinion surveys show that Republicans are losing 10 percentage points off the top as the result of scandals in the Administration. 'So if you didn't win by 60 percent or better,' he said in an interview, 'you've got a handful of trouble in this election.'" An earlier Goldwater poll had shown Watergate hurting incumbents of both parties.

● **"The Howard Baker Boom,"** by Robert Walters. *Columbia Journalism Review*, December 1973. *Washington Star-News* reporter Robert Walters delivered a blistering indictment of national news coverage of Tennessee Sen. Howard Baker, Jr. "The coverage was based in part on the senator's own performance in the hearings, but it went far beyond that. A study of the coverage boosting Baker as a presidential candidate shows that, for several months, the stories failed to provide evidence or solid argument that Baker deserved to be either a President or a presidential candidate. Most stories brushed over the senator's voting record; presented little or no evidence that Baker's personal or business history had been examined; and provided precious little scrutiny of Baker's performance as a senator. Baker may well be a man with an impeccable background, the loftiest of motives, the finest executive talents, and the highest qualifications for national office. This article is not intended to suggest otherwise. It is my aim to suggest that questions of Baker's competence were largely ignored in the spate of articles that appeared during Phase One of the Watergate hearings."

● **"Jobs, Unanswered Messages: Labor Leaders Treat Tunney Roughly,"** by Lee Fremstad. *Sacramento Bee*, January 16, 1974. "The senator was there, a visit with the home folks, to talk about things like energy, allocations, and middle distillate fuels. That's why U.S. Sen. John Tunney (D-Calif.) was jarred yesterday afternoon when Sacramento labor leaders unexpectedly attacked him on dam-building, jobs, unanswered telephone calls, and unanswered letters. To Tunney's obvious shock, James S. Lee, president of the politically hefty California Building and Construction Trades Council, 350,000 members strong, went on the offensive." The complaints from the union leaders irritated Tunney, who told Lee that if he had identified himself by his title, his phone calls would have been returned. When told by another labor leader that the union men weren't "much on titles," Tunney replied, "I don't give a goddamn what a person's title is. I don't think anyone here or in Washington works harder than I do."

● **"President Aloof From '74 Races,"** by R.W. Apple, Jr. *New York Times*, January 18, 1974. The White House has enough troubles without troubling beleaguered Republican congressmen in this fall's campaign. Republican National Chairman George Bush has said the President will not campaign for candidates who do not want his help. But, writes Apple, "If he is still in office come fall, a few of the President's old retainers expect him to be unable to resist the campaign trail, no matter what his difficulties are. He has campaigned every two years since 1946, when he was first elected to the House from California. According to Anne Armstrong, one of the White House's chief political operatives, Republican candidates should be able to survive this fall's election "by identifying with some of the Nixon programs, such as foreign policy in the Middle East, economy, and so on." There are, however, no plans for a massive White House campaign effort reminiscent of the 1970 disaster.

● **"Nation's Republican Chiefs Favor Swift Action on Impeachment,"** *Boston Globe*, January 29, 1974. "The majority of Republican Party leaders across the nation favor swift action on the issue of President Nixon's impeachment 'to clear the air.' However, a *Globe* survey of 50 GOP chairmen in all 50 states found that the chairmen were unanimous in their opposition to the President's resigning. One-fourth of the chairmen are strongly opposed to any impeachment proceedings."

● **"A Pair of Political Party Myths,"** by Martin F. Nolan. *Boston Globe*, January 27, 1974. "There is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Nixon cares about the Republican Party. There was certainly no such evidence in 1972, the year not of the GOP's triumph but that of his own Committee to Re-elect the President. A more realistic appraisal of the Nixon-GOP relationship comes from Sen. Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.) on 'Issues and Answers' January 13: 'What has Operation Candor produced? It has produced a President getting the Republican Party involved in Watergate, which it never was involved in in the first place. That has been the only result of Operation Candor. . .'"

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 509 C Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. Second class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts.