

# RIPON FORUM

REPUBLICAN DILEMMAS

JULY 15, 1976

VOL. XII, No. 14

50 CENTS

## COMMENTARY: THE GOP

GRAND OLD PARALYSIS

by Dick Behn

Regardless of the outcome of the 1976 Republican National Convention, the Republican Party will undoubtedly emerge as a dramatically different animal after this year's election. The form of this political metamorphosis will depend on the winner of the nomination and the results of the November election, but the script will largely be written by the Reaganite wing of the party. 1976 is a make or break it year for the Reaganites. Either they make the GOP into their own ideological retreat or they will break off and form a new conservative party in earnest. The Reaganite message to the GOP is clear: Either lose the party or lose us.

Reaganite contempt for the organized GOP leadership is evidenced in the treatment of the elected and official Republican leadership in states where Reaganites took over the GOP delegation. In Colorado, for example, only the popularity of former Gov. John Love(R) staved off a Reagan sweep of the at-large delegation. Even former conservative Sen. Gordon Allott(R) was denied a pro-Ford seat. The Reaganite performance led one observer to comment, "It reminds you just how little man has come since the cavemen." In order to save their organizational control, the party leadership in Colorado did not even seek delegation seats. Even so, the Reaganites launched a last-minute effort to oust Republican State Chairman Carl Williams, National Committeeman Keith Brown, and National Committeewoman Jo Ann Gray. A similar situation occurred in Idaho where Republican moderates concentrated on the party organization rather than at-large convention delegates. Although National Committeeman David Little was not opposed, Idaho National National Committeewoman Orriette Sinclair had to stave off a stiff challenge from Reagan activist Leora Day.

In Arizona, Sen. Paul Fannin(R) was denied a delegation seat. In Missouri, Attorney General John Danforth(R) was denied a delega-

tion seat. In Montana, State Chairman Florence Haegan was left off the delegation; she made the mistake of favoring apportionment of delegates according to the primary results. In Texas, Sen. John Tower(R) was denied an at-large seat and thus effectively removed from his position as President Ford's convention floor manager. Although Tower was warmly received at the Reaganite state convention, June 18-20, his future in the GOP may have been reflected by the comments of one delegate: "He's absolutely embarrassed us. He's made a fool out of the Texas Republicans. You can bet that this is John Tower's last term in the Senate." Similarly, State GOP Chairman Ray Hutchinson, National Committeeman Fred Agnich, and even former Treasury Secretary John Connally were denied at-large delegate seats.

Such kamikaze instincts seem to predominate wherever Reaganites gather. In North Carolina, Reagan's primary victory over Ford symbolized the ascendancy of Sen. Jesse Helms (R) over Gov. James Holshouser. Helms, who has publicly doubted the viability of the Republican Party in the past and led a committee seeking conservative alternatives, kept Holshouser off the Tarheel delegation. The rejection of the governor and U.S. Rep. James Martin(R) as pro-Ford delegates led Reese Cleg-horn, editorial page editor of the Charlotte Observer, to write:

Holshouser's humiliation was unfortunate not so much because of the personal sting for him as because it further solidified rightwing control of North Carolina's struggling Republican Party. It can hardly win elections if ideological purity is to be so finely ground. This was not, after all, a battle between liberals and conservatives but a struggle between conservatives and rightwing purists. Who could describe Holshouser and Martin as liberals?

Sen. Helms already has shown his scorn

for the Republican Party, except when it is a vehicle for his rigid ideology. Not long ago he called it "a dodo" and made moves that amounted to a threat to forming another party.

If Saturday gave us an indication of how the Reagan forces will behave at the national convention, the Republican Party of recent years may indeed become a "dodo." It has only a fifth of the nation's registered voters and it is not likely to win majorities if it cripples itself with ideological obsessions.

The list of Republican officials excluded from convention participation is a long one. As Claghorn points out, the Reaganites have generally excluded conservatives ---such as New Mexico's U.S. Rep. Manuel Lujan (R) or Oklahoma GOP Chairman Paula Unruh--- not some fuzzy moderates. For years now, Reaganite columnists have been proclaiming the emergence of a conservative majority... an emergence, they say, which is being thwarted by the continued existence of the Republican Party. National Review Publisher William Rusher wrote a polemic for this viewpoint urging the establishment of an inclusive conservative party which would unite Reaganites and Wallaceites. Since Rusher acknowledges the need for some compromise in the fusion of social and fiscal conservatives, it is strange that Reaganites have demonstrated such a perverse lust for intra-party bloodletting.

The inescapable conclusion is that the Reaganites don't care what happens to the GOP. Their contribution to the Bicentennial seems to be the revival of bloodletting as a medical practice. A year ago, conservatives had a double blackmail strategy: Run Reagan if Ford didn't turn right. Alternatively, Drop the GOP if that didn't work. Ford turned right but the Reaganites found blackmail too enjoyable to revert to less mundane pursuits.

Assuming Ford's nomination, the blackmail may take either passive or active aspects. The passive alternative is for Reaganites to either stay at home or vote for Carter. The New York Times has already indicated that massive defections would occur in GOP ranks if either Republican candidate were nominated. Talk of a Ford-Reagan ticket is, of course, meant to avert such a mutiny. Such a solution may bind up the GOP's wounds in much the same way that a bandage can cover a cancer. The bandage lacks any healing properties in much the same way that a Ford-Reagan ticket would only mask the GOP's wounds. Writing on Reagan's devastating impact on the GOP, the Christian Science Monitor's Godfrey Sperling wrote in early July: "But because Reagan has made him look like such an inept candidate

(and thus, at least to many, such an ineffective President), Ford may not even then be able to close the gap (with Carter this fall) very much. And Reagan supporters may add to Ford's problems by not voting for anyone---rather than vote for Ford. That bitterness and divisiveness will have come about because of Ronald Reagan. This would never have occurred if he had not challenged the President."

The portents for a Republican disaster do not bother conservative masochists like columnist Patrick Buchanan. Writing on criticism of Reaganites by Ford backers last May, Buchanan said: "There is nothing wrong with those Republican 'nuts' out there, Mr. President. They are simply weary of the endless retreats, deals, compromises, and cave-ins, counseled by the "practical politics" boys, who have just about succeeded in stuffing you into the history books alongside Chet Arthur, the last GOP President dumped at his party's convention."

In a more recent column, Buchanan was more explicit: "Let us face facts. The hour is at hand when the Republicans, conservatives and liberals should gather together in the halls of their fathers' mansions for a final farewell dinner, and depart their separate ways. Republican conservatives will never support a liberal for President. Republican 'progressives' will take a two-month siesta if Ronald Reagan is the nominee. Ergo, every four years, Republicans to remain together must unite behind moderates and centrists, the lead item on whose political agenda is too often simply divvying up the power, perquisites, and privileges that go with control of the Executive Branch of the government of the United States. Better this fall for the Republicans to go down battling the seedy liberalism of this capital city than to sink slowly beneath the waves, flying the bloodless banner of 'Peace, Prosperity, and Trust.'"

Reaganite expectations for their New Right Revival would ironically hinge on a strong performance by former Minnesota Sen. Eugene McCarthy, who is making a determined bid for ballot positions in about 40 states. There, according to columnist Rusher, "his presence will prove a mighty temptation to liberals who want to send their fellow Democrats a message...his name on the ballot of even 25 strategically important states would be enough to insure insomnia among Democratic campaign managers this summer and fall."

Adds Rusher: "Over in the conservative camp, the major threat to a Ford candidacy (it would not oppose Reagan is unquestionably the combined operation being mounted by the newly formed American Independence Party and its

near-twin, William Shearer's American Independent Party...They plainly intend to recruit a candidate from the right wing of the GOP if Ford has meanwhile defeated Reagan at Kansas City earlier that month, and nobody familiar with the grim mood of much of the American right doubts for a moment that such a candidate would receive millions of votes."

The two American Independent Parties have scheduled their convention for late August in hope that Reaganite lightning will strike their party. The late date is supposed to accommodate the AIPs' lack of a candidate. Like the American Party, which already held its convention and renominated the party's 1972 candidate, Thomas J. Anderson of Tennessee, the AIPs know where they can find a candidate if he'd accept. Anderson probably expressed the sentiments of the three parties the best when he observed: "If we got Reagan, Lord have mercy, we'd take off like a balloon."

If a right wing organization succeeded in getting five percent of the national vote this fall, it would be eligible for federal funding. The right wing "Freedom of Choice" outfit is shooting to be on the ballot in 42-44 states. As a protest vehicle, the Reaganites may be successful. But in terms of creating a meaningful political party, the Reaganites are dealing in celluloid.

Meanwhile, Reaganites have turned their guns on Jimmy Carter, recognizing rather belatedly the threat that Carter poses to a Reagan Sunbelt strategy. In effect, most of the criticism has been directed toward Carter as a closet liberal whose pseudoconservatism must be unmasked. The criticism has some merit, and Carter does indeed have a lot of explaining to do on the issues. But Reaganites are engaging in wishful thinking if they believe that Carter will turn to mush under the heat of a Reaganite attack.

National Review, for example, cites Carter's "Phase I" effort to attract moderate-conservative support and "Phase II" effort to attract moderate-liberal support before concluding, "Carter must have calculated that he could not win without the full support of these liberal and Left interest groups, but clearly his Phase II operation contains enormous risks. The proposals he has embraced go counter to the preferences of a majority of the electorate as measured by every available index. Carter apparently is willing to gamble that he can retain the bulk of his Phase I mod-

erate-to-conservative support by appealing to Sunbelt regional pride and by continuing to play his pious and patriotic tunes, while at the same time giving the liberal and Left interest groups everything they desire in tangible matters. Of his moderate-to-conservative supporters, he is saying in effect: 'Let them eat symbols.'"

While the New York Times' William Safire gleefully compares Carter to his former boss, Richard Nixon, columnist Buchanan asks "What's to be done? The Republican Party must make the nation aware that Jimmy Carter is pulling off one of the great political capers of our era." He is particularly annoyed by Carter's positions on right-to-work laws, withdrawal from Korea, and Vietnam. National Review Bulletin columnist Chilton Williamson, Jr., goes so far as to say, "Carter's implicit appeal---'Trust me'---is an amiable whiff of Caesarism; it is the most radical thing about his campaign. It's far, far to the left of Joe Rauh."

So what's the Republican Party to do. For one, it could lend a critical ear to what Reaganites are doing and saying and realize that the Reaganites are taking no prisoners. The Republican Party is a convenient vehicle for their current aspirations. It is no more than that for many Reaganites.

Second, the Republican Party and President Ford would do well to take some advice from Ford's former press secretary, Jerald ter Horst, who wrote in a recent column:

Every Republican official knows that his party is a dwindling minority. One major reason is that the GOP hasn't given ordinary persons, especially those who have conservative instincts, much to be Republican about. Past Republican Administrations and the panjandrums of the party seem to care more about such lofty matters as "the private sector," federal "prudence," and fiscal integrity." Well, these things are all quite nice, but they don't vote.

If the GOP could begin to deal with the real needs of real persons, if it could learn to be helpful instead of hostile to those who have a natural affinity for Republicanism, it might even stage a comeback. The 1976 Republican Platform would be a great place to start.

In that process it would be useful for Republicans to remember the results of a May Gallup Poll which asked: "What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?" Of the respondents, 38 percent said "high cost of living," 24 percent said "unemployment," and 13 percent said "dissatisfaction with government." ■

---

RENEW TODAY  
TOMORROW, THE POSTAL RATES RISE

---

# COMMENTARY: PLATFORM

SHOWING THE PARTY CARES

by Daniel L. Hall

The Republican Party is teetering on the verge of extinction. If we continue to follow our present course, it is only a matter of a few years before we lose our credibility as a viable national political organization. Right now, our weaknesses are most apparent in urban areas, but the problems will spread and will continue to weaken our party unless we act quickly to correct the situation.

Already, in many of our major cities, Republicans could qualify for enrollment on the list of endangered species. Our numbers have dwindled alarmingly and we are fast approaching the point where there may not be a large enough population base to assure the continuation of the species.

In the District of Columbia, there is a very serious possibility that the GOP will be outpolled not only by the Democrats, but also by the D.C. Statehood Party in the balloting for some city-wide offices. In Philadelphia, the GOP has already been relegated to third-party status, with the Philadelphia Party coming in ahead of the GOP in last year's race against Mayor Frank Rizzo. In big cities throughout the U.S., the Republican Party is repeatedly failing even to field a complete slate of candidates for all available offices.

Granted, there may be certain local problems or weaknesses that can be blamed solely on the local party organization and candidates. But the pattern is too widespread and uniform to be mere coincidence. In city after city, including here in the nation's capital, it can actually be a political liability to be listed on the Republican side of the ballot.

This sad litany has been heard before, from a multitude of sources. The question is what are we going to do about? Certainly, we can all promise to work harder in this election year and we will. That alone will not be enough. I believe that our problems are correctable and that our bad fortune is reversible. And I believe that the national platform committee can begin the Republican Party's turn-around. The key is a national platform that clearly illustrates Republicans' concern for people.

Right now, the majority of the American electorate does not appear to believe that the Republican Party cares about people. Usually, our candidates who win contested elections seem to do so only by personally overcoming this negative image of our party.

The Republican Platform must reflect the genuine concerns of all the American people. Our national platform must appeal not only to the small percentage of the voters who are still registered Republican but also to the majority of all voters.

This means that we must address the issue of health care in a more humanitarian manner. Unemployed people are going without adequate health insurance coverage; middle class workers cannot afford today's ever-increasing medical bills; and none but the very wealthy can escape financial hardship if a major, prolonged illness occurs in the family. The old platitudes about making private health insurance available to all are not good enough. To meet the perceived needs of the voting public, we must do better.

While unemployment figures have improved slightly, most of the public is not satisfied with the unemployment situation. Listening to some of our party's national leaders talk about unemployment today, I get the feeling that I am sitting through a rerun of the body-count statistics from the Vietnam War. The public did not buy them either. Of course, we are correct in rejecting the idea that the federal government should be the employer of last resort, but what positive alternatives are we proposing? Will our platform be able to convince the public that this party really does care about whether or not a worker can find a job? I hope so.

What will our national platform say to minorities? Will it show that we really care? I believe that it must do so if we are to survive as a viable, national political entity. For years, we have stood idly by and watched the Democratic Party reap the votes of the most visible minorities. They continue to win the votes of minorities because they have successfully projected the image of caring. I do not think that their concern is any greater than ours and I do not feel that their record of performance on behalf of minorities is much better than ours. But their public image without a doubt overshadows ours---despite the fact that it was the Republican Party that went to war in the last century to assure the rights of Black Americans and despite the fact that it was and is Democratic politicians who have been most responsible for segregation and Jim Crow laws.

This year, the Republican National Platform must show that our Grand Old Party truly does care about people. We must commit ourselves to agenda items such as bilingual educational programs, day care facilities for the children of working parents, improved vocational training, greater assistance to minority entrepreneurs, and fair and equitable housing opportunities for all. These are not just political promises that need to be made because it is an election year; these are the real needs and concerns of tens of millions of Americans. They are not now being adequately addressed in an appropriate manner by our party.

Finally, in the 200th year of this nation's independence, it is a national disgrace that the people of Washington, D.C. still do not have voting representation in Congress. Three-quarters of a million people live in Washington, D.C. They work there, they raise their families there, they pay their taxes there and they provide the support services needed to keep the machinery of our national government running. They were the first addition to the thirteen original colonies and have a larger population than is found in a number of states, but still, Dis-

trict of Columbia residents have no vote in Congress.

The people of the District of Columbia suffer not only from federal taxation without voting representation, but their local government's policy decisions are frequently subject to veto by a Congress in which they have no vote. This is an issue that will not go away. Three quarters of a million people want to have voting representatives in Congress. I believe the Republican Party should do all that it can to help them secure this basic right that is enjoyed by all other American citizens.

---

Contributor Note: This article was adapted from testimony given by Daniel L. Hall to hearings of the Republican Platform Committee. In a write-in campaign, Hall won the Republican nomination in May for the District of Columbia's non-voting representative in Congress. Hall is a management consultant with an extensive background in government, community and business work; he has also been chairman of the Political Affairs Committee of the D.C. Chapter of the Rip-on Society.

## COMMENTARY: RNC

### WEIGHTING VOTING ON THE RNC

by Josiah Lee Auspitz

The current structure of the Republican National Committee, on which each state has the same number of votes, has advantages that are in keeping with Republican philosophy. It encourages local control and diversity among the state parties. It undercuts any attempt at a dictatorially centralized or overly bureaucratic national party. And it makes the Republican National Committee a relatively small and collegial group in comparison with its Democratic counterpart.

However, this structure has some weaknesses that events of the past few years should lead us to remedy. The resignation and replacement of Sen. Thomas Eagleton as nominee for Vice President in the Democratic Party should remind us that a party needs procedures for replacing its nominee that will bear the scrutiny of an increasingly critical press and public. "One state, one vote" may be legally defensible, but it is a political liability. An added cause for scrutiny is to be found in the provision of taxpayer funds to the national committees of the two major parties for convention expenses. (See the 1974 amendments to the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act, 26 US Code 9008.) The Supreme Court decision handed down this year in Buckley et al v. Valeo applies different standards to the use of public and private funds. This may encourage taxpayer suits or even

partisan legislation to deny public funds to the Republican National Committee if its structure gives grossly insufficient weight to large states which contain disproportionate concentrations of Catholic, Jewish, Spanish-speaking, and black citizens.

Finally, the health of the party itself in a fluid political and legal environment requires a national committee able to act as the representative agent of the national convention in the four-year period when the convention is not in session. Democrats have introduced sweeping new powers for their national committee in the past few years. The GOP would be untrue to the spirit of the two-party system if it denied itself the ability to compete on equal ground.

In 1972, the Republican National Convention did introduce an important precedent on which the Republican National Committee can build. Rule 30 (Section A, paragraph 8) authorizes the RNC to use weighted voting to supersede convention rules in the event of a court decision voiding certain provisions of the delegate allocation formula. In such an event, the RNC Members representing each state were authorized to cast the same number of votes as were allocated to said state or jurisdiction at the 1972 Republican National Convention. The following proposal builds on

this precedent. It can be conveniently introduced after paragraph A of Rule 29:

a) In all votes of the full Republican National Committee directly affecting Presidential and Vice Presidential selection, rules changes, and disbursement of federal campaign funds, committee members representing any state, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to cast the same number of votes as said state, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were entitled to cast in the preceding Republican National Convention. Procedural votes on whether a matter falls under this rule shall also be weighted to reflect voting strength at the previous convention. The vote of a state, jurisdiction, or territory may be divided in the event of disagreement among committee members representing said state, jurisdiction or territory.

b) In the event of the death, resignation, illness or legal disqualification of the Presidential or Vice Presidential nominees

in the period between the convention and the election, the Republican National Committee shall select a replacement by majority vote in accordance with the weighted voting specified in Section IIIa above. In the absence of death or a letter of resignation, a two-thirds weighted majority of the Republican National Committee must ratify judgments of unfitness.

Weighted voting would apply only to the full Republican National Committee on specified issues. On committees and all other issues, RNC operations would remain unchanged. This gives the RNC the advantage of a flexible response capability without the unwieldy and bureaucratic structure of the Democrats. ■

---

Contributer Note: Josiah Lee Auspitz is an independent research fellow in political philosophy for the National Endowment for the Humanities. This article is adapted from testimony given by Auspitz, a former national president of the Ripon Society, at hearings of the RNC Convention Rules Committee.

---

To: FORUM SUBSCRIBERS  
From: Dick Behn, Editor  
Subject: Political Information

The FORUM is always seeking additional political information, particularly, in an election year. Your help in filling in information on the following form and sending it along with relevant newspaper clippings to Box 226, Charlestown, Massachusetts 02138, would be greatly appreciated.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
State: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

In a Ford-Carter race, who would capture your state? \_\_\_\_\_

In a Reagan-Carter race, who would capture your state? \_\_\_\_\_

Gubernatorial Race Notes:

Senate Race Notes:

Congressional Race Notes:

State Legislative Race Notes:

Whether successful or not, Ronald Reagan's struggle for the Presidency has drastically changed the character of the Republican Party. No matter who eventually wins in Kansas City, the Republican candidate will embark upon a fall campaign as the nominal leader of a severely fractured party.

But, to understand the implications of the Reagan challenge, the situation that provoked the struggle must first be understood. In July 1975, several factors seemed to dictate the logical strategy for the Republican Presidential hopes of 1976. Because of their minority party status, the Republicans appeared to face an uphill fight. Nevertheless, Republican Party unity combined with internal Democratic strife seemed capable of allowing a GOP opportunity for retaining the Presidency. Moreover, during his first year in office, President Ford had shown a high level of competence in handling foreign affairs, and he had managed to stabilize a somewhat shakey economy. Ideologically at the center of the Republican spectrum, President Ford appeared to be the only rational choice for the GOP.

Superseding logic, however, was the historical structure of the Republican Party. For many years, a clearcut internal rift has divided the GOP. The rightwing faction has tended to support zealously a strict, conservative philosophy. In addition, the ideologues in this faction have refused to exhibit a basic tolerance for fellow party members who hold a less rigid world view. On the other hand, the less conservative wing of the party has voiced a somewhat more moderate political philosophy, and generally, this group has focused less on ideological purity than on building a majority coalition. This historical party split may explain the basic reason for the Reagan challenge. In the summer of 1975, President Ford did not represent ideological perfection to the Republican right wing.

As the conservative dissidence became increasingly evident, President Ford moved to quell the incipient rebellion. During the fall months, he gradually moved to the right to conciliate conservative protests. Nelson Rockefeller was removed from further consideration as a Vice Presidential candidate. Increasingly, the Administration emphasized its support for a strong national defense and its hardline attitude against big government. In all fairness, President Ford's efforts should have staved off right-wing challenge.

Curiously, Ford's strategy did not suc-

ceed. Conservative ideologues were not satisfied with the President concessions. Moreover, as the President shifted gradually to the right, his support from Republican moderates became less intense. With the President in a weakened position, Ronald Reagan launched his challenge.

Cultivating a right-wing constituency, Reagan sought to distinguish differences between his positions and those of the President. Yet, because of the President's solid conservative record, the former California governor offered little in terms of substantive issue differences. Therefore, the nomination struggle became primarily a contest of differing styles.

On the one hand, as a member of the minority party in Congress for 26 years, President Ford exhibited the style of an experienced problem solver. Drawing from his background in the House, Ford realized the limits of a minority party member in achieving his preferred policy outcome. Moreover, Ford understood the limits of elected officials in delivering on campaign promises. The President's style was that of an honest man who would not oversell the powers of the Presidency.

On the other hand, in his campaign rhetoric, Ronald Reagan did not feel constrained by either the limits of a minority Presidency or the complexity of domestic and world problems. Thus, Reagan was able to excite the right-wing groups with his rhetoric on such matters as defense spending, welfare abuse, bureaucratic waste and even the Panama Canal. By striking a more vocal and simplistic conservative style than Ford, Ronald Reagan captured the hard core support of the party's right wing.

Through July 1976, the substance of the Ford-Reagan race has not changed significantly. A difference in style is still the major ingredient. Yet, with the end of the Presidential primaries and thus the reduced need to win voter popularity, the question of style is somewhat less important for the Republican Party. An increasingly important consideration is which candidate would be stronger in the November general election.

Supporters of President Ford argue with some validity that their man would be the stronger candidate. Not only does the President seem to occupy a somewhat more moderate position than Reagan, but Ford possesses the inestimable advantage of in-

cumbency. Voters would be hard-pressed to turn Ford out of office in the midst of a strong economic recovery.

In contrast, the arguments in favor of Reagan's electability leaves much to be desired. His supporters contend that because Reagan is a new face in national politics, he would be able to capitalize on current anti-Washington sentiment. Yet, that argument is invalidated by Democratic nominee Jimmy Carter. Not only is Carter perceived as an anti-Washington figure, but he also is a member of the party which is out of power.

A second argument proposed by Reaganites is that Reagan could attract enough Democratic support to construct some sort of conservative majority. Clearly, that strategy did not work for Barry Goldwater in 1964 against a moderate-liberal, Lyndon Johnson. Why should it work in 1976 against a more conservative Jimmy Carter? The obvious conclusion is that the only hope for a continued

---

#### REPUBLICAN DELEGATES/ALTERNATES

The Ripon Society is interested in working with delegates on issues regarding the party platform, delegate apportionment, and the presidential nominating contest. Please send your name, address, and phone number to Jeanne Cronin, Ripon Society, 1609 Connecticut Ave, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

---

Republican Presidency lies with the nomination of Gerald Ford. Moreover, the impact of the Reagan challenge upon Republican Party hopes in 1976 is extremely clear. Reagan has proved to be a severely damaging force to the GOP. Should Ford be the nominee, then the intensification of intraparty strife brought about the Reagan challenge shall surely work against him. Instead of providing healthy internal competition, the Reagan challenge has served only to weaken the GOP.

For the more distant future, the meaning of the Reagan challenge appears ambiguous. On one hand, it has bitterly divided an already ailing minority party—a party which is trying to withstand the pressures of a constantly decreasing membership. On the other hand, perhaps the impending debacle of 1976 will teach Republicans the lesson that should have been learned back in 1964. The only way to achieve majority party status is through broad-based support. And the only way to attain broad-based support is through a basic tolerance of diverse ideas and ideologies within the party. The umbrella of the GOP must be spread large enough to encompass a wide range of beliefs. ■

---

Contributor Note: Jay S. Lucas is a first-term state representative from Newport, New Hampshire, a "Ford" delegate to the Republican National Convention, and campaign manager for Gerard Zeiller, the moderate Republican candidate in this year's primary against Gov. Meldrim Thomson(R-N.H.).

---

**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 © 1976 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. Rehluss, 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.