

RIPON FORUM

JUNE, 1969

VOL. V, No. 6

ONE DOLLAR



When Computers Hit Congress:

Systems Politics and the Checks and Balances



Dick Lugar: Making it as a GOP Mayor

Plus SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN ON THE FORTAS
AFFAIR . . . THE NEW YORK PRIMARY . . . JUS-
TICE DURING RIOTS . . . ABM POLITICS . . . NEW
JERSEY TRIUMPH . . . PEACE CORPS PROBLEMS
. . . AND A REPORT FROM MAHOUT ON SECRET
WHITE HOUSE PLANS!

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL —2

GUEST EDITORIAL

This month, Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, long a fighter for financial disclosure and other aspects of a meaningful Congressional code of ethics, discusses proper judicial ethics in the light of the slowly waning Fortas affair. —3

POLITICAL NOTES —3

ABM REPORT

Our special correspondent from Philadelphia reports on the ABM battle there and on how the Democrats are using it increasingly as a partisan issue on the local politics level. —6

RIOTS AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Is justice and due process for arrestees during a time of civil disorder possible in practical terms? Experience of major cities hit by riots for the last two years showed up major snags in our capacity to deal constitutionally and fairly with those arrested. The Kerner report highlighted this lack and warned that it must be dealt with. One city that has is New York, and Robert C. Dinerstein outlines the problems and the Lindsay Commission's solution. —7

MAKING IT AS A GOP MAYOR

Our special correspondent profiles Indianapolis Mayor Richard Lugar, whose energetic and progressive regime seems to be winning him friends and accolades in his new job despite all the frustrations and handicaps attendant thereto. —10

CONGRESS AND THE INFORMATION REVOLUTION

The third industrial revolution, summarized in the catchword "automation," has by now been transforming American industry at an accelerating rate for nearly two decades. What's going to happen when it hits Congress? M.I.T. professor and former Ripon president John S. Saloma III has been studying this question for some time, and concludes that a redistribution of the fundamental balance of powers may be in the offing with the advent of "Systems Politics." —15

BOOKS — THE PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps is a fascinating bureaucratic animal that has managed to avoid many of the pitfalls of its species. But Washington empire builders are eyeing it even as the Peace Corps itself continues its chronic identity crisis. In the outcome of this Washington melodrama lies the fate of the program, as Don Wolfensberger points out in his review of the latest Peace Corps book. —21

14a ELIOT STREET —22

LETTERS —23

MAHOUT

This month, our ace correspondent and journalistic seer reports from the White House, where realization of an impending housing gap with the U.S.S.R. has spawned a secret plan to solve this problem with a new "technological breakthrough." —24

THE RIPON SOCIETY, INC. is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young business, academic and professional men and women. It has national headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts, chapters in seven cities, National Associate members throughout the fifty states, and several affiliated groups of sub-chapter status. The Society is supported by chapter dues, individual contributions, and revenues from its publications and contract work. The Society offers the following options for annual contribution: Contributor \$25 or more; Sustainer \$100 or more; Founder \$1000 or more. Inquiries about membership and chapter organization should be addressed to the National Executive Director.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BOARD

Officers

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

Cambridge

*Terry A. Barnett
Howard L. Reiter
Sam Sherer

Chicago

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

Dallas

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

Hartford

*Nicholas Norton
Alvin Dozeman
William S. Glazier II

Los Angeles

*Melvin H. Bernstein
Edward H. McAniff
Richard J. Ward, Jr.

New Haven

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

Ex-Officio At Large

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

New York

*J. Eugene Marans
Robert L. Musser
Judah C. Sommer

Seattle

*Thomas A. Alberg
Camden Hall
William Rodgers

Washington

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

At Large

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

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

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

In publishing this magazine the Ripon Society seeks to provide a forum for fresh ideas, well-researched proposals and for a spirit of criticism, innovation, and independent thinking within the Republican Party. Articles do not necessarily represent the opinion of the National Governing Board or the Editorial Board of the Ripon Society, unless they are explicitly so labelled.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are \$10 a year, \$5 for students, servicemen, and for Peace Corps, Vista and other volunteers. Overseas air mail, \$10 extra. Advertising rates on request.

Editor: A. Douglas Matthews

Associate Editor: Evelyn Ellis

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

Technical Editor: Janet Beal

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

Circulation Manager: Nancy Morton

Correspondents

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

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

EDITORIAL

It was certainly no fault of the Administration that Mayor John Lindsay lost the Republican primary in New York. The rapid public transfer of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the Brooklyn Army Terminal; the grant of National Park status to the Queens Breezy Point area; the timely appearance of a super model cities grant; and the generous funding of the summer Youth Corps program all made it quite clear that a Republican mayor could expect substantial support and cooperation from a Republican Administration in Washington.

Those signals were a marked contrast to those emitted by Albany. The city's legislative program was smashed on practically all points as governor Rockefeller sat on his telephone — except for a strenuous successful effort to cut back welfare and administration funds which hit New York City hard and belied his personal financial contribution to the Lindsay effort. The disastrous vibrations from Albany may well have been the margin of defeat in New York.

Still, one could assign the same margin to the mayor's own failure to build up his party during the early years of his administration; ultimately, the primary results must be viewed as an anti-Lindsay vote among Republicans in New York.

But given the mini-minority status of the Republican Party in the city and the peculiar nature of the primary, the results are virtually meaningless. Although the GOP nomination was a hotly-contested prize, both candidates de facto deprived it of function by pledging to their respective supporters that they would continue the race as candidates under third-party labels even if denied the Republican line. Since the primary was not intended by either candidate to be determinative of his future candidacy, it is hardly reasonable to regard it as binding on anyone else. Unthinking application of the principle of party loyalty to the New York election simply yields absurd results.

The consequences of the unusual primary results also bear out this proposition. Although John Marchi beat Lindsay, the mayor's running mates Sanford Garelik and Fioravante Perrotta each scored impressive victories against their opponents on the Marchi slate for the respective nominations for President of the City Council and City Comptroller. Now Marchi, while invoking the hallowed principle of party unity, has indicated that, instead of supporting his fellow Republican nominees, he will campaign for his ideological soul brothers, Vito Bat-

tista and Robert F. Kelly of the Conservative ticket. Lindsay, on the other hand, while continuing to oppose Marchi, has pledged support for Garelik and Perrotta. Indeed, one could mount the Buckleyan argument that Lindsay is the more loyal Republican since he is supporting two out of three GOP nominees for city-wide office, while Marchi is supporting only one, himself. Q.E.D. about the meaningfulness of the Republican primary in traditional terms.

The election did have one potentially very important consequence, however: the decision to form a new party to which disgruntled Republicans and Democrats might repair. Whatever its name — the "Urban Party" is the current favorite — it amounts to a counterbalance outside the GOP to the growing aggressiveness of the Conservative Party (a function the Liberal Party never really performed because of its basic ideological if not operational compatibility with the regular Democrats). This development is a natural one which was bound to occur as soon as the Conservative Party gathered enough strength to make an impact on the GOP.

The appearance of the Urban Party, whatever its necessity, holds mixed omens for New York Republicans. It provides yet another party-splitting element and may be a vehicle for schismatic Democrats to devastate the election chances for future liberal Republicans. On the other hand, it could continue to serve its initial function of providing a platform for a progressive Republican, such as Senator Charles Goodell, if denied the nomination of his party. In fact, the new party seems tailor-made for a statewide race by a liberal Republican type in 1970 — with or without GOP endorsement.

This is not necessarily a good development for Nelson Rockefeller, but as noted he has himself to blame. His actions in the primary looked suspiciously like an effort to buy Conservative Party acquiescence to his candidacy in 1970, a prize which may cost a lot more now in light of the Conservatives' success in New York City. Instead, those machinations have resulted in the creation of a strong liberal pressure group, the Urban Party, outside of the GOP, which could open the pincer possibility of opposition to him from a liberal Republican next year.

At any rate, thanks to the ceaseless travail of the Conservatives, combined with divisions and mistakes in the progressive ranks, the Republican Party in New York has moved a step closer to being crunched to splinters.

The LESSONS of FORTAS

Last fall, for the second time in the history of the United States, the Senate withheld confirmation of a presidential nomination for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The first time was in 1795, when the Senate refused to confirm John Rutledge, who was nominated for Chief Justice by President Washington.

The wisdom of the Senate's recent action will be debated for a long time. While the resignation of Mr. Fortas, a brilliant lawyer, was a genuine human tragedy, even more important in the long run are the precedents which were established.

The Senate's role has been clarified and strengthened. No longer is it limited merely to ascertaining whether a nominee for the Court is "qualified" in the sense that he possesses some minimum measure of academic background or experience.

The Senate's action in the Fortas case stressed anew that under our constitution, the power of any president to nominate constitutes only half of the appointing process. The other half lies with the Senate and particularly in the case of a Supreme Court appointee, this solemn obligation includes ascertaining whether a nominee has a sufficient sense of restraint and propriety.

In addition, the case has sparked a renewed awareness of the need to maintain public confidence and trust in our institutions of government.

Unfortunately, a survey last year indicated that unfavorable feeling toward the Supreme Court outweighed favorable sentiment by a 3-2

ratio. If the judiciary in general and the Supreme Court in particular are to remain secure against tyrannies of all persuasions, they must retain the public's trust and confidence. The courts must not be scarred even by suspicions concerning the financial or political dealings of their members.

There is justifiable concern whether members of the Supreme Court or the federal judiciary should accept outside fees of any nature. Indeed, the Fortas case has reopened the question of what, if any, non-judicial roles justices or judges should play. Viewed realistically, there is little that a justice or judge can say or write publicly which does not involve issues likely to come before the courts.

Senator Griffin of Michigan has long been on record in favor of full financial disclosure for members of Congress. He has introduced a bill, S-2109, in the current session requiring public disclosure of all judges' outside earnings which at present has some 25 co-sponsors.

As a result of the Fortas case, the dialogue has begun. Hopefully, the serious attention now focused on legislation requiring all federal judges — including justices of the Supreme Court — to make full disclosure of outside income will result in the adoption of meaningful rules of conduct, perhaps by the Judicial Conference itself.

Accordingly, in the final analysis, a tragic episode in the history of the highest Court may prove to be the basis for revitalizing the strength and respect which the judiciary so desperately needs in these troubled times.

Political Notes

NEW YORK: Marchi beats Lindsay, Buffalo version

A bright light has been snuffed out, at least temporarily, in Buffalo, New York. Edward V. Regan, a 38-year-old Republican City Councilman-at-large has been one of the hottest properties in Buffalo GOP history for the past few years. In his fight for a Council position 4 years ago, Regan scored well in Polish and black districts, and upset the 2-1 edge that the Democratic Party holds in registration. As Councilman, he has

worked for constructive, substantive improvements and displayed the kind of ability which gave him a reputation as "the Lindsay of Buffalo."

But the GOP Ward Chairmen, in a meeting to endorse a candidate for this year's mayoralty race, ignored Regan's obvious qualifications and surprisingly endorsed Mrs. Alfreda Slominski, a sharp-tongued member of the School Board whose claim to fame is a harsh campaign against school busing to achieve integration. The vote, which Regan expected to win, was 21-1 against him, one more indication: A) that the "Louise Day Hicks Syndrome" which first surfaced in Boston still has a lot of political muscle in racially-inflamed cities; and B) that some Republican leaders still can't get over the thrill of picking inferior candidates and losing elections.

CALIFORNIA: GOP clinches control of state legislature

Robert G. Wood, a Republican apricot grower from Monterey County won the third straight victory of the year in a special election to fill a vacancy in the State Legislature. On June 17, Wood piled up a resounding 56% majority for the 34th Assembly District seat left vacant by the death of moderate Republican Alan Pattee. This gives the GOP a 41-39 majority in the Assembly and a majority in both Houses for the first time in 13 years — crucial in light of the upcoming 1971 reapportionment.

Wood, who calls himself a moderate, stated that he will not be a "rubber stamp" Republican, despite active campaigning and fundraising support from Governor Reagan.

Wood defeated Democrat and former State Senator Fred Farr, a leading conservationist, who resigned from his post as director of the Federal Highway Beautification Program to run for the Assembly.

VIRGINIA: hotsy totsy - mace for nazis!

We read the following intriguing note in the "NS Arms" section of a recent National Socialist White Peoples Party Bulletin, published in Virginia:

"Early last month the Party's supplier for Chemical Mace, the disabling self-defense gas, was put under intense pressure by federal authorities to cut off sales to NS Arms. Since then NS Arms has found another supplier for an even better product. The new product is called Chemical Billy. This new product contains 1.1% more phenylchloromethylketon (purified form of tear gas) than Mace. Civil rights groups have complained vigorously about the use of Chemical Billy by police departments. Chemical Billy is available only in 6-inch size cannisters which contain 80 half-second bursts. (A half-second burst is enough to bring even the biggest Buck to his knees.) Its pressurized stream will reach out 20 feet to an attacker. A volume purchase has permitted a significant reduction in the price of Chemical Billy: \$8.95 per cannister, \$10.95 with holster.

"A different product has been selected to replace the pen-sized container of Mace. This is called the Bodyguard. It has been selected because of its amazing potency and its ability to strike an attacker at greater distances than Mace. The Bodyguard can be carried easily in the shirt pocket. The reduced price of Bodyguard is \$4.95 each.

"Members and Supporters should arm each member of their family with a cannister of Chemical Billy or the Bodyguard."

MISSOURI: Danforth makes waves, hints '72 candidacy

Missouri Republicans, pinning their hopes for the future on Attorney General John C. Danforth, the only Republican to win state-wide office in 1968, were encouraged when he told the press recently that he would consider running for Governor in 1972.

Since his election, Danforth has forced Democratic Governor Hearnes and Lieutenant Governor Morris to admit that there are too many custodial positions at the new State Office Building in Kansas City. Hearnes and Morris cut 50 to 60 custodial jobs, considered plums for the Kansas City Democratic "factions." Danforth insisted on a public meeting of the board of public buildings and cited high custodial costs in comparison to federal office buildings in Kansas City. The situation is still simmering.

D. C.: RNC action program invades Democratic turf

What ever happens to old storefront campaign headquarters after the election is over? Instead of dusty desertion or a new pizza joint, they'll now become full-time social action centers, thanks to the GOP National Committee, which is launching this ambitious program in traditionally Democratic ghetto neighborhoods.

The Action Center project was designed by Elly M. Peterson, former chairman of the Michigan Republican Party and now GOP national vice chairman. She will try to set up on a national scale the success she engineered in 1967 in Detroit's 13th Congressional District. Residents of the 13th, a predominately black neighborhood, brought scores of problems and complaints to the Action Center. Though the center produced little measurable political progress, Ms. Peterson believes the dividends will roll in in the long run — already the office in Detroit has 100 active black workers, a local black director and is on its way to trimming the close to 90% Democratic voting record of the district.

Co-sponsors of the program are Connecticut State Committeewoman Tina Harrower and John Marttila, the first director of the Detroit Action Center. Marttila has gone right to work getting things stirring in Newark and Wilmington.

—Please turn to page 9

Creeping Partisanization on ABM

(From Our Special Correspondent)

Almost before the press had filed out of the East Room of the White House after the President's announcement of the Safeguard system, Senator Hugh Scott (R.-Pa.) announced his support for the President's program of deployment. Coming from the newly-elected Minority Whip and a significant power in the Party, Scott's announcement was expected to start a chain reaction of support for the revised and no longer suburban-oriented ABM. But this particular domino theory failed to take account of the depth of opposition to the program in both the Senate and in local communities. The surfacing of broad based opposition in Scott's own state is a case in point. Once confined to a narrow base among peace groups, organized opposition to Safeguard has spread to a broad range of establishment local and civic groups.

An important forum against ABM was provided by Action for New National Priorities, a coalition of 21 community organizations, affiliated with a national group of the same name and chaired by former Pennsylvania Senator, Joseph Clark. Joining Clark to testify against ABM June 2 was an impressive array of scientists, churchmen and community leaders, including representatives from the YWCA, Delaware Valley Housing Association, City-wide Tenants Council and the Germantown Community Council. John Coleman, President of Haverford College, chaired the meeting, which gave Mrs. Roxanne Jones of the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization prolonged applause when she testified that poor people did not need an ABM and would soon be organized against it.

The biggest surprise of the meeting was the uncompromising position taken against ABM by David Berger, Mayor James Tate's hand-picked candidate to oppose the Republican incumbent, Arlen Specter, for District Attorney this fall. While Republican governors are forced to side-step the issue by claiming it is not a state issue, as they did at the recent Republican governor's conference in Lexington, Democrat Berger sees no anomaly in making it a city issue; on the other hand, neither did anyone else. Stung by the Young Democrats' endorsement of Specter at Temple University, Berger clearly was looking forward to a meeting before the ADA later in the month, where he hoped at least to neutralize support for Specter, who was

endorsed by ADA in 1965 and 1967 for D.A. and Mayor respectively.

Berger's remarks marked an increasing partisanism over ABM. On May 1, Philadelphia City Council passed a resolution "memorializing" the President to reconsider Safeguard and the contemplated reductions in health and welfare portions of the forthcoming budget. The resolution passed by a straight party vote, all three Republican councilmen voting "no." Another resolution introduced in the state House of Representatives by three Democrats would request Pennsylvania's Congressmen to vote against deployment of the proposed ABM system. Joe Clark, himself, led a petition drive against ABM in Philadelphia's downtown business district.

The most significant Republican opposition to Safeguard remained that of junior Senator Richard Schweiker, who sent a letter to the June 2 Armed Services hearing reaffirming his opposition.

Senator Scott appeared three days later in a press conference to bolster the ABM cause. Scott made public a poll, commissioned by the citizens group favoring ABM, which claimed 84% of Americans supported the idea of having an ABM defense in general while 73% specifically endorsed Safeguard.

The credibility of the \$10,000 Opinion Research Corporation poll was not free from doubt. One of the questions asked was: "President Nixon has come out for a limited ABM system—called the Safeguard system—which is supposed to protect our ability to strike back at an attacker. Do you think Congress should approve this system or should not?" When newsmen suggested the wording of the question made it "loaded," William Casey, chairman of the pro-ABM committee, replied that it had been written in "a restrained way."

Scott suggested at his press conference that the President might defer the request for acquisition of ten additional land sites or he might defer deployment in the interest of promoting disarmament talks with the Russians once Congress authorized deployment of the system. With his mail running 9-1 against Safeguard, a new group of community organizations entering the contest, and the apparent willingness of the Democrats to make ABM a partisan, local issue, Senator Scott may find some sort of meaningful ABM compromise in his interest.

Justice During Riots

The latter half of the 1960s in America has witnessed the beginning of what historians may well call The Era of Civil Disorders. In April 1968 alone, figures compiled by the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence at Brandeis show 202 "disorders" throughout the country. Obviously, the only long-term solution to the problem is the elimination of the roots of unrest; but in the meantime thought must be given to the maintenance of order without the abrogation of the rights of those arrested.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Commission), gave substantial attention to these problems in a much-overlooked section of its March, 1966 report. The Commission noted that "in the cities shaken by disorders . . . there were recurring breakdowns in the mechanisms for processing, prosecuting, and protecting arrested persons . . . which in the main resulted from long-standing structural deficiencies in criminal court systems." Building on this observation, the report checklisted some of the specific problems (*see box*) and urged that cities begin planning to eliminate them.

In New York, Mayor John Lindsay, who had served as vice-chairman of the Kerner Commission, responded by appointing an ad hoc Committee on the Administration of Justice Under Emergency Conditions. The article below details the emergency contingency plans and other changes in procedure instituted as a result of that hitherto unpublicized report.

Unfortunately, during the period of the 1967 and 1968 disorders and thereafter, the glimpse of the law enforcement process given to the general public by the mass media ceased once an arrest had been made. Subsequent discussion centered on whether the police had used too much or not enough force in making arrests; and whether, in fact a sufficient number of arrests had been made. Articles written by lawyers about riots took either a commercial approach, dealing with ghetto insurance or municipal liability for riot caused damages. Or they took an academic look at the constitutional aspects of arrest and search and seizure during riots. In short, both public and academic analyses of the administration of criminal justice during civil disorders seemed to stop at the courthouse door.

It was the Mayor's committee's job to go through that door and make a detailed analysis of local pro-

THE AUTHOR

Robert C. Dinerstein, 27, is Assistant Corporation Counsel for the City of New York. He was a staff member of the Mayor's Commission and drafted much of the legislation referred to in the article.

cedures and facilities. A report was submitted in August 1968 setting forth a detailed program for prompt booking and arraignment of large numbers of people in a short time without impairing their rights. Not surprisingly, the results of that scrutiny had an even greater impact than originally expected. Many procedures designed to cope particularly with a riot situation have replaced the standard procedure entirely. Several new techniques, about to be introduced as standard procedures, are going to be adopted to the emergency plan.

For example, under a bill passed this year in Albany, non-court personnel (a station desk clerk, for example) may be authorized by the Appellate Division to administer the oath in connection with swearing out a criminal complaint. This will allow the police and the district attorney to prepare a criminal complaint in a stationhouse or elsewhere away from the courthouse and free the officer to return to his patrol. This procedure will be used regularly during the evening hours, first in the Bronx and thereafter in Queens and Brooklyn; it will be followed in all cases during a disorder.

THE PROBLEM

In analyzing the experiences of those cities hardest hit by the 1967 riots, the Kerner Commission found that the breakdown in the administration of criminal justice was characterized by:

1. Relatively few successful prosecutions for serious crimes committed during the riot periods. For example, a majority of the felony charges were dismissed at preliminary hearings for lack of evidence or at trial for insufficient evidence.

2. Judicial procedures oriented to mass rather than individualized justice. In Detroit there were group arraignments and many defendants were not advised of their constitutional rights.

3. Absence of normal screening procedures to distinguish the more serious offender from minor offenders. This problem was characterized by inadequate identification procedures, lack of fingerprint checks and excessive bail. The Kerner Commission found that in Detroit the bond for curfew violators was as high as \$25,000 and usually not less than \$10,000. (In a less dramatic illustration of this problem, members of Mayor Lindsay's staff, inspecting the post-arraignment detention facilities

in the Manhattan Criminal Court the day following the Columbia University disorder, found Mark Rudd sitting in one cell, while nearby a Good Humor man sat glumly awaiting his fate.)

4. Inordinate delays in arraignment and admission to bail. Again, in Detroit, confinement for days prior to arraignment, coupled with detention for failure to make excessive bail, resulted in persons charged with minor offenses remaining incarcerated for a longer period prior to trial than their sentence would have been if convicted.

5. Shortages of judicial and non-judicial court personnel, probation officers and experienced defense counsel. Aggravated by the conditions already described, many indigent defendants pleaded guilty or went to trial without counsel in Detroit and Newark.

6. Serious overcrowding in detention facilities and failure to provide adequate food, water, toilet facilities and medical treatment.

7. Unavailability of adequate current information as to status or whereabouts of persons arrested which is necessary to enable families, counsel and other interested persons to communicate with them.

To deal with one final major obstacle to the effective handling of civil disorders the City Council passed a local law at the Mayor's request which authorized him to declare a state of emergency and to take certain appropriate measures such as imposing curfews, prohibiting the sale of liquor, guns and ammunition, prohibiting pedestrian and vehicular traffic and closing places of public assemblage. These statutes gave the Mayor the authority to take fast, responsive executive action in response to an emergency situation. The State Legislature passed a similar law giving such powers to the chief executive of all cities in the state.

Upon the recommendation of the Committee, the Mayor also had introduced in the State Legislature a series of bills designed to expedite the procedures from arrest to arraignment without diminishing the rights of the person arrested. Most of these measures were enacted into law. Taken together, they permit a policeman, after making an arrest during an emergency, to return quickly to his patrol while still insuring proper identification of officer and defendant, the right of a defendant to prompt booking and arraignment, to release on bail, if appropriate, and other due process safeguards.

The accomplishments of the Mayor's Committee in response to its specific mandate complement the following fundamental improvements made in the administration of justice in New York: the 1962 reorganization of the state court system; the 1965 revision

of the penal law and the proposed revision of the criminal code; the authorization by the State Legislature in 1968 of the addition of 20 judges to the New York City Criminal Court; the approval this year by the Legislature of the removal of traffic cases from the Criminal Court to an administrative agency, thereby freeing nearly 20 more judges; recent bail reforms.

These achievements do not mitigate the continuing need in New York City for expanded and modernized court facilities and more non-judicial court personnel. There is certainly need for improvement here and elsewhere. In an assessment of the nation's response to the Kerner Commission Report, compiled by Urban America, Inc. and The Urban Coalition, entitled "One Year Later," the picture was bleak. These groups had found little progress in upgrading the courts, which continue to suffer from even longer trial delays — an aspect of the problem of judicial administration which becomes particularly acute during a period of increased numbers of arraignments.

Few persons, black or white, lawyer or layman, who have been exposed to the conditions which exist in the lower criminal courts throughout most of the country, would question the urgent need for improvement.

The example set by Mayor Lindsay's Committee indicates the measure of success that can be achieved at the local level. Only a full commitment such as this will help restore confidence in our system of criminal justice.

—ROBERT C. DINERSTEIN

THE SOLUTION

The plan which the Lindsay committee, together with the courts, designed to take advantage of the statutory and procedural changes discussed provides for the establishment of "staging areas" and central booking facilities in the boroughs of Manhattan and/or Brooklyn. The staging area may be a police precinct, public building or large enclosure, depending upon the circumstances, but most important is that it be located on the periphery of the disturbance.

When the mayor has declared an official state of emergency, all of the procedures authorized by the special legislation together with appropriate changes, are put into effect. The groundwork for these is laid as the need for a state of emergency develops.

POST-ARREST PROCEDURE

Upon making an arrest, the police officer takes his prisoner to the staging area. At that time two Polaroid photographs of prisoner and officer are taken for identification purposes. The prisoner is searched; his thumbprint, the date and time recorded on the back of the photograph; and a simplified arrest form filled out. (These thorough identification procedures are vital in order to avoid the chaos that plagued such cities as Washington, D.C., in April, 1968, and Detroit and Newark in 1967. In these cities many hundreds of prosecutions of serious offenses failed for lack of adequate identification and facts concerning the crime.)

In order to promptly record those facts an assistant district attorney is stationed at the staging area to prepare a simplified, multi-carboned complaint form in the presence of the arresting officer. That officer "affirms" instead of "swearing to" the complaint before a court clerk as is normal procedure. (This technicality eliminates the need to have a court clerk at the staging area.) This insures the proper preparation of a legally sufficient complaint while the facts are still fresh in the mind of the arresting officer. At this point, the arresting officer returns to duty at the scene of the disorder.

BOOKING

An escorting officer or officers then takes several prisoners and their papers in vans to the central booking facility at the Criminal Court building in Manhattan (and/or Brooklyn if necessary). There the prisoner is booked and arraigned. First, he goes through standard pre-arraignment procedures. If the crime charged is fingerprintable under the Code of Criminal Procedure, that is done; but the prisoner is arraigned and considered eligible for bail, without awaiting a report on any prior criminal record, under the provisions of one of the emergency statutes.

The most important reason for this post-arrest procedure is to separate various classes of serious and non-serious offenders so that they may be treated as individuals on the appropriate basis. The first part of this evaluation of each offender is done by the Probation Department in their release-on-recognition (ROR) investigation. Priority is given to screening non-fingerprintable (less serious) offenses, since these would be most eligible for such release. (A person who is released on his own recognition is given an "appearance ticket," a type of summons analagous to a traffic citation, indicating the date on which he must return for trial. He is arraigned at that future date. Failure to appear on that date is considered bail jumping). These Probation Department reports will be submitted to the court at the arraignment which follows immediately to help guide the judge in setting bail.

ARRAIGNMENT ON BAIL

At the time of arraignment there are both prosecution and defense counsel (Legal Aid lawyers where the defendant does not have private counsel), who will have access to the complaint and ROR report. This, then, is the second and most important step in evaluating each case individually. The judge has before him the facts relating to the individual defendant. This is vital in order to avoid the "mass-arraignment" which the Kerner Commission found common in the wake of the 1967 riots. (It should be noted that the *escorting* officer appears with the defendant in court. The *arresting* officer is, of course, back on patrol. In many cities experiencing riots, this escort concept was used *without* the complaint of the arresting officer setting forth the facts.)

Upon the setting of bail, in appropriate cases, and a trial date, the arraignment process comes to an end. Bail bondsmen and sureties will be available at the central booking facilities and at the place of post-arraignment detention. These central bail offices will be kept open around the clock so that upon the posting of a bond at any time of night or day a person would be released immediately.

This surface sketch of the procedures does not indicate the extensive work required of each law enforcement agency, and of the courts, to perform the services necessary to make this plan work. These include furnishing transportation between the various points in the process; supplying food and medical care at the detention facilities; bail re-evaluation in every case where bail has been set and the defendant cannot post the bond; furnishing information to the public on curfews, etc.; and furnishing information to the family and friends of persons arrested.

— R.C.D.

PROFILE: Richard Lugar

Making it as a GOP Mayor

(From Our Special Correspondent)

Many residents of the south side of Indianapolis find the city's rambling Garfield Park a favorite Sunday spot for family reunions and recreation during the steamy days of midsummer. It is a time far removed from the two favorite Hoosier avocations — basketball and politics — or so it would seem.

But in the summer of 1967, for a man driving a slightly battered green Ford, such was not the case. Thirty-six-year-old Richard G. Lugar, the Republican candidate for the mayor of Indianapolis was determined to carry his bid for election into traditionally Democratic neighborhoods, and that meant visiting and talking to them wherever they could be found.

It was a strategy that paid off handsomely in November of that year, when with the help of strong organizational backing and a well-financed campaign against a relatively weak opponent, Dick Lugar became Indianapolis' first Republican mayor in nearly two decades. As one journalist observed, "it was a classic case of the right candidate, the right situation, and the effective organization coalescing around a single objective — the mayor's office."

Lugar's credentials for the job were impressive: a brilliant college career at Denison University, a Rhodes scholarship (where his path crossed that of Republican Bostonian John Sears), and a stint in the Navy marked his earlier years.

COWS, CANS, BIZ WHIZ

Returning to Indianapolis in 1960, he and his brother took over operation of several family interests including a large stock farm and the Thomas L. Green and Company firm, a producer of automated food machinery. Their aggressive joint management of these operations was such that Thomas L. Green was one of the first midwestern firms to be awarded President Kennedy's "E" for export excellence.

Lugar's reputation as a successful businessman also gave him leverage in Indianapolis' community and civic affairs, where he actively participated in or supported everything from the Chamber of Commerce and the Indiana (ABA) Pacers, as well as the Indianapolis Urban League and the Community Action Against Poverty program.

As an outspoken advocate of quality education (he is the youngest trustee of his alma mater, for example),

he made his first bid for elective office. Living on the west side of Indianapolis in a modest Cape Cod home with his wife Charlene (co-president of the Denison student body when they were undergraduates), four young sons and a huge basset hound named Samantha, Lugar became aware of the pressures and needs of the growing school system which caused him to run — successfully — for election to the School Board in 1964.

In this official — but unsalaried — capacity, he spoke to hundreds of parent, church, and civic groups; answered over 3,000 personal letters from citizens of Indianapolis; and provided aid to hundreds of callers



and visitors to his office in the space of three years.

Then, in 1967, at the urging of several friends (including William D. Ruckelshaus, now Assistant Attorney General for Civil Affairs — see Nov. '68 FORUM) he announced his availability for support—which he got—of the Marion County organization as its slated candidate in the May primary. It was the cementing of this relationship with Marion County chairman (now national Committeeman) L. Keith Bulen which was the principal vehicle for the success of both men in Republican politics.

PERPETUAL MOTION

Lugar proved to be a decisive and aggressive mayor during his first year in office, and a highly visible and accessible one as well. With a phenomenal memory for detail and articulateness to match, he spoke to over 1200 groups varying from church groups in basements and people on street corner rallies to corporate boardrooms and the Republican state convention (he was keynoter). There were also the official welcomes, which included such disparate groups as business groups, fraternities, and a sewing convention ("he kept them in stitches," commented one aide, only half facetiously.)

In his first year as mayor, Lugar cites as his greatest accomplishment the creation of an employment Task Force and Volunteer Advisory Corps, charged with the task of finding jobs in the prospering metropolitan economy (less than 2% unemployment) for the hard-core poor black and white elements of the community. With both business and labor solidly behind him, more than 2900 such persons were placed in permanent employment at an average cost-per-job of about \$1.40. Lugar hopes to supplement the program with Project Fresh Start, now on the drawing boards, a hardhitting program to encourage high school age youth to stay in school and/or find them jobs before they are trapped by poor employability prospects and join the ranks of the hard-core unemployed.

Lugar also instituted "Upswing '68," a spinoff of the mayor's Recreation Task Force, which involved 25,000 of the inner city's youth (ages 15-24) in recreation, education and job projects last summer. Lugar's personal commitment to the program extended to basketball scrimmages and daily jogging with participants at 6:00 A.M. (one widely circulated picture showing him running even appeared in the *Okinawa Star* and — as Lugar puts it wryly — "earned me the opprobrium of several older ladies in our community as 'our nude mayor.'")

Other areas which have come under the attention of the Lugar administration include housing (such concepts as the Community Development Corporation are under study, and a non-profit corporation to build and rehabilitate low-cost single family housing is on the drawing board pending funding), air and water

pollution and law enforcement (the police department has been beefed up, the personnel are now better-paid, and extensive community relations programs have opened lines of communication and helped to lessen tensions in inner-city areas).

When an isolated incident erupted into violence early in June, Lugar gave free rein to Police Chief Winston Churchill and the temperate action of the Police Department averted what could have been a major disorder. A barroom brawl and scattered arson and looting remained just that without resulting in the significant community polarization which so frequently develops during and after such violence. With active support from most of the black community, Lugar hopes the city will remain "cool" the balance of the explosive summer months.

Likewise his personal interest and pressure have been instrumental in making sense out of the city's financial squeezes. As one aide put it, "his budget is as tight and stretches as far as his personal finances, and he won't even let his driver park the car unless there's money in the meter."

"UNIGOV" PROPOSER

At this writing, Lugar is working closely with Marion County (greater Indianapolis) legislators, state officials and community leaders to effectuate a unified government plan for Marion County. Though prevented by the Indiana constitution from thorough consolidation of all the "political" areas of government, "UniGov" would consolidate most functions under control of a single county-wide executive and a council comprised of 29 districts, 25 single-member and 4 at-large.

Similar to the Nashville plan in its usage of variable service districts, passage of "UniGov" would help to bring together the 650,000 residents of Indianapolis with some 200,000 suburbanites in the largest such undertaking yet attempted in the United States.

Lugar's "UniGov" proposal was passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor in March. It is now facing a court test in federal district court. (Lugar expects a favorable ruling.)

The proposal has earned the vocal opposition of two disparate groups — conservative suburbanites and black militants — but seems to have the support of most of the rest of the community. The suburbanites see it as a threat to their schools (the Indiana constitution prohibits this) and the black militants are afraid that it will dilute the voice of the black community within the city of Indianapolis (in fact, with the single-member-district plan, it would expand the black community's role in formal government proceedings). Nonetheless, the criticism led Lugar to comment recently, somewhat ruefully, "If we had kept the same plan and named it 'orange marmalade' I'm sure it would have been more favorably received."

Clearly, however, even if the "UniGov" proposal fails in the courts, Lugar's administration will have accomplished much symbolically to unite the nearly one million inhabitants of Indianapolis and Marion County. He has good lines of communication open to the 27% of his constituency which the black community constitutes. He has been careful to avoid the mistake made by New York's Lindsay of alienating poor and lower-middle class whites. And he has proven the catalyst for expanding the concern of the business community in the future of the city and the quality of life in Indianapolis. In short, he has managed to weave together a fragile sense of community in Indiana's largest city.

To help unite the "UniGov" constituency, the mayor's Communications Task Force is engineering a "Get With It" campaign similar to New York's "Give A Damn." Employing five advertising agencies and all available media, the Task Force has made "spots" explaining the problems of the inner city to the white man and the suburbanite. To be sure, Indianapolis does not face the massive problems of a New York or a Boston, but as Lugar's press secretary, Robert Beckmann, points out, "we have done a job of coping with urban problems as they exist in our community which can be matched in few, if any, cities in the United States today."

Throughout all this, Lugar has managed to balance the disparate constituencies of a modern city. By being a good administrator, he has earned the respect of Republicans; but he has at the same time been administering programs which gained him support of distinctly non-Republican groups. It was partially this widespread support which enabled him to come out early and strong for Richard Nixon — much to the latter's pleasure.

As mayor over the second-largest city with a Republican administration (and the largest with both the mayor and council under Republican control), he recently commented in likening Nixon to Lincoln that—as many would agree —Nixon had made a surprisingly good start, his support being vindicated.

As for his personal ambitions for higher political office, though his accomplishments and achievements make him a leading Republican candidate for governor in 1972 or Senator in 1970, Lugar remains quiet. For the present, he has said repeatedly, his ambition is to do a better job for Indianapolis.

Recently, Lugar has been boomed as a potential 1972 vice-presidential choice, and when one prominent Indiana Democrat was recently asked to comment on whether, if Nixon should drop Agnew in 1972, he might turn to Lugar, the response was: "He would certainly add a lot to the Republican ticket that wasn't there in 1968." Then, with a gleam, he added, "that would get him out of Indiana, wouldn't it?"

OREGON: Attorney General vindicated

After an embarrassing six month legal battle, Republican Lee Johnson has finally assumed office as Oregon's Attorney General. Johnson had easily defeated Democratic incumbent Robert Thornton in November, but his election was voided by a Circuit Court tribunal, because he had technically violated Oregon's Corrupt Practices Act. The Court upheld his election opponent's contention that Johnson had exceeded the limitation on personal expenditures, and had falsified his expenditure report.

Johnson appealed the lower court's decision to the Oregon Supreme Court, which reversed the decision on the grounds that while he had violated the law, the violations were not "deliberate" or "material". Thornton made a final attempt to appeal that decision to the U. S. Supreme Court, but his petition was rejected, and Johnson was sworn into office. To add to his embarrassment, the state's new legal officer has also had his driver's license suspended for frequent disregard of the state's highway speed limits.

Although Johnson should by all measures prove to be an able Attorney General, his personal and political "image" will require a bit of rebuilding before he runs for re-election.

"SHREWD" ... "Penetrating" That's Us!

Or, at least according to the New York Times Review of Books, that's:

The Lessons of Victory

Ripon's appraisal of the 1968 election and its implications for 1969 and after. A complete analytical presentation of the future of American politics and the requirements for the GOP's governmental and political priorities.

ORDER NOW — at Subscriber's Rates

The book is selling for \$6.95 hard-bound and \$2.65 in paper at bookstores. The Book Club price is \$5.25 and \$1.95* postpaid respectively.

Ripon Book Club
14a Eliot Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Cahill Leads GOP Resurgence

(From Our Special Correspondent)

Progressive Republican Congressman William T. Cahill won an upset victory in the New Jersey gubernatorial primary on June 3, besting conservative GOP Congressman Charles Sandman and three other more moderate contenders by 13,000 votes.

As the only unmistakable conservative in the field — he ran primarily on a no-tax plank, varying his pitch every so often with a denunciation of student disorders and urban riots — Sandman benefited from the cohesion of the substantial right-wing element of the New Jersey GOP.

The moderates, to the contrary but as usual, had unity problems as four of them crowded onto the ballot. Cahill's problem was to come to the fore of the moderates as the man who could win in November. Initially, his campaign was only an extension of his former Congressional efforts, and he had no organization or impact on the state-wide level. Preliminary strategy had been to rely on endorsements from key county organizations, assuming that traditional organization politics would provide sufficient strength to dominate the campaign. However, the failure of two of these endorsements to materialize precipitated a change of plans. The final weeks of the campaign thus saw the entrance of Campaign Systems, Inc., the high-powered campaign consulting firm of John Deardourff and Doug Bailey, into the fray.

It was this influence that persuaded Cahill's organization to spend some of the money it had been husbanding for the general election. Over one thousand radio spots were purchased and newspaper ads were increased in the last week. This eleventh hour blitz helped neutralize the exposure Sandman had gotten in his four-year campaign against a state income tax. It also crowbarred Cahill's name into the consciousness of the moderates, and made it plain in the final days that it was a two-man race.

Of unquestionable help to the Cahill cause was the effort of the organization in Bergen County, the banner Republican county in the state. County chairman (and now the new state chairman — *see box*) Nelson Gross came out early and strong for the Camden Congressman and produced a plurality in Bergen alone

of 26,000 votes. This plus Cahill's 21,000 spread in his home county was enough to offset Sandman's pockets of strength around the state for the 13,000 vote edge.

Also of major importance to Cahill's success was his endorsement by GOP Senator Clifford Case only a little more than two weeks before the election. Other respected state and local leaders then followed Case's lead and came forward to endorse Cahill. The Ripon Society also issued an endorsement of the Congressman that received extensive local coverage. This solid moderate support, the fine organizational work in key counties, and the editorial endorsements of virtually every major daily newspaper in the state combined to give Cahill his victory.

Cahill must now face former Governor Robert B. Meyner in the general election. Meyner preceded incumbent Democrat Richard J. Hughes as Governor and, by coming out of retirement to seek his old office, seems to be following the trend set by former New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner. In New Jersey, however, where the Democrats have enjoyed 16 years of uninterrupted control of the governorship, Meyner will find it difficult to avoid responsibility for the state's ills. These include a grossly underfinanced school system, an impending fiscal crisis, and one of the potentially most explosive race problems in the country in Newark (where white vigilantes and black militants each patrol their own turf). In addition, mob influence in New Jersey politics has recently received extensive coverage due to the release of the now famous Simone de Cavalcante (Sam the Plumber) bugging transcripts by the Justice Department.

Indeed, perhaps the happiest outcome of the nomination of former FBI special agent and prosecutor Cahill by the Republicans is his potential for a responsible approach to the problems of law and order and the widespread infiltration of organized crime into the life of the state. These will be major issues in 1969. The candidate has a record of being both strict in the enforcement of law and yet openminded in the support of civil rights and student demands, all of which provides an excellent opportunity to hammer out an effective but progressive program on crime and civil disorders that could become a national model.

NELSON GROSS: Cahill's Political Field Marshal

With the nomination of moderate Congressman William T. Cahill as New Jersey GOP gubernatorial standard bearer, Garden State Republicans stand on the threshold of Morven, the colonial governor's mansion in Princeton, for the first time in 16 years. Cahill is a startling change from his bland, inept predecessor candidates who handed Morven twice to Robert B. Meyner and twice to Richard J. Hughes, and the difference should show in the November results.

Cahill's triumph, however, is indicative of the genuine resurgence of the New Jersey GOP. Despite Hughes' 1965 landslide (in which he succeeded in bringing a Democratic legislature with him to Trenton, a feat last accomplished by Woodrow Wilson) and the 1964 disaster which preceded it, the Jersey GOP has risen, phoenix-like, in near-miraculous triumph: in 1966, Senator Clifford P. Case, the popular and articulate progressive Republican, won overwhelmingly, and the following year, the GOP regained control of the legislature by lopsided margins. Last year, Richard M. Nixon carried the state; and, as the gubernatorial campaign begins, Republicans control 17 of the state's 21 county governments. Moreover, the party has emerged remarkably little-scarred from the bruising primary duel between Cahill and conservative Congressman Charles W. Sandman.

Even if Cahill should chance to lose in November, he will leave behind a new state chairman who, during the next four years, may have a very important impact on the state of the Jersey GOP. Nelson Gross is young and effective. He relies on saturation use of mass media advertising, extensive telephone canvassing, and a healthy grass roots organization.

From his French Provincial law office, unique in Hackensack, Gross presides over heavily Republican Bergen County, a political province which stretches from the ugliness of the industrial and blue-collar towns near New York City to the suburban and semi-rural north and west along the New York State line. Gross has shown himself to be unfettered by ideology as he engineered a string of spectacular GOP victories in his short stint as county chairman. He told a visitor recently that the only label he likes is "Republican, short and simple." He says quite frankly that he is more interested in winning than in maintaining a set philosophy. This pragmatism is best seen, perhaps, by his stunning move at the 1968 Republican National Convention: tube watchers will recall that the New Jersey delegation had been pledged to favorite son Senator Case, as a holding action by the Rockefeller forces. With a Nixon victory forthcoming, Gross led his Bergen County — and some other — delegates into the Nixon corner and the entire delegation voted, one-by-one, on national TV. That fall, Gross engineered the 60,000-plus victory for Nixon in Bergen County, by which the Republican candidate carried New Jersey.

All this has not gone unnoticed by the current occupant of the White House. On Nelson Gross's desk sits a tasteful cigarette box with a small gold plate: "With Deepest Appreciation, (signed) Richard M. Nixon, 1969." Moreover, Gross has been a regular caller at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue on patronage and other matters. He is an important, and badly needed, link between Trenton and the White House. Recalling Jack Kennedy's decisive personal campaign swing in the close election of 1961 between the then-Judge Richard J. Hughes and former Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell, Gross undoubtedly will call on President Nixon to do the same thing for Bill Cahill. Few expect Nixon to turn down such a request from so devoted an ally.

In choosing Nelson Gross for his state chairman, Mr. Cahill chose an activist. Gross is a man totally wrapped up and totally devoted to politics and the Republican party. He is a combative, shirt-sleeved organization man. Sitting in his Hackensack office, he said, typically, that he will speak, he will organize, he will travel. He anticipates a full-time, major role. He is blunt. He will stress the positive in the coming campaign; few expect Cahill to get mired in one issue, which is what happened to the helpless Wayne Dumont and his state chairman, Webster B. Todd, a hard-working, cigar-smoking, highly capable politician, over a Communist at Rutgers in 1965.

The election in New Jersey this fall will be won county by county, and this is Gross's turf. With him prodding them, the county organizations across New Jersey should come to life. The new chairman's strategy is simple: As Cahill is the first candidate to come out of South Jersey, he emerges solidly ahead there. Gross sees highly urban Essex (Newark), Passaic and Union counties falling into line. To these, he adds rural and suburban counties like Sussex, Warren and Morris in the west. Bergen County, with its massive Republican margin, will be the capstone of Cahill's victory. It is flawless — on paper. But, Robert Meyner is a shrewd politician and many things can happen between mid-summer and early November. Yet, the plan is Nelson Gross's. If the luck and acumen which he has had in the past few years hold, New Jersey will have, in William Cahill, its first Republican governor in 16 years.

In the immediate background is Nelson Gross. As to the future, he grinningly admitted that in politics "one goes day-by-day." The future, particularly if a Cahill victory materializes, seems nothing less than bright for New Jersey's new state chairman. He presently has access to the President of the United States and his power within the Party is large and growing. "Day-by-day," it becomes more apparent that Nelson G. Gross will be a figure to watch as the GOP faces up to the 1970's.

—KEVIN M. O'CONNELL

Coming Soon: 'Systems Politics'

Despite all the talk about the electronic age, the computer era is not really upon us yet. Its arrival awaits reductions in the net costs of acquiring, processing, storing, retrieving, and using information. As the next five or ten years witness the beginnings of this process, government as well as the rest of society will begin to feel the results of this new technology which will make possible an advance in human intellectual capacity comparable to the invention of language, arabic numerals and calculus.

The consequences of computerization for the American system of checks and balances will of course be fundamental. With systems analysis will come "systems politics." John S. Saloma III, former president of the Ripon Society and associate professor of political science at M.I.T., working under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to the American Political Science Association, has been studying the likely impact of a computer technology on the governmental decision-making process. His fascinating discussion of the potential changes in the balance of power among the Congress, the President, and the bureaucracies that computers may spur is adapted from his book *Congress and the New Politics* published by Little, Brown and Company this month.

By John S. Saloma, III

Is the demonstrated success of the computer and the new information technology in business, industry and private institutions transferable to the arena of public policy? If Congress embraces the computer, the really significant result will be improved techniques of decision-making — operations research, mathematical analysis, systems modeling and simulation — used in conjunction with computers and a more adequate data base.

No matter how conservatively one views the future, computers, by virtue of their ability to store and process enormous amounts of data, to calculate at lightning speeds, and to simulate human and organizational decision-behavior, provide man with an intellectual tool of almost inconceivable power. Almost certainly the application of the computer will introduce a new era for both the social and political systems. There will be cumulative improvement in information processing and computer-assisted techniques for analysis. Together, these advances will dramatically alter the decision-making context. Looking at the massive information problems in government today suggests the potential.

Information provides the premises for decision or action. By one definition, decision-making is sim-

ply "the process of converting information into action." Yet in a political system where information is a form of power, there are many limitations on acquiring the right information. The political decision maker needs, broadly speaking, two types of information: *technical* information defining the content of a policy issue and *political* information concerning the relative strength of competing claims and the consequences of alternative decisions.

CONGRESSIONAL DATA WOES

The Congress suffers from several specific information problems. It is dependent on the Executive bureaucracy, and that bureaucracy often cites Executive privilege as a justification for withholding information. In addition the widespread secret classification of material under the mantle of "national security" raises another powerful barrier to Congressional access to needed information.

Also, the individual member of Congress groans under a glut of paper and strains to acquire specific, reliable information as anyone familiar with "the Hill" will testify. Not surprisingly, a variety of simplifying devices are substituted for individual decisions: following party leadership, deferring to the

judgment of the responsible committee, voting with state delegation, consulting members who are expert on the subject under consideration, etc.

The point is clear. Most of the limiting conditions that act to constrain decision-makers in a world of imperfect information are abundantly present in the contemporary Congress. Congressmen and Senators muddle through as best they can.

The question of interest to us is what difference will the new information technology make for the decision-making process in government. First we shall examine a range of technically feasible change; then, some of the political factors that will condition such change in the American political system.

One of the most obvious advances that will be made possible by the new information technology is increased quality of information (including factors such as relevance, precision, completeness, and timeliness) and quality of information processing (accuracy, speed, ability to handle complex relationships, inflexibility, and potential for codification in standard rules).

But, with the computer the problem of information overload will be more subject to the control of the individual decision-maker. He will have the potential to get "on top" of his work. The computer can be programmed to provide top decision-makers with "exception" information demanding attention or action.

Decision-makers may specify in advance what types of information they wish to receive on given subjects of interest as new information becomes available. Central libraries or document centers can then service the individual decision-maker according to his "interest profile" through a technique of "selective dissemination of information."

Instead of being a largely passive recipient of information, the decision-maker will be able to interact with the data system using it as an active search mechanism.

IMPORTANT CONTROLS INTRODUCED

Congressmen may continue to tap a variety of information sources on a random basis to obtain political information, but improved selective processing of relevant technical information (and even political information on their constituency) should significantly change the problem of information overload. The individual legislator will have an important degree of control over the amount and nature of information he receives.

The legislator will be provided with the capacity for systems thinking and systems analysis — that is, the dynamic behavior of complicated systems and the analysis of multiple variables. Such simulations will permit the preparation of major contingency plans.

A lengthened time perspective, and a greater opportunity for strategic planning will replace the "remedial" orientation of incremental policy-making with orientation toward the future. He will be able to think ahead more, instead of exhausting himself just trying to keep abreast.

The incrementalist's view that "public policy problems are too complex to be well understood, too complex to be mastered" and that decision-makers develop "a strategy to cope with problems, not to solve them" will be replaced with a more optimistic perspective. The decision-maker will be "on top" of information. He will have analytical techniques and information processing capabilities that will give him new understanding of governmental and social systems and with this a sense that he can manipulate and control them. Where the incrementalists have rejected the impossible prescription to be comprehensive in favor of a more manageable strategy of "outright neglect." The new information technology will enable the decision-maker to develop a *more rational and aggressive* strategy of problem-solving.

But perhaps the greatest long-run contribution of the computer to man's problem-solving capacity will be its ability to facilitate two types of breakthrough in collaborative research. The first of these gains is the cumulative storage and preservation of solutions — a kind of division of intellectual labor. Since a computer never forgets, all gains or improvements in computation or analysis, no matter how incremental, are preserved until better techniques are perfected and may be retrieved, used and refined by contemporary and future generations of decision-makers.

One does not have to be a technological radical to appreciate the cumulative potential of computer programming. If most human decisions have an underlying structure, as disjointed, incremental, restricted in scope as that structure may be, in time computer programmers and analysts will discover and program the implicit decision techniques, rules, and coefficients. Already computer programs based on the analysis of past managerial behavior have proved more efficient than continued management practices (*i.e.*, rules of thumb) based on experience. Most computer experts do not expect the computer to replace the human decision-maker but rather to extend his planning and decisional capacities through the continued refinement of man-machine interaction. The computer will thus absorb the incrementalists in its inexorable accumulation of intellectual power.

'ON-LINE' COMMUNITY

Even more significant than the steady development of computer programs is the advent in prototype form of "the on-line intellectual community" based on man-computer interaction and computer-facilitated

cooperation among men in a university setting. Carl F. J. Overhage and R. Joyce Harman describe the potential breakthrough based on the experience of Project MAC (research and development of Machine-Aided Cognition and Multiple-Access Computer systems) at M.I.T.:

"Because communication among men is fallible, and because heretofore men did not have effective ways of expressing complex ideas unambiguously — and recalling them, testing them, transferring them, and converting them from a static record into observable, dynamic behavior — the accumulation of correlatable contributions was opposed by continual erosion; and the melding of contributions was hampered by divergencies of convention and format that kept one man's ideas from meshing with another's. The prospect is that, when several or many people work together within the context of an on-line, interactive, community computer network, the superior facilities of that network for expressing ideas, preserving facts, modeling processes, and information and the same behavior — those superior facilities will so foster the growth and integration of knowledge that the incidence of major achievement will be markedly increased."

Comparable networks will in time be available in business and government and among sectors of each of these communities with overlapping research interests. The potential of man-machine-man interaction for pure and applied research is one of the scarcely realized but most staggering potentials of the new information technology.

Before examining the overall significance of these factors on decision-making in government, it would be wise to examine some reservations about the revolutionary impact of information technology.

DILEMMAS PERSIST

Lessening the information constraints on and increasing the potency of the analytical tools available to decision-makers will not remove the dilemmas of decision-making. There are limitations that go well beyond information *per se*. As the information constraints on decision-makers are eased, other limiting factors and decisions will come into play:

1. The problem of values. If we define politics as a struggle for control stemming from conflict over the direction of social life and public policy, it is clear that the central problem of politics is one of values, not information. Decision-making involves values at all stages. Choice activity especially requires value criteria for decision. For instance, budgeting is a political activity and the problem of choice or allocation ultimately remains one of values.

2. The political use and abuse of information. Information systems in government may be used to serve the political purposes of the political actors who have the resources to control them. How then can one prevent the President or program-oriented bureau chief from consciously or unconsciously biasing an information system that Congress must use?

3. Cost factors. Government (and the taxpayer) must pay the bill for the computers, their programming and the personnel to man them. Balanced against this cost is the problem of final payoffs: how much tangible difference will all this new equipment make?

Acknowledging these reservations, however, we still believe that the combined and cumulative impact of the new information technology will bring some radical changes in the environment of governmental decision-making.

Mid-1970 is only six years away — is it impossible that improvements in the legislative process from wide use of advanced data systems will actually be achieved by 1975? Studies by RAND Corporation experts suggest that by the early 1970's computers will be small, plentiful, and inexpensive. Computing power will be available to anyone who needs it, or wants it, or can use it either by means of a personal console connected to some large central facility, or by a small personal machine. Additional projections foresee, by 1975, a computer that will make possible automatic libraries able to look up and reproduce copy; by 1978, automated looking up of legal information, and the widespread use of automatic decision-making at the management level for industrial and national planning. By the mid-1980's, the computer will begin to realize its potential as a research tool through modeling and experimentation, as an integral part of the educational system, and in areas such as medicine and biological sciences.

Assuming that the projected technology is largely realized within the Executive branch by the mid 1970's, we shall examine some of its consequences within the Executive and then go on to examine the potential impact on Congress.

NEW BUREAUCRATIC CLASS

First, there will result a centralization of effective decision-making authority at the Presidential and departmental levels. As the compartmentalized information resources of individual agencies are integrated into comprehensive information systems, political executives will have greater leverage over the bureaucracy. At the same time fewer people will be involved in policy decisions. The likely long-term trend in the Federal government is toward the development of highly trained professional "analyst" staffs within the Budget Bureau and at the departmental secretary

level. The power of the analyst within the Executive branch will pose new problems for Congressional watchdogs. Congress must define new points of access and review in the decision-making process if the historical concept of balance is to be maintained.

Secondly, there will develop a more explicit, candid style of politics which may complicate the problem of achieving political consensus. The above point to important secondary consequences for Congress.

THE IMPACT ON CONGRESS

In January, 1968, the Legislative branch acquired its first Analysis and Data Processing (ADP) installation directly involved in aiding the legislative process. The new on-line terminal system, installed in the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, now enables LRS to record and store on magnetic tape descriptions of all bills and resolutions introduced in the 90th Congress. The system will compile by computer the "Digest of Public Bills" and eventually allow random recall of bills by number, title, and word descriptions, at the request of a Congressional office or committee. (Upwards of 26,000 bills and resolutions were introduced in the 89th Congress — an indication of the scale of the project.)

Congressman Robert McClory (R-Ill.) who in the 89th Congress introduced the first bill in either House directly applying ADP techniques to the work of Congress, has been the most articulate spokesman for Congressional action. Congressman McClory, concerned by the growing "information gap" between the President and Congress, proposed to equip the Congress with "an identified capacity, based on automatic data processing devices and procedures, to retrieve selected information that is of priority value to the Members and committees."

After viewing the new system, Congressman McClory anticipated that some of the next ADP applications might be:

- 1) Daily printouts summarizing the previous day's Congressional action;
- 2) An automated index of congressional documents and legal periodicals;
- 3) Up-to-the-minute information on legislative issues scheduled for debate;
- 4) Vote summaries on bills already passed;
- 5) The status of legislation pending in committee;
- 6) Description of information stored on computer files in the Executive departments.

THE WIND IS SHIFTING

A quiet revolution in thinking appears to be taking place on Capitol Hill. Members privately express the desire to be aware of coming problems so

they can "gear up" for them. A few Senators and Congressmen already sense that information technology is the "coming thing" and are investing their own time as well as that of their committee staff and/or their office staff in developing a greater familiarity with information systems.

A wide range of Congressional committees have been studying a variety of related problems (and educating their members in the process): the implementation of (PPBS) the Planning-Programming Budgeting System pioneered by former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara; the development of social indicators and a system of social accounts; copyright legislation relating to information retrieval; the application of the systems approach to urban problems and environmental pollution; and, the consequences of computer technology for individual privacy. The committee publications of the Congress — hearings, staff reports and memoranda, selected documents — already constitute one of the most comprehensive and relevant sheafs of facts on the social and political implications of the new information technology.

While most Congressmen and their staffs have had only a brief introduction to information technology and its potential, a start has at least been made. The real change in Congressional attitude and skills will probably not be felt, however, until a new wave of political talent with practical experience with computers — through universities and the private sector — is elected to Congress. Some of the IBM experts have already turned up in the halls of Congress. One of them; formerly employed by the International Business Machines Corporation and a candidate for the Doctorate in Business/Government Relations from the Harvard Business School (then) freshman Congressman Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (R-Mich.), caused somewhat of a stir in Washington in the fall of 1967 by sending then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara a request for a matrix of 85 specific data items for which he (Riegle) had written a computer program. Another freshman Senator with a combined engineering and law background, Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr. (R-Tenn.), lectured the Association for Computing Machinery about the impending nuclear power breakthrough in breeder reactors that could produce power at almost zero fuel cost and the need for a much broader Congressional overview and plan for the technological and social revolution that this implied. Senator Baker has been an articulate spokesman for a new Senate Select Committee for Technology and the Human Environment.

Impressive as these individual examples may be, Congress as an institution has yet to experience the potential of information technology. Widespread Congressional interest suggests a greater receptivity toward computers and information systems than might at first

inspection have been anticipated. It is still likely, however, that Congress will lag behind the Executive in fully accepting the new technology.

HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE

How great a lag will exist by our projected date of 1975 — assuming that Congress permits the Executive to implement the new technology without hinderances? We may posit three points on a continuum from (I) *Congressional resistance* to computer technology, notably the failure to fund any central computational facility for use by the Congress, the failure to budget any allowance for Congressmen to utilize other facilities, and the failure to provide analyst staff for the use of the committees and/or members; through (II) *limited Congressional acceptance* of computer facilities and analyst staff with access tightly controlled by the individual committees and/or party leaderships; to (III) *open Congressional acceptance*, with all members enjoying “free” use of computer facilities and full access to staff and data resources. According to our projection, Congress could have moved all the way to Situation III by the mid-1970’s. A more realistic estimate would place it somewhere between Situations II and III. Ultimately, in our estimate, Congress will operate in Situation III although the exact institutional form in which it organizes and applies these new resources remains to be determined.

Accelerating the acceptance of innovation are the built-in tensions between authorizing and appropriations committees both eager to control program decision; the publicity incentive for committee and subcommittee chairmen generally to identify themselves with innovations and the perennial Congressional fear that Congress is yielding initiative and authority to the President; party competition; and, the generational divide between “activists” and high seniority Congressmen.

Indeed, once he had access to the new data processing and systems analysis tools, the contributions of the individual legislator would be considerably enlarged. We have noted the contribution of individual legislators to Congressional initiative in legislation and investigation. Although only a minority of Congressmen will choose to play the role of legislative inventor or watchdog, the effectiveness of such members will be enormously increased by computer-assisted techniques of search and analysis. Members will be free to “browse” through the data archives in developing and assessing legislative alternatives. Some legislators will hire professional analysts on their office staffs or acquire analytical skills themselves. While such legislative diligence will still be the exception, one can readily foresee a Congressman sitting at a console in his office poring over a computer print-out into the late evening hours and cutting through the paper ar-

guments and justifications of Executive programs with penetrating lines of questions.

In addition, *ad hoc* congressional study and work groups would freely form and disperse as new challenging tasks arose at the interstices of committee power. The work of such study groups would be “collateral” to that of the standing committees but would introduce a needed flexibility into the Congressional organization.

CAN DEMOCRATIZE COMMITTEES

While information systems afford new possibilities for specialization and increased committee power — especially in the area of legislative oversight or control of the Executive bureaucracy, they should also afford possibilities to “democratize” committee power. Where limited information previously conferred important advantages on those few individuals who had the legislative seniority and central committee positions to accumulate such information, now generalized availability of information and program analyses would enable junior committee members and interested Congressmen not on the committee to gain a better understanding of the issues involved. The majority would have greater opportunity to influence committee action and to prevail against the committee on the floor when its action was not representative of the views of the entire membership.

Generalized information systems should enable Congress to satisfy both the necessity for specialization and the goal of comprehensive policy reviews. Where information on Executive agency activities has been compartmentalized within the Executive budget and the Congressional committee system, it would now be available to any curious Congressman. The “special analyses” of the federal budget already being developed by the Bureau of the Budget are a prototype of the kind of comprehensive information that Congressional committees will be able to tap. Individual Congressional committees, no longer limited to information within their agency jurisdiction, could become important loci for government-wide program review and coordination. Where the President alone has had the information to develop a measure of agency coordination, Congressional committees would now share that information, and the authority to use it, subject to the majority support of Congress.

NEW BALANCE OF POWER

While the application of information technology in government will have its greatest immediate political impact *within* the Executive (with important secondary consequences, as we have observed for the Congress), the longer term consequences of better information in government raise fundamental questions about the American system of separated powers. Congress and legislative bodies generally need *not* lose power to the

Executive. The potential advance in information technology is theoretically equally accessible to *both* the President and Congress, with Congress standing to enhance its powers versus the Executive considerably. The thorny question of how power should be organized in the American political system will be faced once again.

Beginning roughly with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and including the establishment of the modern Executive bureaucracy, the Executive staffs to the President, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there arose a specialization of roles — Executive leadership and Congressional review or oversight. The model of “Executive-centered” government while tending to enhance the power of the President and reduce the autonomy of Congress, was based on a rationale that differentiated roles for President and Congress.

Simply stated, the President set the agenda for legislation; the Congress reviewed, amended, and passed legislation; the President supervised the execution of the laws by the federal bureaucracy; and the Congress reviewed administrative performance. Executive-centered government, however, conferred important relative information advantages on the President. The President was closer to the day-to-day operations of the Executive bureaucracy. He had access to the detailed information generated by the budgetary cycle and the numerous intelligence activities of the general bureaucracy. Moreover, the budgetary process and supporting central staff gave him a continuing framework for decision.

BLURRING DISTINCTIONS

A second major rationalization of authority has begun with the new emphasis on program budgeting and information systems in government. As this rationalization proceeds many of the assumptions underlying specialized roles for the President and Congress will have to be re-examined. The distinction between Executive decision-making and broad policy oversight will become increasingly blurred as the time perspective of governmental decision-makers is lengthened. As improved information systems yield better indicators of performance, reduce the time of the management information cycle, and permit real-time monitoring of governmental activities, the Congressional role of “oversight” (review after the fact) will be supplemented by new possibilities for “control” (legislative decision or activity prior to the relevant administrative action). The policy or control functions of the President and Congress will become less distinguishable as both develop the capacity to ask program questions and undertake analyses of data from the same generalized information systems or specially developed systems for their own use.

One restraint on a fully developed Congressional policy role in the past has been the unwillingness of Congress to build a parallel legislative staff bureaucracy. As a result, Congress has often had to “second guess” the Executive without the information to back its hunches. Now, as technology generalizes the availability of information, Congress can tap into Executive-based information systems, establish quality controls, and develop more limited information systems for its own specific requirements. Congress will review, evaluate, analyze and make its own determination of priorities. The process of making choices and analyses more explicit enables Congress to participate much more intelligently and vigorously, with a *limited* staff, in the decision-making process. In fact, there may even be a danger of too vigorous participation.

The new definition of the separation of powers that will evolve is a matter for speculation. If we assume the trends that we projected earlier, distinctive Presidential and Congressional biases may soon develop in the decision-making process. We might expect the Executive to overemphasize the benefits of rationalization in program formulation and administration, to overvalue economic and technical criteria of performance. If the new information technology leads to an increasing separation between operating missions, life styles, and social roles for those institutions and individuals involved in rationalized activities compared to those involved in nonrationalized ones, Congress, representative of a society embracing both lifestyles, would inherit the difficult task of mediating the impact of the former on the latter and restraining the tendency toward irrational and frustrated response. Congress would add elements of “political rationality,” considerations of human costs and benefits to the decision-making process.

‘SYSTEMIC DISSONANCE’

In this context, one rationale for the separation of powers — “systemic dissonance” — takes on new significance. We have suggested through this discussion that the revolution in information technology represents an almost immeasurable potential increase in man’s knowledge — especially in his understanding of and ability to control his environment. The intelligent use of that knowledge and the power it confers is an awesome responsibility. In the United States it involves the democratic consideration of emerging technological possibility and consequences. The multiple perspective of the American system, the numerous points for developing, testing, and advancing ideas may ultimately prove to be one of the greatest assets of American democracy in the future.

Ed. Note: All footnotes in the above article were eliminated for simplicity.

Chasing Super-Volunteer While Fleeing the Foggyrats

Agents of Change: A Close Look at the Peace Corps, by David Hapgood and Meridan Bennett. Little, Brown and Company, 239 pages.

One of the most amazing things about the Peace Corps is that after eight years it still is not quite sure what it is, what it has accomplished or where it is going. The paradox of the Peace Corps is that this continuing identity crisis is the source of both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness.

On the one hand, this ambiguity of goals has allowed for flexibility, diversity and change uncommon to most bureaucracies. On the other hand, it has left the Peace Corps with little in the way of tangible success.

Authors Hapgood and Bennett bring to this book the combined experience of seventeen Peace Corps program evaluations on three continents and visits to many more. They have concluded that, "as a contributor to development in the third world, the Peace Corps can make no great claims to accomplishment," but that "Americans are getting a very special kind of education at a bargain price." The volunteer, then, and not the host country, has been the chief beneficiary of the experience, and America in turn will presumably greatly benefit from what the volunteer brings back with him.

The authors question whether this alone is sufficient justification for the Peace Corps and suggest that the agency could and should make a greater contribution to third world development.

The book devotes a chapter each to examining the various areas in which volunteers are working: teaching (which comprises roughly half of all volunteers), rural action, health and birth control, and community development. With isolated exceptions, the authors give less than average marks to all these efforts.

The reasons may be traced to a misconception of what constitutes success. According to the authors, Peace Corps thinking has long been guided by "the good seed concept" which assumes that the contact alone between volunteers and host country nationals spells success. The authors claim that success has been gauged by the

THE AUTHOR

Don Wolfensberger is currently the legislative assistant to Congressman John B. Anderson (R-Ill.), chairman of the House Republican Conference. Wolfensberger served for two years (1967-68) as a Peace Corps volunteer in Tanzania, East Africa, where he taught English in a secondary school. He has worked as both a newspaper reporter and radio newscaster. He is an M.A. thesis candidate in political science at the University of Iowa.

number of contacts without regard to the nature or effect of the contact. They argue that the contact quantity gauge was based on a colossal ethnocentrism: "That we Americans are so good (or skilled or democratic or whatever) that our very presence among the less fortunate is a benefit in itself."

This may have been a necessary rationalization for the lack of development impact created by thousands of non-skilled B.A. generalists who were capable of little more than smiling and "making friends for America." The good seed concept is therefore based on the assumption that the maximum number of volunteers produces the most effective Peace Corps.

It should be noted parenthetically that while the authors criticize the Peace Corps for failing to establish objective criteria for measuring developmental success, they admit that the intensely personal encounter is in the less tangible area of human development. For instance, if rigid attitudes are seen as a barrier to development and the goal is therefore one of changing attitudes, how do you determine which attitudes need changing, how do you go about changing them, what new attitudes do you replace them with, and finally, how do you go about measuring all of this?

"DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE" CONCEPT

The authors argue for what they call the "development assistance" concept, which assumes that "what matters most is development — the goods, attitudes, skills, energies and institutions needed to eliminate poverty and misery." They are rather vague as to how this concept can best be implemented. Somehow, the Peace Corps should capitalize on "the golden ten percent" of development successes from the past, and turn out what they refer to as "agents of change." These "agents" should be able to adapt and apply improved productive technology, understand the local culture, explain the intruding world culture, increase the options to the aided by opening new channels of communication, and increase the powers of their hosts while limiting their own powers.

The authors admit that finding this type of volunteer may be difficult (in Peace Corps circles he is known as Super-Volunteer). Is there any indication that he will ever be more than part of that "golden ten percent?" A Peace Corps development orientation in training and programming along with a deemphasis on "the numbers game" may ensure a greater percentage of successes. The time may be ripe to "think small" — two words which cannot be found in most bureaucratic lexicons. But the Peace Corps as a bureaucracy is atypical and hopefully still capable of such a change.

President Nixon's new Peace Corps director, Joseph

Blatchford, is first to admit that the agency cannot be judged only in terms of the good will it generates but must address itself more directly to the problems of development.

BLUE-COLLAR VOLUNTEERS

Blatchford has already eliminated many of the agency's paternalistic policies towards volunteers, visited volunteers overseas, and established several task forces which have already reported back on various reform proposals. The new director has indicated an interest in attracting more skilled blue-collar workers to the Peace Corps and in expanding service to three years to include one year at home. He is also interested in recruiting more volunteers from American minority groups and in bringing foreign volunteers to work in American slums.

Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk once said: "The Peace Corps can best serve American foreign policy by not being a part of American foreign policy." At his confirmation hearing, Mr. Blatchford echoed

these sentiments: "It must be made clear and reaffirmed that the Peace Corps is not an arm of U. S. foreign policy or subject to considerations of foreign policy."

All these affirmations and reaffirmations have apparently fallen on deaf ears at Foggy Bottom. The new forces of efficiency, coordination and consolidation at the State Department have formed a task force to study ways to forge closer ties between State, the Peace Corps, AID and USIA. The outcome hangs in the balance.

The Peace Corps under Joe Blatchford could become a dynamic and revitalized agency and a real "agent of change" in the third world. But at the same time, there is a danger that the Peace Corps could become over-structured, over-State-Departmentalized not to mention CIAed, and over 30. The effect could well mean the death blow to the youthful enthusiasm and idealism that have made the Peace Corps a truly unique and popular volunteer movement.

—DON WOLFENBERGER

Mahout - from page 24

"Since taking office, this administration in its meetings of the Urban Affairs Council has seriously considered the challenge currently being posed by the Soviet housing build-up and the impending threat for the 1980's and beyond, as China begins to develop its own low-cost housing capability. I want to make it quite clear that we will not shrink from these hard realities as some unilateral standpatters would have us do. It would be easy and popular. . . .

"Instead, we intend to adopt a plan that will maintain America's basic principles while at the same time improving the deteriorating relationship between our citizens and their military guardians. Consequently, I am submitting legislation to the Congress allocating to the Department of Defense the responsibility for

building two million new, low-cost homes per year. . . .

". . . continue the stockpiling of houses until we have reached clear and overwhelming sufficiency in this field and have built, in the words of the reknowned gap theoretician, Herman Kahn, a 'spare United States'". . . .

* * *

As the presses were beginning their mighty roar, we received one last communication from Mahout, a phone call in which he said that he had seen preliminary blueprints from the Pentagon. They call for six-foot-thick concrete walls and appear to be located underground "to eliminate air pollution problems." The toilet facilities he reports, "represent a real technological breakthrough in bomb-shelter jobs."

14a ELIOT STREET

● Two Ripon members have just been awarded White House Fellowships for 1969-70. **Bobbi Greene**, National Governing Board member from New Haven, and 1969 graduate of the Yale Law School, was one of two women chosen. And **Bill Kilberg**, '69 Harvard Law graduate, also a long time National Governing Board member and frequent contributor to the FORUM, received the second fellowship.

● Ripon's 1968 election book, **The Lessons of Victory**, is still receiving wide press coverage. **David Wilson** of the Boston **Globe** recently appraised it: ". . . an excellent piece of research, rich . . . in party lore and a joy to read. . . . If you are seriously interested in Presidential politics you ought to own it." Several members have appeared on local radio shows to discuss the book: National Director **Bruce Chapman** spoke in Seattle, and in Washington, D. C., **Mike Brewer**, Ripon's political di-

rector discussed Ripon, and in particular the election report, on a panel with **Bud Wilkinson** and **George Reedy**.

● The Ripon national office welcomes another female to its ranks, **Melissa Dempsey**. After two years at Wellesley, Melissa will head for New Haven this coming fall to be a Yalette. She has aggressively taken charge of the Circulation Department for the summer.

● On June 16, the lead article on the New York **Times**' "second front" page was devoted to the work of 28-year-old Cambridge resident and Ripon member **Dr. George Nolfi**. Nolfi has just opened his own consulting firm, University Consultants, Inc., which is currently studying campus disorders. He arranged a conference in Washington, to which he invited many college administrators and assigned them to roles in a mock campus confrontation and building takeover. Many of the admin-

istrators found it quite enlightening to play S.D.S. leader, Afro member, or student government leader.

● Another Cambridge chapter member, and former National Governing Board member, **Ralph Earle** is working with the Cambridge Tenants Union to drum up support for Cambridge rent control.

● The Chicago Chapter has hired **Skip Gedge** for the summer to coordinate and promote chapter activities. The group also just announced its support of several bills to change the elective process in Chicago: one for the non-partisan election of the Chicago mayor, one to give the mayor the right to appoint the city clerk and treasurer, and another for the elimination of the two-party primaries.

● Ripon in the Far West has much to report. Organizational meetings have been held for new chapters in Portland, Oregon, and San Francisco. The Portland group, led by attorneys **Robert Ridgley** and **Lyndon (Tuck) Wilson**, plans to emphasize local issues such as metropolitan reorganization. One of the leading participants in forming the Portland group is Secretary of State **Clay Myers**.

● The San Francisco group, headed by **Robert Radway** of San Mateo, a recently graduated law student and FORUM correspondent, and San Francisco attorney and National Governing Board member, **Robert Kirkwood**,

will tackle state and local questions alike in its early stages. Several representatives of the Mexican-American community are in San Francisco Ripon and may spark a Ripon study of the Republican party's relationship to Spanish-speaking citizens.

● From Seattle, the local Ripon group urged the City Council to avoid politics in choosing a county ombudsman and to choose a man with outstanding abilities. The local branch of the Society also urged that the City Council appoint a citizens committee to make recommendations of qualified candidates. It seems that the Ripon Society in Seattle will be running the policy and public relations sides of Secretary of State **A. Ludlow Kramer's** campaign for mayor of Seattle.

● Action abounds also within the Washington, D. C. chapter. A short time ago it sponsored a panel discussion on the administration's domestic programs, moderated by **Bill Duke**, former Administrative Assistant to Senator Javits, and participated in by **John Price**, former Chairman of the Board of the Ripon Society and currently an assistant to D. P. Moynihan; **Richard Nathan**, Asst. Director of the Bureau of the Budget; **Sidney Gardner**, Director of HEW's Center for Community Planning; and **Carol Khosrovi**, Legislative Assistant to Senator Percy.

● Seen in the New Senate Office Building recently by Mahout — a long, happy, well fed, and sleek cockroach — out for its morning constitutional across a Senator's rug.

LETTERS

CONGRATULATIONS

Dear Sirs:

May 21, 1969

Congratulations to the Ripon Society for the thoughtful position paper on "Volunteerism and Youth." Again you have contributed significantly to the discussion of how best American can solve its problems.

As someone who is constantly confronted with the narrow, lackluster approaches of a bureaucrat-heavy Executive Branch, I am concerned that those who count the most — Members of Congress, Administration executives, etc. — are not subject to new ideas and fresh approaches. Too often Congress adopts the easiest course with little or no thought being given to its ultimate success or failure. Accordingly, we are enveloped by a myriad of Federal programs which are, at once, overlapping, underfunded, ill-conceived and most unfortunately, touted to be panaceas for our public programs.

At last I believe we have an Administration dedicated to getting at the core of our problems rather than shoving them further under the rug. At the heart of any cure is non-governmental participation. This is true for one basic reason — the purely public route followed in one form or another since the days of the New Deal has failed. I hope that the Nixon Administration recognizes this fact and takes seriously your excellent proposals.

John Meagher
Legislative Assistant to
Alexander Pirnie, M.C.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO NIXON

Dear Sirs:

I have just finished reading the accounts of the administration's sandbagging of the prospective appointment of Dr. John Knowles as assistant secretary of HEW. And I have been reflecting on that in conjunction with your blatant whitewash of the Nixon administration in the May issue, entitled "Beyond the First Hundred Days."

Well, since that first Hundred Days we have seen far too much of what the future will be like. The Knowles case is an open admission that offices in the Nixon administration are in the grip of the highest bidder. Taken in conjunction with the retention of J. Edgar Hoover and Lewis B. Hershey, the ABM or "Safeguard" (big joke!), the MIRV, the continued influence of Everett Dirksen, and other similar phenomena, it is more than sufficient demonstration that the administration is selling out to special interest pressure groups in the most craven possible way. This ward-heeling variety of political action,

continued much longer, will make the Johnson administration look positively virtuous by comparison.

The hopes of many members of the Ripon Society that the Nixon administration might restore some measure of principle to our Federal government have by now been pretty well dashed. Those of us who strongly opposed the Society's endorsement of Richard Nixon last Fall have been pretty well proven right. It is now quite plain that no liberal Republican of conscience can continue to cooperate with Mr. Nixon's policies and allies on grounds of conscience, any more than the George Norrises of the 20's could cooperate with the likes of Calvin Coolidge, or the Conscience Whigs of the 1850's with the likes of Daniel Webster. This administration, like the last, is making cynics of the rising generation. This Society must not sell out to it, or to blind optimism about it, in the vain hope of exercising any influence on the policies of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue; it must remain not the celebrant but the goad of its party in office or out.

WILLIAM A. KOELSCH

DUMP NIXON

Dear Sirs:

Would you please quote me a rate of the following copy, to be inserted as a Classified Ad:

"WANTED: Fellow members of the Ripon Society, and any others who believe in decency, social justice, fair play, and above all the lost American tradition of anti-militarism and peace, as well as fidelity to the Constitution that (a) forbids making war without a declaration by Congress and (b) makes our Senate-ratified treaty obligations the Supreme Law of the Land; only those who are **fed up to here** with the Nixon style and substance, who believe in loyalty to principle above party, cannot sit by and watch the growth of a monster that has room for Roger Robb, Otepka, and that unspeakable Kleindienst, but not for Dr. Knowles, and need we say more; **purpose**, to form the groundwork for a dump-Nixon organization in preparation for what may be America's last chance, if it is not too late."

For the Society itself not to have taken that position, sir, I find to be an abdication of the great purposes that brought it into being.

—HOWARD N. MEYER
Rockville Centre, N. Y.

Ed. Note: It is not the current policy of the FORUM to accept classified advertising.

'Housing Gap' Spurs Secret Plans

Sans fanfare last April, the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress released a report on "Industrialized Housing" which presented some intriguing conclusions about the housing situation around the world. Among the more jolting of the report's observations was the following:

"Within a few years — perhaps a decade — it will probably be generally acknowledged internationally that the best-housed inhabitants of any large country in the world are those of the U.S.S.R. The political impact of this situation will be profound. The United States will suffer devastating comparisons."

Even more ominously, the warning was coupled with a pessimistic conclusion:

"There is no prospect that we in the U.S.A. will be able to embark upon a similar program for our cities in less than five to ten years."

Immediately after the report was issued the FORUM dispatched its ace journalistic seer and ferret, Mahout, to get the real poop on what impact the report has had at the White House. Just before the presses rolled, we received the following dispatch from him.

—The Editors

All indications, official and otherwise, are that the Urban Affairs Subcommittee report has severely shaken the new President. He is known to have spent three hours with those responsible for the report, listening intently to their observations, asking perceptive questions and — to the consternation of his aides — throwing his schedule for the day to the winds. Since then, the implicit warning about the impending "housing gap" between the United States and the Soviet Union has been an important topic of debate in White House circles.

Subordinate to the issue itself but ever present as an undercurrent to the discussion has been the possible political impact of the situation for 1972. It is widely assumed that the President would like to be re-elected in 1972, and that his opponent is likely to be Massachusetts Senator Edward M. Kennedy (now referred to as "Brand X" among the Madison Avenue coterie of Nixon advisors). The President is only too painfully aware of the effect of the phony "missile gap" charge had on his political fortunes in 1960; and he does not wish to give Kennedy or a stand-in Democratic nominee any pretext to manufacture any other "gap" issues.

To date, the only major ongoing action in the housing field is "Operation Breakthrough," George

Romney's still jelling proposal for cooperation between government, business, and labor to break through the barriers that currently exist in industrialized housing.

The Administration is coming to view this as merely a first step that permits them to claim to have taken the initiative, buying time while various project teams work to determine exactly what the Soviet threat is and how to counter it. "The President is leaving his options open at this time," the FORUM was informed.

This is no hollow phrase to mask indecision or confusion, however, insiders stress, and pains have been taken to emphasize that the problem is receiving government-wide attention. For example, the Defense Department is making its Samos "spy" satellites — which are responsible for all the timely new data being gathered on the new Soviet ICBM, the SS-9 — available to gather information on the true extent of the deployment of industrialized housing throughout the U.S.S.R. (The Pentagon is preparing a request for a special \$5.4 billion supplemental appropriation to cover the cost of extra film).

In addition, the government-wide energies devoted to brainstorming sessions and memo-writing have produced several radical proposals. One is to fund already existing federal programs designed to encourage low-cost housing to a level that would actually make them effective. Another is to modify F.H.A. financing so that substantial amounts of low-income housing can be included. A third would be to adopt a federal "performance" building code (as opposed to current obsolete "specification" codes) that would break down the myriad local restrictions which hinder low-cost industrialized housing.

However, insiders predict that all these suggestions will be eliminated as un-American, and influential voices are pressing for a Presidential Commission. As a presidential counsellor put it, "in trying to catch up with the Russians, we must not do anything that would amputate the Invisible Hand of the Free Market System that is now providing a home or invisible facsimile thereof to every American at 8½% per annum."

Already a tentative speech draft to announce a truly American solution has been prepared, snatches of which the FORUM has been able to obtain. Examples:

"Since 1949, when Congress passed the National Housing Act establishing a national housing goal of 'a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family,' the United States government has had a firm commitment to keeping its citizens indoors; and I want to reaffirm this nation's commitment to 'housing with honor.'

—Please turn to page 22