

RIPON FORUM

The New Politics
of the
Old Dominion

MAY 15, 1977

VOL. XIII, No. 10

50 cents

Commentary: New York

SHIFTING THE REPUBLICAN AXIS

by Dick Behn

Since he stepped down as Vice President, there have been periodic rumors that Nelson Rockefeller was about to run for mayor of New York City or otherwise abandon his current political retirement. There has been no dramatic evidence to document the rumors but New York politics without Nelson Rockefeller is missing one of its most stable elements.

For thirty years, the dominance of the Republican Party by first Gov. Thomas Dewey (1942-54) and then Rockefeller (1958-73) was a constant in both New York politics and the politics of the national Republican Party. The power of New York City money and political talent combined with the power of the New York governorship to assure the influence of New York within the GOP.

Since 1900, Republican and Democratic governors from New York have alternated in dominating the political machinery of their respective national parties. Republicans Theodore Roosevelt (1898-1901) and Charles Evans Hughes (1907-1910) were key figures in the presidential contests of the century's first two decades. Roosevelt was placed on the GOP's 1900 national ticket by GOP boss Thomas C. Platt specifically to get him out of Albany.

The election of Alfred E. Smith (1919-1920, 1923-28) began an era of Democratic dominance that was continued by Franklin D. Roosevelt (1928-32). When Dewey succeeded Herbert Lehman, he resurrected Republican preeminence in the state. Democratic Gov. Averell Harriman's dreams of Pennsylvania Avenue were abruptly ended by Nelson Rockefeller in 1958. In his new position Rocky replaced Dewey as a given in the Republican presidential equation for the next two decades.

Rockefeller also replaced Dewey as a target of Republicans who resented New York's dominance of Republican National Conventions. At the 1952 GOP National Convention at which Dewey had played a key role in securing the nomination of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late Sen. Everett Dirksen pointed told the New York governor: "We followed you before and you took us down the path to defeat."

Dewey had been a master at pre-convention politics, nearly winning the 1940 nomination as well as those in 1944 and 1948. Dewey never allowed himself to become polarized from major party groups. Writing on Dewey's success in winning the GOP presidential nomination in 1948, pollster Elmo Roper said: "He did it by avoiding a coalition with either side, nationalists or internationalists. He drove his efficient organization right down the middle to fill the gaping hole which separated the two wings. He was able to do this because of a general lack of agreement as to where he stood, which created a political vacuum that pulled in votes from all sides."

While his organization was efficient, Dewey presented a public image much different from the one projected by Nelson Rockefeller. While Dewey suffered from a reputation for aloofness, coldness, and opportunism, Rockefeller was an ebullient campaigner who projected better in person than on television. While Dewey had avoided specific stands, Rockefeller alienated fellow Republicans with the specificity of his stands. While Dewey lacked an earthy warmth and touch of human frailty, Rockefeller's warmth was punctured by the frailties of his divorce and remarriage.

While Dewey never mastered the art of the general election campaign, Rock-

efeller never mastered the art of pre-convention politics. He became an easy target for those Republicans who resented both New York and Eastern liberalism. Rockefeller became a codeword for what many southern, midwestern and western Republicans disliked about the functioning of the GOP. He was a convenient lightning rod for both conservative and geographic static.

Up until 1964, pragmatic Republican politics required the GOP to consider the impact of a potential nominee on New York's Electoral College votes. The nomination of Barry Goldwater demonstrated the willingness of many Republicans to write off New York. Whereas the traditional conflict within the GOP in this century had been between the Midwest (represented by Ohio's Robert Taft) and the Northeast (represented by Dewey and Eisenhower), 1964 marked an alliance between much of the Midwest and the South and West. The regional fluidity carried over into the 1968 contest between Nixon, Rockefeller and Reagan. 1976 marked the emergence of a new Northeast-Midwest coalition which parried with the South-West coalition of Ronald Reagan.

With Rockefeller's retirement, many of the old antagonisms to New York within the national GOP may retire as well. Symbolically, Rockefeller was a political bonanza for his opponents. Stimulating such a wide range of animosities would be a difficult chore for any future New York Republican leader.

Without Rockefeller's prestige and media exposure, the New York GOP may temporarily lose party influence. It may be possible for other Northeast Republicans to emerge from the shadow of New York and Rockefeller into the national prominence they could not attain so long as Rocky was politically active. A Republican governor from New Jersey, for example, would automatically assume greater prominence in the post-Rockefeller era. So do senators like Massachusetts' Edward Brooke and Pennsylvania's John Heinz.

In the long run, New York may be able to achieve greater political effectiveness within the GOP. The Northeast-Midwest alliance may be revived in 1980 behind a moderate candidate like Illinois Gov. James Thompson. In the immediate future, New York will

be free from the "bully" image it carried into GOP politics for the past 30 years. It would be ironic if stripped of the burdens of leadership, New York became a more effective force within the GOP.

Internally, the New York Republican Party is struggling to fill the vacuum left by Rockefeller's retirement. GOP State Chairman Richard Rosenbaum and State Vice Chairman Eunice Whittlesey were chosen in early April to succeed Rockefeller's longtime allies on the Republican National Committee, George Hinman and Dorothy McHugh. A more important choice for the GOP will be the selection of a successor to Rosenbaum as state chairman in June.

Rosenbaum has effectively dropped the gubernatorial ambitions he once held to return to the practice of law. The acknowledged frontrunner for the 1978 gubernatorial nomination is Assembly Minority Leader Perry Duryea of Suffolk County. Duryea, however, is surveying the political landscape before committing himself to the race against Gov. Hugh Carey (D). Another moderate-conservative, State Senate Majority Leader Warren Anderson, is considered Duryea's chief competition for the post. U.S. Rep. Jack Kemp, a Buffalo area congressman who had been exploring a gubernatorial race, has now refocused his eyes on the 1980 race for the seat now held by Sen. Jacob Javits.

Any opponent of Gov. Carey will have a tough race. The incumbent Democrat has proven to be much more adept at political image-building than at the complexities of running the state. Republican legislators tend to talk wistfully of the forceful Rockefeller leadership of past legislative sessions. But should Duryea win the governorship, it would bring his impressive powers of both leadership and conciliation to the national Republican scene. Duryea's style fits the immediate requirements of New York's place in the GOP national firmament. Though less dramatic than Rockefeller's, it potentially could be more effective. ■

RENEW TODAY

Write: Ripon Society
800 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Almost 30 years have passed since Secretary of State George C. Marshall delivered his commencement address at Harvard University in which he proposed the Marshall Plan for the post-war recovery of Europe. While European-American relationships have changed significantly since the post-war years, Europe again looks to the United States for leadership and support from the world's most recent recession in 1973-75.

At the European Community Council meeting of heads of government in late November and during the Mondale Mission to Europe in January, European leaders pressed the Carter Administration for clues to American foreign economic policy and for support for joint economic growth.

How the Carter Administration intends to respond to these needs is not yet clear. It is not even clear whether or not the Carter Administration will respond directly to them at all. The withdrawal of the President's proposed \$50 rebate is the sort of response which is likely to confuse finance ministries in Western Europe.

The Carter Administration has the usual opportunity of any new administration to reshape and redirect American policy toward Western Europe. And while defense and the coordination of certain kinds of geographic policies will always remain important in the relations between Europe and America, the major policy problem now affecting those relations is economic: How do the industrialized countries of Western Europe and the United States (along with Japan) achieve their joint goals of economic growth without inflation or substantial unemployment.

American contributions to the eventual solution will inevitably be made against a backdrop of several factors. Among them are these:

First, Europe remains the principal American overseas interest. Without intending to minimize our relationships with other parts of the world, it is Western Europe that is America's major ally, major trading partner and investment center, and the major source of our shared values, history, and econom-

ic and political arrangements. Europe's prosperity, growth, and stability must occupy the highest place in American priorities.

Second, there has undoubtedly been a shift in emphasis in Euro-American relations from the political and military to the economic. In other words, there has been an increasingly politicization of economic relationships between Europe and the United States.

The Marshall Plan is a forerunner of such concerns. But until relatively recently, this kind of politics was overshadowed by the military and diplomatic problems confronting the alliance.

The new emphasis on economics reflects two fundamental developments: First, political leadership on both sides of the Atlantic have had to cope with economic problems which are increasingly resistant to traditional economic prescriptions. Second, the energy crisis spawned by the 1973-74 oil embargo has added another burden to the already overloaded agendas of Western political leaders.

At one time, the private sector acted as a buffer between the two regions. Now the demands of domestic economies on national governments have exacerbated international economic problems.

Meanwhile, the relative positions of the United States and Europe have changed since 1973. In the Vietnam Era that preceded the oil embargo, the prestige of the United States appeared to decline in comparison with that of Western Europe. The war, urban riots and racial conflicts, the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., the inflation and recession of the early 1970s, the closing of the gold window in 1971, and the incredible paralysis of the Watergate scandal all seemed to be the symptoms of an irreversible decline in America which would inevitably mean that at last Europe and the United States could face each other as equals...or dumbbells as they were described in one popular metaphor.

Moreover, while America seemed to be declining, Europe was expanding, and if

the great movement toward unity appeared to slow a bit, at least the work was being consolidated. In particular, the rivalry between the Economic Community and the Free Trade Association ended with the British, Danish and Irish joining the former group.

But the oil embargo and the ensuing recession reversed the trend. The Vietnam War ended, some progress seemed visible in America in the areas of racial discrimination and urban blight, the assassinations faded in memory, the American balance of payments bounced back, and the floating exchange rate was institutionalized while gold was demonetized, thereby ending or at least alleviating several of the peskiest problems of recent times.

Perhaps more important, the Watergate episode finally drew to an end, and President Ford gave the country two years of quiet, stable government. While Europe scrambled to make quick deals with the Arabs to ensure oil supplies, the United States attempted to exert leadership in attempting to create an international and ongoing energy agency. It soon became clear that of all the western industrialized nations, the United States was the least apt to be affected, at least in the short run, by an energy shortage.

Moreover, the United States seems to have recovered more rapidly from recession. While unemployment and inflation are still high, the inflation rate is lower than that in Western Europe, and our unemployment rate seems headed in the right direction. The inauguration of Jimmy Carter with solid Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress, that seem unlikely to dissipate significantly in 1978, promised four years of continuous leadership in the United States.

No such situation obtains in Western Europe. Of the four major powers in the European Community---Britain, France, Germany, and Italy---none has a really stable government. All have faced recent threats to their authority. Of the four, only Germany has what could be called a "good" economic outlook for 1977. Britain and Italy, on the other hand, remain in serious economic straits.

All of which is to say that the American decline relative to Europe seems to have been arrested. It is now the Europeans who are looking to the new Carter Administration for some guidance and assistance in restoring prosperity

without inflation and unemployment.

There are a number of specific policies which the Carter Administration will consider and perhaps implement during the next few months. The President's energy message in April had important implications for economic relations between the United States and Europe. Certainly, it indicates to the Europeans the seriousness with which the United States views the seriousness of the energy problems faced by members of the Atlantic alliance.

Whether or not one agrees with the President's emphasis on energy demand rather than energy supply, the fact remains that the statement has been made and certain directions almost inevitably set. Thus far, there has been little negative reaction from Europe.

What the Europeans have been urging is that the United States join Germany and Japan in some stimulation of the three nations' economies in order to improve trade and upll Europe out of its doldrums in an export-led recovery. Thus far, the Carter Administration has been reluctant to undertake that effort. It apparently believes that the American economy is already improving and that to do more would merely increase the chances of renewed inflation. The Germans and Japanese both seem to agree with this analysis. They too have resisted specific policies aimed at deflation.

More important than precise policies is the matter of American attitude and philosophy toward Europe. The Carter Administration, like all its predecessors, will obviously employ policies which the administration perceives to be in the nation's best interests. The important point, therefore, is to realize that Europe's prosperity and growth are matters of the greatest interest to the United States.

No so-called "domestic" American economic policy will be without its ramifications in Europe. The key to the pursuit of a principal American national interest is the thoughtful, cooperative development of economic policy which will promote the economic development of both the United States and Europe. ■

Contributor Note: Thomas A. Sargent is an associate professor at Ball State University in Indiana and a contributing editor to the FORUM.

Politics: Virginia

OLD CANDIDATES IN THE OLD DOMINION

The next gubernatorial campaign in Virginia generally starts about the time that the ballots are being counted from the last one. The loser is frequently a potential candidate for the next election since state law eliminates the possibility that the incumbent can run again.

The three candidates in this year's gubernatorial election began their campaigns in 1973. In reality, however, they have been preparing for even longer. Henry Howell ran unsuccessfully for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1969, won a special election as lieutenant governor and then lost the 1973 gubernatorial election to Gov. Mills Godwin. Attorney General Andrew Miller has been incubating in that post since 1970 while Lt. Gov. John Dalton has been waiting for the gubernatorial office to have a vacancy since 1974.

The first round in this year's contest will be the June 14 Democratic primary between Howell and Miller. The second round on November 8 seems likely to mark the further decline of the Virginia GOP---a process which began with the election of Sen. William Scott(R) in 1972.

Dalton, who is assured of winning the Republican nomination at the GOP state convention June 4, is the son of Federal Judge Ted Dalton. The elder Dalton, a leader of GOP moderates in the 1950s, nearly upset the Democratic machine by winning the gubernatorial post himself in 1953. As the son of a leading moderate, the younger Dalton has never really been trusted by the hard-core conservatives who dominate the Virginia GOP. In an effort to avoid a competing candidacy from the GOP right, John Dalton has moved rightward since 1973.

Dalton's positioning has prevented the feared conservative rebellion, but it has weakened him considerably as a candidate in the general election. Dalton's most recent stance in his series of conservative postures is his opposition to "peak load" pricing for electricity. He also continues to stress issues---such as opposition to common situs picketing and support for the right-to-work law---that are not major issues in 1977. Overemphasis of these right-wing positions splits him further and

further from the black, blue collar, and moderate voters whom he needs in November.

Dalton's weakness on issues is compounded by poor organization, a large but weak staff, and a dearth of campaign funds. Increasingly, it appears that the winner of the Democratic primary will be Virginia's next governor.

The few moderates left in Virginia's GOP tried to find a stronger candidate to run in Dalton's place. Former moderate Republican Gov. Linwood Holton(1970-74) was urged to run. He backed off, preferring to keep his eye on the upcoming 1978 Senate race. Former Navy Secretary and U.S. Bicentennial Director John Warner wanted to run. He started too late and could make no serious challenge to Dalton within the inner circles of the party. Warner was more successful in his campaign for Elizabeth Taylor's hand in marriage. Even Gov. Godwin foresaw Dalton's problems and reportedly urged him to run again for lieutenant governor.

Thus, the Virginia GOP enters the 1977 race with a likely loser as its candidate. Dalton is the product of the mistaken Republican philosophy of limiting competition within the party. Only a Democratic bloodbath on June 14 will give Dalton the office he so badly wants.

The Democrats occasionally provide some signs they may oblige. Like Dalton, Miller is the son of a one-time non-Byrd Machine candidate for governor. Like Dalton, he is a moderate who has sought conservative money and conservative support in his effort to win the gubernatorial nomination. And like Dalton, a good part of his gubernatorial quest is based on conservative consternation at a possible victory by populist Henry Howell of Norfolk.

Howell, a former state senator, won election as lieutenant governor in 1971 as an independent. When Howell ran as an independent for governor in 1973, the badly-splintered Democratic Party did not nominate a candidate. His narrow loss in that race provided an opportunity for a rerun that will probably be his last try for the governorship.

Initially, it looked as if Miller would defeat Howell---particularly as smart conservative ABH (Anyone But Howell) money shifted from Dalton to Miller. But the former attorney general, who recently resigned, has been a surprisingly poor candidate in terms of issues, organization, and advertising. Howell, meanwhile, is looking much stronger than some had anticipated. He seems well organized, but perhaps more importantly, he is more centrist and less populist than during his earlier campaigns. There is much less "Keep the Big Boys Honest" rhetoric this year.

Howell has the AFL-CIO's endorsement, disappointing Miller who had hoped to keep labor neutral in the contest. Howell has also gained the support of two important black organizations. While Miller is still afforded the edge over Howell, his bumbling has demonstrated his ability to lose the Democratic primary. A Miller victory would seriously deflate Dalton's chances in November.

The contests for attorney general and lieutenant governor have provided the only statewide GOP competition this year. The GOP establishment searched long and hard for a lieutenant governor candidate who could defeat State Sen. Joe Canada (R-Virginia Beach). Canada's vote against the Equal Rights Amendment earlier this year---in the face of his



MILLS GODWIN

stated support for ERA---galvanized opposition from both sides of the ERA controversy. Former State Finance Secretary Walter Craige, Jr., has announced for the nomination. While he is a very competent investment banker, Craige is a colorless speaker and inexperienced political campaigner.

The liveliest GOP contest is for the nomination for attorney general. Moderate-conservative State Sen. J. Marshall Coleman from Staunton is in an uphill fight against State Del. Wyatt Durette from northern Virginia's Fairfax County. Durette has the emotional support of the conservatives, who will control the nominating convention, because he served as a regional coordinator for Ronald Reagan in last year's presidential campaign. Although Durette now proudly wears the conservative mantle, he had been---until political expediency directed him otherwise---rather moderate and at times even a closet liberal. Durette's support for Reagan has apparently cleansed him of past ideological sins. Coleman is working hard to secure convention votes on a limited budget and may yet wrest the nomination from Durette.

The Democrats are enjoying a three-way scrap for the nomination for lieutenant governor. Contending for it are State Del. Major Reynolds, brother of the late lieutenant governor and scion of the Reynolds Metals family; Chuck Robb, husband of Lynda Bird Johnson; and State Del. Ira Lechner, a bright attorney from Arlington.

Reynolds has the most going for him in terms of political name and money and the least in terms of smarts, looks, judgment and ability. Robb has a pretty face, smiles nicely, and has the fervent support of the ABL (Anyone But Lechner) money---a source of funds similar to ABH money. Lechner has three things going against him: he is Jewish, from northern Virginia, and as a labor union lawyer, supports collective bargaining for public employees. Lechner has campaigned almost full time for two years, but he still is not as well known as Robb or Reynolds. Reynolds currently appears to be leading, but his inept campaigning may enable Robb to win the primary.

Four Democrats of varying ideological hues are vying for the nomination for attorney general: State Del. Edward Lane of Richmond, a 24-year House veteran; State Del. "Shad" Solomon of isolated Bath County; State Del. John Melnick of

Arlington; and John Schell, a bright young liberal attorney from northern Virginia.

Melnick has labor's backing but that may not be enough to overcome his difficult style. Schell has the backing of the blacks, but lacks an organization and name recognition. Lane is lackluster and conservative but favored to win, particularly if Schell and Melnick split fairly evenly the 15-20 percent of the vote in northern Virginia. The dark-horse is Solomon. Although he is 58, a one-term delegate, short, and portly, he has built up many contacts around the state through his vice chairmanship of the state crime commission. Given the Democratic field, the attorney general's office may provide the GOP with its best opportunity this year.

While the 1977 contests hog the lime-light, there is already interest in the 1978 Senate election to replace retiring Sen. William Scott(R). The conservatives beat back an attempt by GOP moderates earlier this year to schedule a primary for 1978. The GOP candidate will now be chosen in a convention that

the right wing believes it will easily control.

At the moment, former state Republican Chairman and national GOP Co-Chairman Richard Obenshain has the conservatives' blessing for the nomination. Former Gov. Holton has indicated an interest, but the odds against him may be too great. John Warner appears hungrier and more likely to contest Obenshain, but he will have a difficult job overcoming the conservative leader.

The Democratic field is broader. It is also more obscure since the state's two leading Democrats are battling each other for this year's gubernatorial nomination. Names already in the ring are retiring State Del. Carrington Williams of Falls Church; liberal State Sen. Clive DuVal of Fairfax; and State Sen. James Edmunds of Southside Virginia. One of this year's Democratic statewide contenders will probably get the nomination. And that Democrat will probably win if the Republicans nominate Richard Obenshain. Stung with a Scott once, Virginians are not likely to make a similar mistake. ■

Ripon: Update

SOUTH DAKOTA A poll taken by Decision Making Inc. in April shows that U.S. Rep. Larry Pressler has a 67-24 percent lead over Gov. Richard Kneip(D) were the two to face each other in the 1978 Senate election. The Republican congressman led Sen. James Abourezk by a 60-20 percent margin before the Democratic incumbent decided to retire. Matched in a GOP primary with his 2nd C.D. colleague, James Abdnor, Pressler would win by a 53-26 percent margin with undecided Republicans leaning overwhelmingly to Pressler. Abdnor led Kneip in the same poll by only a narrow margin. The survey was sponsored by Citizens for the Republican, the National Conservative Political Action Committee, and the Pressler for Congress Committee.

MICHIGAN The surprise announcement by Sen. Robert Griffin(R) that he would not seek reelection in 1978 has shaken the political lineup in Michigan. It has raised the possibility that Gov. William Milliken(R) might switch to the Senate race and former Lt. Gov. James Brickley, now president of Eastern Michigan University might enter the gubernatorial race. An able and articulate moderate, Brickley could use his absence

from the Michigan political scene to good advantage. Griffin's announcement followed a recent Democratic poll showing that Attorney General Frank Kelly(D) would run strong races against both Griffin and Milliken. Griffin apparently tired of the strains of political life without the rewards that followed from his former leadership post and friendship with Gerald Ford. Griffin's 1966 opponent, former Gov. G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams, is now being mentioned as a possible Senate or gubernatorial candidate. Public Service Commissioner William R. Rawls(D) has already announced his gubernatorial aspirations while House Speaker Bobby Crim has denied his. GOP conservatives are likely to use Griffin's retirement to run their own nominees for senator or governor or both. State Sen. Jack Wellborn, who led last year's Reagan campaign, is likely to be a key figure in such an effort. Other potential Republican Senate candidates include U.S.Rep. Philip E. Ruppe and former U.S.Rep. Marvin Esch.

IOWA The situation in Iowa resembles that in Michigan and Maine. In all three states, Republicans have one "sure winner" who could run for either the governorship or the Senate. And in all three, Republicans would prefer to see the sure winner



MISSOURI

Missouri voters may be regretting their role in one of last November's biggest upsets, the defeat of Republican Gov. Christopher "Kit" Bond. In a recent analysis in the Kansas City Star, reporter T. Wayne Mitchell wrote: "Gov. Joseph Teasdale arrives at his 100th day in office with his administration beset by problems, and the Kansas City Democrats shows little inclination to spend enough time at the job to solve them. Signs in the first three months point to trouble ahead for the struggling administration. Some of the governor's staunchest supporters say privately that unless his performance improves he may face opposition in the Democratic primary should he choose to seek reelection...The governor has been unable to carry our major campaign promises, has failed to keep self-imposed deadlines for completing various tasks and has displayed an indecisiveness on issues. When reporters complained recently to Teasdale that he was giving different and often contradictory answers to the same question, Teasdale suggested that reporters discern his position by adopting the 'majority of his statements.'" Teasdale's policy troubles are compounded by his apparent indifference to the work ethic.

seek the governorship than the Senate. If Ray switched from the governorship after 10 years to oppose Sen. Dick Clark, the GOP would probably have a divisive primary between moderate Lt. Gov. Arthur Neu and conservative Attorney General Dick Turner. Conservative former Lt. Gov. Roger Jepsen is also a gubernatorial possibility, but in any event, the GOP would have trouble holding the post. Should Ray decide against the Senate seat, it would be an open GOP field, slanted uphill. Both GOP National Committee representatives---John McDonald and Mary Louise Smith---have been mentioned, but both are considered unlikely starters.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sen. Jesse Helms (R) seems to be adjusting his conservative image in preparation for next year's Senate campaign. Although Helms is not changing his ideological stripes, he is seeking to moderate his public image, according to the Charlotte Observer's Ferrel Guillory: "Helms is likely to appear more 'grandfatherly,' one Republican analyst theorized. 'Soothing,' suggested a GOP congressional aide. 'Sensitive,' said a Helms ally. So, for example, railing against bigness in government, labor and business helps Helms cast himself as a bit of a populist, a defender of the 'little guy,' the small businessman."

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., 800 18th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. 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. 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.