

RIPON FORUM

THE RIPON SOCIETY HAS MOVED.
THE NEW ADDRESS IS:
1609 CONNECTICUT AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009

OCTOBER 1, 1975

VOL. XI, No. 19

50 CENTS

POLITICS: THE GOP

RIPON SOCIETY LOSES DELEGATE ALLOCATION SUIT

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled September 30 against the merits of the Ripon Society's suit challenging the constitutionality of the delegate allocation formula for the Republican National Convention. In a 9-1 decision, the court split on issues of standing, "state action," and justiciability, but the majority agreed that the Republican Party had not violated the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in the allocation of delegates to the 1976 convention.

The court's action reversed an earlier decision favorable to the Ripon Society by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and ordered Ripon's suit dismissed. The court's action also reversed a string of favorable court rulings in Ripon's case which dated back to 1972 and which had been interrupted only by an unfavorable stay of execution by Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist in 1972. Although some doubt was cast on the Ripon Society's standing in the suit, no such doubt was cast in the majority decision on the standing of the eight individual plaintiffs in the suit. The Ripon Society has now taken under consideration a petition for a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court. Such a petition to call up the case for Supreme Court attention would be necessary for further court action.

In making its ruling, the Appeals Court contradicted a 2-1 ruling in Ripon's favor by a three-judge panel of the same Appeals Court. Members of the court's majority also cast doubt on the validity of its reasoning in earlier cases on which the appeals court had ruled involving national convention delegates, e.g., Georgia v. Democratic National Committee. The Ripon Society had challenged the delegate allocation formula adopted by the 1972 Republican National Convention on the grounds that the formula—particularly its bonus delegate provisions—discriminated against larger states by underrepresenting Republican voters in those states.

Based on evidence accepted by the U.S. District Court in its earlier decision, a convention delegate from Alaska represents over eight times the Republican voting strength of a delegate from Florida. Again, given the delegate allocation formula for the 1976 convention, a delegate from Alaska represents over seven times the population strength of a delegate from Massachusetts. By comparison, voting weight discrepancies in the Electoral College are at most 4.4 to 1. Ripon contended that voting weight discrepancies greater than those of the Electoral College constitute a violation of the "equal protection" clause. It noted that smaller states are granted about five and two-thirds delegates per Electoral College vote, under the current formula. If the eight largest states were allowed delegations in a similar proportion to their Electoral College vote, the number of delegates from these states would jump from 870 to 1294.

According to the majority decision, "In short [Ripon argues] that, which of its permissible constituencies the Republican Party chooses to represent at a national convention, it must represent those constituents as a legislature would, and give them mathematically equal representation or have a compelling reason not to. That is the essence of the claim, and also its essential fallacy." According to the court, "The fact that the conduct of a national political convention may be subject to the Equal Protection Clause does not in itself establish the applicability of the one person, one vote rule. Instead, the court ruled "that the principle of one person, one vote is not an absolute" and agreed with the Republican National Committee that "the public and private interests in making decisions through some other scheme of representation outweigh the interests served by numerically equal apportionment." Consequently, the majority decision gave short shrift to the mathematical data involved in delegate allocation.

The majority also refused to apply to the national convention level, rulings by other federal courts that the equal protection principle did apply to delegate allocation to conventions at the state level. Chief Judge David Bazelon, in dissenting from the court's reasoning on this point,

argued that national political conventions were an integral part of the political process, and therefore, logically subject to the "equal protection" clause and one-person, one vote rulings. Bazelon, who wrote the earlier three-judge panel decision, concluded: "The whole purpose of reapportionment is to give all voters an equal place at the democratic starting line. What thereafter occurs is but the natural workings of the democratic process in which temporary majorities make necessary political decisions. The whole drift of reapportionment—the one-person-one-vote principle—is to prevent these temporary majorities from entrenching themselves in a manner that prevents the natural working of the democratic process in the future. Reapportionment derives its immense constitutional legitimacy from its prevention of this entrenchment. This is the main error of the court's way: it assumes that decisions of a temporary majority in the organization of the party and the use of the party's political power are no different from entrenchment of the temporary majority in the very process of political choice. The court then leaps to the improbable conclusion that malapportionment of political parties either does not violate the one-person-one-vote principle or is outside the one-person-one-vote principle." The principle's importance may be even greater for a convention than for a general election, Bazelon argued, because "for the great mass of voters their choice has already been determined by the convention's decision.

While noting that the Supreme Court has specifically stated that it has not decided whether the equal protection principle applies to national political conventions, the majority seemed strongly influenced by recent Supreme Court decisions backing the rights of national political parties to make convention decisions free from interference by state or federal courts. The Supreme Court's recent decision in Cousins v. Wigoda allowed the Democratic National Committee to bar seating of the Daley delegation at the 1972 Democratic National Convention was cited as one example of possible national convention powers. Based on Supreme Court actions, several concurring judges indicated that earlier decisions by the same Appeals Courts in Georgia v. Democratic National Committee and Bode v. Democratic National Committee were no longer valid. As a result, these same judges argued that the Ripon case never should have been decided on its merits but should have been dismissed because of the failure to prove Fourteenth Amendment "state action." Furthermore, argued some judges, the case was not "justiciable" because there were no clear standards for the court to rule on a "constitutional" delegate allocation formula and because a court ruling constituted unjustified interference in the conduct of political party affairs. The full majority, however, refused to rule on these issues and never decided whether "state action" had been proved or "justiciability" ascertained. As two of the concurring justices wrote: "By failing to resolve these issues in a case brought sufficiently in advance of the 1976 national conventions to permit adequate deliberation, we doubtless will face the unenviable task of resolving these questions on the eve of a national convention under time constraints and other pressures that would make reasoned deliberation difficult, if not impossible."

Chief Judge Bazelon took vigorous exception to contentions that state action was not proved. He also objected to the view that territorial discrimination was not as important as racial discrimination when application of the Fourteenth Amendment was involved. Referring to the Reynolds v. Simms reapportionment decision, Bazelon said: "The subject matter of Reynolds and the present litigation is territorial discrimination against the right to vote of certain citizens. Reynolds teaches that such discrimination is forbidden by the same constitutional structure that forbids racial discrimination against the right to vote of certain citizens."

A basic tenet of the majority decision was that political parties were free to conduct national political conventions without regard to the Fourteenth Amendment since the First Amendment's right of free association took precedence in this case: "If the right to vote is a right to true participation in the elective process, then it is heavily implicated in the nomination process. We do not deny this, but rest our judgment on the view that, as between that right and the right of free political association, the latter is more in need of protection in this case." According to the court, allocation of convention delegates is simply one of many undemocratic actions under taken by political parties. It agreed that the allocation formula had substantial political wisdom, and that in the case that it did not, the political party would suffer reverses in the general election. Concluded the court: "It is urged that this formula represents nothing more than an effort by party members from strongly Republican states to perpetuate their control. But it seems to us that the First Amendment protects their power to do precisely that. The party could have chosen a delegate allocation scheme calculated to broaden its base, by giving special influence to delegates states where the party is weak. Instead, it appears to have chosen to consolidate its gains in states where it has been strong. We are not about to hold that this is an irrational way to seek political success."

Significantly, however, the court did not shut off jurisdiction over internal political party affairs. In deciding to ignore the question of justiciability, the majority opinion concluded: "We agree that a strict one person, one vote standard is inapplicable, and since we consider the

party's choice among allocation schemes to be as much an exercise as an infringement of constitutional rights, we cannot say that it offends the constitution. What we decline to do, however, is to take the more drastic step of holding that we would never be competent to reach a contrary conclusion." This ambivalence was underlined in the decision's conclusion:"...although courts should be slow to interfere with the internal processes of political parties, circumstances can be conceived of wherein they may grant relief. Where such circumstances do not exist, Georgia, Bode, and this case should serve to discourage resort to this court for the resolution of intra-party differences."

Judge Bazelon interpreted the majority decision differently:"Stripped of its rational exterior, I read the majority opinion on rehearing as telling us something of this sort: The reapportionment decisions were intensely controversial and involved a radical extension of judicial power. We will not extend those decisions nor the philosophy of judicial power they embody even if logically compelled, absent either more public demand than we can perceive or clear guidance from the Supreme Court. We simply do not believe the principle of one-person-one vote is sufficiently important to overcome these concerns of institutional competence and popular approval, which have always lain on the horizon of the reapportionment decisions and which counsel studied conservation of the power of judicial review." As Bazelon points out, this is like saying "that the Kansas City junior college district must be properly apportioned while the national convention of a major political party is not." ■

POLITICS: THE GOP

THE RIPON SUIT: SUMMARY CHRONOLOGY

- November 8, 1971. After discussions with Republican Party officials seeking to avoid litigation proved fruitless, the Ripon Society filed a complaint in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia asking that the delegate allocation formula for the 1972 Republican National Convention be declared unconstitutional.
- April 30, 1972. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia upheld Ripon's position in declaring unconstitutional the uniform victory bonus system and in enjoining its use for the 1972 convention.
- August 16, 1972. At the request of the Republican state committees of 14 southern and western states, Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist stayed the District Court's injunction, thus allowing the convention to proceed under the old delegate allocation formula.
- August 22, 1972. The Republican National Committee adopted a new delegate allocation formula for the 1976 convention.
- December 30, 1972. After the pending appeals from the April 30, 1972 decision were dismissed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, the Ripon Society filed a supplemental complaint in the District Court, challenging the constitutionality of the formula adopted at the 1972 convention.
- January 11, 1974. The U.S. District Court again held in Ripon's favor in declaring unconstitutional the uniform victory bonus adopted at the 1972 convention and in enjoining its use in a new formula to be adopted by the Republican National Committee. However, the court ruled that the proportional victory bonus was constitutionally acceptable.
- March 5, 1975. Upon appeals from the District Court decision by both the Ripon Society and the Republican National Committee, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit ruled that the uniform and proportional victory bonus allocation systems were unconstitutional. This decision upheld Ripon's position; however, because of the important constitutional issues involved, all nine members of the Court of Appeals wished to review the matter. Thus, the decision of the three-judge panel was vacated, pending reargument before the full court.
- May 30, 1975. The suit was reargued before the full U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.
- September 30, 1975. The U.S. Court of Appeals, in an 9-1 decision, ruled against the merits of the Ripon Society suit, arguing that the "equal protection" arguments advanced by Ripon were superseded by the "free association" arguments advanced by the Republican National Committee. The court reversed the District Court decision and remanded the case with instructions to dismiss.

DULY NOTED: STATES

Although Democrats outweighed Republicans, 1,500 lbs. to 1,483 lbs., the GOP won the tug of war and went on to defeat the Democrats in team competition by a 3-2 margin. The contests between Republican and Democratic members of Congress were filmed for airing on CBS Sports Spectacular.

● "Dick Ogilvie's Back, Dreaming Big Dreams," by Michael Kilian. Chicago Tribune, September 5, 1975. Former Illinois Gov. Richard Ogilvie has been named to head up the Ford campaign in the state, and columnist Kilian thinks that the appointment may be the beginning of a political comeback by Ogilvie, who lost a reelection bid in 1972 because of his enactment of a state income tax. If former U.S. Attorney James Thompson loses next year's gubernatorial election to incumbent Gov. Daniel Walker (D), "or ---if the Walker administration's big spending forced him into a tax increase---he could find himself a one-term governor. Then the Republicans would need someone else. Ogilvie would be only 55, and his political apparatus would be in place. If not then, 1980 offers the prospect of Adlai Stevenson's Senate seat. Ogilvie's margin of defeat was so narrow in 1972 that, if 36,000 regular Republican voters had stuck with him, he would still be governor. They went with Walker to protest not only the income tax but Ogilvie's ban on leaf burning in small villages and other political mistakes. Richard Ogilvie always was a man to learn from his mistakes."

● "Demo Leaders Encourage 4th Term for Rampton," by Douglas L. Parker. Salt Lake Tribune, August 31, 1975. "Except for an occasional dissent, Democratic county chairmen are encouraging Gov. Calvin L. Rampton to seek a fourth term next year, according to a survey of local party leaders," writes Parker, who made the survey. But, according to the Tribune political editor, "If it came to the governor not running, however, a majority of the county chairmen surveyed said they believe three-term Congressman Gunn McKay of Huntsville should leave Washington to run as the Democratic gubernatorial nominee." One county chairman asserted that McKay was the only other candidate who could win the governorship for the Democrats. About two-fifths of the county chairmen, however, thought McKay should stay in Washington and leave the gubernatorial race to another, possibly younger candidate.

● "Recent Statements Wither Tunney's Support Among Liberal Groups," by Leo Rennert. Sacramento Bee, August 19, 1975. "Political advisers have begun to warn Sen. John V. Tunney (D-Calif.) that he risks serious erosion in liberal support next year as a result of several recent controversial stands on energy, jobs, health and defense spending. Both [in Washington] and in California, Tunney strategists have begun to take more seriously the primary challenge of former antiwar activist Tom Hayden, who no longer is regarded as an exotic nuisance." Tunney is in trouble with labor for switching his position on a national health insurance bill he had cosponsored, in trouble with liberals for supporting the B-1 bomber program, and now in trouble in the primary where he had expected an easy victory.

● "A Very Strange Method of Avoiding Party Warfare," by Carol Surkin. Boston Globe, September 21, 1975. "If you ask him, Gov. Michael Dukakis will tell you things are really looking up for his administration. That is not true. Whether the governor will face it or not, he is in serious trouble, according to key committee chairman and other leaders of the legislature. Massachusetts government is functioning poorly and soon may function worse because the governor appears unable to build a working relationship with them. Dukakis's rigidity and aloof manner has alienated him from even his strongest allies and potential allies there," writes Surkin. "If Dukakis is not learning by experience, someone better teach him fast. The way things are going in the State House, the government could end up paralyzed by a stalemate between the governor's office and the legislative leadership."

● "Moderate GOP Wing Hints County Break," by Jeff Rodack. Hollywood (Florida) Sun-Tattler, September 15, 1975. Broward County is one of three banner Republican counties for the Florida GOP, but the ultraconservative orientation of the county leadership has prompted a split among Republicans. Moderate former County Commissioner Robert Huebner has been organizing a move to form a GOP organization separate from the Broward GOP Executive Committee. Huebner is dissatisfied with the leadership of GOP Chairman A. Gray Boylston: "The party has disintegrated during his tenure. It's not completely his fault, but the situation in the county has changed." Not only has Democratic registration increased, but several prominent conservative Republicans in the county have recently changed their registration. They include the county sheriff, a state senator and a member of the Port Everglades Commission. The Republican defections have frightened liberal Democrats scared that the conservatives might challenge their party leadership. Although the county sheriff, Edward Stack, chaired Richard Nixon's 1968 presidential drive in the state, County GOP Chairman Boylston called the move opportunistic: "They're all opportunists. They're like sunshine patriots. Stack has never done anything locally in the party except run for sheriff." Meanwhile, the changes in the county GOP might have an impact on the outcome of a Ford-Reagan presidential primary in the county next March. Said Huebner of Boylston: "He's seemingly in support of Ronald Reagan when we have a president who is already a Republican."

"Field Must Be Doing Something Right," by M. Charles Bakst. Providence Journal, September 28, 1975. Commenting on the recent string of victories by Republicans in local elections since H. James Field Jr., became state GOP chairman, Bakst writes: "...it has yet to be demonstrated that the GOP is about to make sweeping breakthroughs at the state level next year. But for a party as downtrodden as the Republicans in Rhode Island, any victories at all are more than welcome, and the recent GOP successes do indicate that Field must be doing something right." Field's office has been instrumental in providing support for local GOP elections, leading one town chairman to observe: "I can't say enough about the guy. He's doing a terrific job."

"Kansas City Is Short On Delegate Housing," by Morris Cunningham. Memphis Commercial Appeal, September 14, 1975. "Clarke Reed, the Mississippi national committeeman (sic), feels that despite its increased voting strength, the South may be less effective at [the 1976 Republican National Convention] than at other recent GOP conventions. He recalls, for example, that at Miami Beach in 1968, the southerners were largely unpledged and were able to cooperate and work together very closely. Next year, most southern delegates will be elected in primaries and will arrive in Kansas City unpledged and unable to maneuver. Thus, the outlook is for less cooperation among southerners. Considering the possibilities, Reed said he may suggest to the Mississippi GOP Central Committee that it opt for selecting Mississippi's delegates by the customary convention process, rather than going the newly authorized primary route. It sounds noble to elect delegates," Reed said, "but you wind up with delegates bound up for two ballots and no flexibility. The convention process is just as fair, and you wind up with delegates who have room to maneuver."

"Mrs. Whittlesey Blocks Dem Plans to Capture Delaware County From GOP." Philadelphia Observer, September 15, 1975. Delaware County was run by a GOP machine called the war board until 1974, when the machine fell apart amid charges of corruption and lost the county's congressional seat to Democrat Robert Edgar. Democrats hoped to make further inroads in the Republican stronghold this fall, but a "clean government" slate headed by State Rep. Faith Whittlesey, 36, will be more formidable opponents than the Democrats had counted on. Republican Whittlesey is a former special assistant U.S. attorney in Philadelphia.

POLITICS: STATES

George Wallace has finally come out against discrimination. Gov. Wallace (D-Ala.) praised a new capital punishment bill as he signed it into law in September, saying that it "can be applied without discrimination." Furthermore, Wallace expressed optimism that the law would be put to speedy use, declaring: "There are a lot of bad white folks and a lot of bad black folks who ought to be electrocuted." Said Wallace: "I hope we'll see some electrocutions in this state."

DELAWARE

U.S. Rep. Pierre S. du Pont IV's gubernatorial campaign received an unexpected boost this fall from the Delaware constitution. Du Pont had acceded to pressure from state GOP leaders who wanted the congressman to seek the gubernatorial nomination in order to avoid a divisive campaign for the nomination. After du Pont entered the race, however, Lt. Gov. Eugene Bookhammer (R), who had already announced, refused to withdraw from the race, and support mounted for keeping Bookhammer on the ticket for lieutenant governor—despite du Pont's insistence that he have a free hand in choosing his own running mate. It was becoming evident that if Bookhammer was to be dropped, du Pont would have to do the dirty work himself. But the Delaware constitution saved du Pont from this unpleasantness because a slightly ambiguous section indicated that a lieutenant governor probably could not serve three terms, thus ruling Bookhammer out of the race. Bookhammer is now considered a possible entrant into the race for du Pont's congressional seat—which is already being sought by State Senate Minority Leader Michael N. Castle, GOP National Committeeman Thomas B. Evans, Jr., State Treasurer Mary D. Jorlin, and former State Sen. Andy Foltz. Foltz and Castle are possible du Pont choices for lieutenant governor. Du Pont's Democratic opponent, Gov. Sherman Tribbitt, continues to please those sections of the electorate who believe he should do virtually nothing. Another Democratic star, however, is quickly becoming as controversial as Tribbitt has been in the past—thus reversing the 1972 situation when a controversial Republican governor and a controversial mayor of Wilmington both went down to defeat. Wilmington Mayor Thomas J. Maloney has led sort of a charmed existence and was expected to be a tough opponent for Sen. William Roth (R) next year. Maloney now finds himself in the middle of a bitter teacher strike, which is endangering his labor support. Maloney's past tough stands with municipal employee unions and stringent budget policies had generated considerable suburban respect, but this source of strength could be seriously undermined if labor takes a walk in next year's Senate race. Maloney's refusal to intervene in the school board negotiations has particularly angered striking teachers. In reply, the mayor has said: "I'm not going to give in. I may not get reelected, but I'm not going to be the be Beame of Wilmington." Maloney has another problem. Wilmington is likely to face a court order to begin busing to desegregate its schools next fall. Sen. Roth has a long record of anti-busing sentiment which Maloney will find hard to match. As a result, the odds on Roth's reelection are

steadily improving—particularly as Roth's campaign gears up and his computer grinds out a steady stream of letters appealing to special constituent interests. Note: Former Wilmington Mayor Harry G. Haskell, who once rivalled du Pont as a potential GOP star in the state, has apparently vacated the Delaware political scene and moved to his estate in Pennsylvania.

MASSACHUSETTS

The brother of a former administrative assistant to U.S. Rep. Robert Drinan (D-4th) expects to seek the Republican nomination to oppose Drinan next year. Arthur Mason, a Boston lawyer who formerly worked for the Securities and Exchange Commission, is already making contacts for next year's race.

MISSISSIPPI

A recent poll in Mississippi showed voters about evenly divided among supporters of Democrat Cliff Finch, Republican Gil Carmichael and undecideds. Carmichael hopes to get the majority of the undecided vote by holding a sort of press conference in each county in which the voters will question him on any issue. By this tactic, Carmichael hopes to undercut the impact of Finch's "workingman's campaign." Both men are concentrating on state economic issues. In the legislative races, Republicans are hoping to expand their two-member delegations in both the House and Senate. There are 13 Republicans running for the Senate and 30 for the House, including four black Republicans running in Hinds County. Three Republican women are also seeking legislative posts.

NEW JERSEY

Former U.S. Rep. Charles Sandman (R) reportedly plans another congressional campaign in 1976. Before he does so, he needs to clean up the financial debts of his 1973 gubernatorial campaign, which reached \$235,000 at one point. Sandman's most recent financial report lists his debts at \$42,600, but finances are not quite as rosy as they might seem. Two creditors claim they are still owed \$55,000. One of them says of Sandman's accountants: "They just arbitrarily wiped it off the books and said it was a contribution. I don't give a damn what their report says or doesn't say. There is no way they have paid me and I want the money." Other debts were forgiven or settled for less than face value.

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Republicans have the same problem with next year's gubernatorial nomination that the Democrats have with next year's presidential nomination—a plethora of possible candidates but no logical frontrunner. The GOP laundry list includes former House Speaker Art Bunker; State Rep. Robert Reimers; State Sen. Robert Melland, a former assistant majority leader; State Sen. David Nething; State Sen. Chester Reiten, mayor of Minot; State Sen. Chuck Goodman of Grand Forks; State Rep. Myron Atkinson of Bismarck; and Ray David, a former official in Sen. Milton Young's campaign. David may be the logical successor to Robert McCarney as the maverick, conservative gadfly candidate. (Auto dealer McCarney was for years North Dakota's version of Meldrim Thomson.) Friends of McCarney have a court suit filed which challenges the constitutionality of unvouchered expense accounts for state elected officials. These expense accounts have been an accepted way of circumventing a provision of the North Dakota constitution which forbids legislators from seeking executive positions for which they have voted raises. If the court suit is upheld, it would dramatically limit the number of legislators interested in seeking positions which offer very limited financial compensation. The Republicans have one additional problem with their laundry list of candidates—none of whom have yet announced. Most of them represent urban areas, but an "ideal" GOP candidate needs to have a strong identification with agriculture. Whoever is the candidate will have a difficult time against Gov. Arthur Link (D), who manages to keep a large portion of the electorate happy despite his long history of difficulty in making decisions. On the Senate slot, on the GOP ticket, there is less confusion. No Republican has expressed any interest in opposing Sen. Quentin Burdick (D) besides GOP National Committeewoman Gerridee Wheeler. Wheeler maintains that she is only running for reelection as national committeewoman at this time, but is still considering a Senate campaign. Announcing season in the state isn't expected to begin in the state until late fall.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The trustees of the University of South Carolina became the center of a political controversy recently when they interfered in the admissions process at the university's law school to order admission for the sons of several prominent Democratic politicians. South Carolina lawyers were enraged by the ruling, under which the son of Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.) and 13 other candidates were admitted to the law school. Hollings himself attended the trustees' meeting where the decision was reached, after a state senator told the board that his son and others had been penalized in a special pre-law prep course because they were politically connected. Hollings' son, however, reportedly now intends to go into banking rather than law. But the law school's faculty was enraged and charged that the law school may lose its accreditation as a result.

COMMENTARY: LABOR

AN OPEN EYES POLICY FOR THE GOP

by Gary A. Myers

There is no election day cure—all for the Republican Party's labor image. The job of convincing men and women in the ranks of labor, organized and unorganized, that the Republican Party is their best hope is a day-to-day task, with no quick cure gimmick or magic formula. Republicans have not done that job well. Far too often, we create the impression that only on election day are we interested in the affairs of labor.

The results have been obvious. Only in 1972, among recent election years, has the rank and file of organized labor flocked to the polls to vote Republican, or perhaps more accurately, vote anti-McGovern. Republican Party leaders on a national level seldom seem to realize that organized labor is more than organized leadership. It is people all over the main streets of our nation—
—young, old, middle-aged, male and female—American families whose bread winners happen to wear a union button as they earn their daily bread. Their objectives are exactly the same as our own:
—a strong America with open, representative government;
—a crime-free America; and
—an American where everyone can work who wants to do so.

Organized labor is more than the rhetoric of the picket line. It is more that section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory arbitration, or situs picketing. Organized labor is organized to speak for men and women who work for a living, just as business and industry is organized to speak for those who provide the jobs. The job producers in America have been working successfully with organized labor nor for more than 30 years—working to produce the goods and services that have made us the envy of the world.

Today, organized labor searches for solutions to improve a faltering economy. What in GOP rhetoric helps them find an answer. It seems to me that we must be firm, not apologetic, in presenting why the system we strive for is good for all—workers and producers. The paychecks of organized labor are spent for the same things on which Republicans spend their checks and their families suffer just as much when their paychecks stop. It is only through a recognition of this mutual concern that we can solve our economic problems. Too often, I feel, we react with knee-jerk objections to the demands and concerns voiced by labor's leaders, seldom sharing ideas for solutions to common problems. Too often, I am convinced, we inject our party into the arguments between labor and management, assuming political solutions for economic problems.

I have respect for George Meany, just as I have respect for the president of General Motors, but I learned long ago that neither should be treated unquestioningly as oracles of our future well-being. Both should be respected for what they are—partisans. And Republicans should respect what they represent because both represent the concerns of people who have legitimate rights and economic concerns.

Millions of laboring men and women—and I have been one all of my adult life—earn a decent living within our system of free enterprise that creates jobs and continuing opportunity. Millions of these men and women are already part of the Republican Party. At least for this reason, it is demeaning to talk about "letting labor into the party." For millions of us, we are the party.

Today, if you drive down Shady Grove's Main Street, you would be hard put to tell who works with machines and who works with an accountant's ledger. And that is exactly the way it should be and it is exactly what the Republican Party must realize if it is to claim majority political leadership. I recommend—as one who has learned to sweat both as a laborer and as a foreman—that as a first step, we go home to our towns and cities and search out and recognize rank and filers who already share the Republican philosophy.

What is needed in the Republican Party is an "Open Eyes Policy," not more rhetoric about an "Open Door Policy." Despite what many assume, there is nothing to fear from the union button, and those who wear it have nothing to fear from the Republican button. There are many faces in the Republican Party, just as there are many faces in organized labor. Of foremost concern today for Republicans should be a willingness to include in our councils and gatherings as equals the faces of all citizens whose support we have sought or obtained in the past. This means an end to the "them and us" attitude toward labor by many Republicans. Our arguments and debates will be more meaningful when we do this and much better for the Republican Party and the people it represents.

As a steel mill foreman, I participated in the concerns of our laboring men and women, frequently sharing those same concerns in the lower ranks of management. What I learned made an in-

delible imprint on my convictions that job security---the opportunity to feed, house, clothe, and enjoy life with a family---is a basic drive motivating men and women. We are fortunate to be a rich nation, able to provide this opportunity to so many.

We are a massive churning nation of producers and consumers. We are a nation of privately owned capital. Above all, we are a nation of free citizens. If we keep this fact in mind, as human beings and as a political party, we will never put the interests of capital above the interests of people. We should work towards the efficient, productive use of and conservation of capital to serve the needs of people. Capital should serve people, not vice versa.

I am convinced that if Republicans get back to basics and reiterate our concern for a free competitive structure where the rights of people come first, labor will become a familiar component of the Republican Party. If the Republican Party wants the support of labor, organized or unorganized, then it must forget the old assumptions and communicate and demonstrate again and again its allegiance to working citizens. If we can express the urgency of living with less government at all levels, while adhering to the principles of a marketplace economy, then we will be doing something and saying something the American working man and woman understand and support. ■

Contributer Note: Gary A. Myers represents the 25th C.D. of Pennsylvania in Congress.

Box 226, Charlestown, Mass.

Former Chief of Naval Operations Elmo Zumwalt addressed the Washington, D.C. Chapter September 22 on the topic of energy development. The chapter's

speaker at its August 25 meeting was Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman.

● Jerry McMahon, executive assistant to Sen. Charles Percy, spoke to the Chicago Chapter on August 14 and J. Terrence Brunner, executive director of the Better Government Association, was the chapter's speaker on September 16.

● Minnesota Chapter member Sally W. Pillsbury has been appointed to the board of United Service Organizations by President Ford.

● Former State Rep. Michael L. Strang(R) has been named to chair the Colorado Chapter's forthcoming Conference on Energy. Issue development for the conference is being coordinated by Dwight C. Moorehead, executive vice president of Petro-Lewis Corporation; Dr. William E. Matthew of the Denver Research Institute; and Professor John A. Carver of the University of Denver College of Law, a former commissioner on the Federal Power Commission. The conference is being directed by Albert Cohen. Moorehead spoke on energy policy to a September 30 meeting of the chapter.

● Persons interested in formulating a Ripon Foreign Policy Committee, should send their names, addresses, phone numbers and area of interest to Guy G. Rutherford, Jr., 4 East 95th Street, New York, New York 10028.

● Former Tennessee Gov. Winfield Dunn(R) was the guest speaker for the Nashville Chapter at a meeting September 10.

● The appointment of former National Governing Board member Bobbie Greene Kilberg as associate White House counsel did not please some conservatives. As Human Events reported it: "Mississippi GOP Chairman Clarke Reed...took the matter directly to White House Chief of Staff Don Rumsfeld. Reed reportedly told Rumsfeld that Kilberg's appointment as associate counsel to the President was an insult to conservative Republicans and could weaken the President among party regulars."

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., 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage rates paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices. Contents are copyrighted © 1975 by the Ripon Society, Inc. Correspondence addressed to the editor is welcomed. (Ripon FORUM, Box 226, Charlestown, Mass. 02129.)

In publishing this 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 \$15 a year, \$7.50 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$6 extra. Advertising rates on request. Please allow five weeks for address changes.

Editor: Dick Behn

Editorial Board:

Robert D. Behn, Chairman
Clifford Brown
Robert H. Donaldson

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. Rehfuss, Thomas A. Sargent, Richard Cleveland, Mark Frazier, Peter Berg, Martin Sours, and William K. Woods.

Technical Editor: Brian J. McCarthy

RIPON FORUM

Published semi-monthly by the Ripon Society, 1609 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and other mailing offices.