MEMORANDUM

TO: 1970 Democratic Incumbents
FROM: Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman
SUBJECT: Proposals for a U. S. Senate Campaign

INTRODUCTION:

The complexity and sophistication involved in today's campaigns for the U. S. Senate all but preclude the possibility of a dark-horse candidate coming on the scene at the eleventh hour and through an exciting whirlwind of personal activity sweeping to an unexpected victory. Today's campaigns require meticulous planning and flawless execution. The "key" is to GET AN EARLY START. In a sense the next campaign of an election winner begins right after the victory celebration.

What follows is a timetable outline of a Senate campaign.* Most of it will be applicable to any State's campaign. However, it should be revised to more particularly suit a given situation. (A detailed study of an actual campaign is available through the Senatorial Campaign Committee.)

TO BE DONE IMMEDIATELY:

1. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF PAST ELECTIONS: It is important to analyze past election results from a number of angles, not merely those pertaining to the office under consideration. Often times voter trends, which will ultimately effect State-wide campaigns, first become evident in the figures gleaned from the results of the elections to local office. By combining the results of, for example, all the 100 elections to a State's lower house, you are less likely to have your analysis greatly

*Note: This timetable is based on the theory that organizational work for a campaign should begin at least two years before the election. If time does not permit, the timetable can be picked up by an extra "immediate" effort.
affected by a strong political figure who is bucking a trend. Analysis should go back over a number of elections.

2. VOTER REGISTRATION: This should be a continuous effort in combination with other political figures, the Party, labor and voter groups. Registration should be selective. It should be based on analysis of past elections. You, of course, will find it to your advantage to register heavily in those areas which are most likely to return a favorable vote.

3. REPORT ON LAST CAMPAIGN: Where possible work out an exchange of information with other successful candidates.

4. CANDIDATE RECRUITMENT AND ASSISTANCE: A blank spot in any slot for local elective office will hurt the cause of all state-wide candidates. A person interested in a state-wide office should encourage others to fill these slots and assist them as much as practicable. This should be done during all election years, not merely the one in which he has a special interest. The local candidates' gratitude is an ancillary benefit.

5. CONTACT WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS: Liaison with local elected officials should be frequent and regular. They are close to the constituency. Their opinions are therefore valuable. You will also be better able to call on them for assistance at election time.

6. CAMPAIGN THEME: To be most effective a campaign should be built around a theme. Since this often comes as an inspiration to one of those involved in the organization, it is never too early to be on the lookout for it.

7. LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: A network of interested people should be established throughout the state to voice your cause through letters-to-the-editor. You supply the substance of the letter, the person rewrites it, in his own language if necessary.
8. FILM FOR T.V. SPOTS: Good T.V. spots are probably today's most essential ingredient for a successful campaign. Important and/or interesting events involving the potential candidate should be preserved on film.

9. FUND RAISING: Campaigns today are tremendously expensive. Any legal means of raising funds should be pursued at all times. Caution should be taken that you don't alienate other candidates by holding a fund-raising event in one of your "off" years, which happens to be his "on" year.

10. LEGAL: One or more competent lawyers should be assigned the job of researching the law relative to elections and fund-raising. This should be kept up to date at all times.

11. CAMPAIGN GUIDELINES BOOKLET: Assign the task of constructing a campaign guidelines booklet to a carefully selected committee. This booklet should contain detailed information regarding how you expect your local coordinators to operate their segment of the campaign. It must be supplemented as the campaign develops. If it is properly done, it will eliminate a great many time-consuming problems.

WITHIN TWO YEARS OF THE ELECTION:

1. FUND-RAISING: This should be operating in earnest within two years prior to the election. The caution involved regarding other candidates should be less of a consideration at this point.

2. SET UP A SKELETON CAMPAIGN ORGANIZATION: This organization should include all the people necessary to run the campaign, from the director down to county coordinators. All should be supplied with a campaign guidelines booklet. (They should be asked for suggestions on improving it.)
3. PROJECTED BUDGET: Even though a budget projection made at this point will be subject to substantial revision, it should be drawn up in detail. Certain items will remain fairly constant throughout (i.e. rent, telephone service, staff salaries, etc.). Media expenditures will fluctuate with the availability of funds. These should be expressed in terms of percentages, so that the budget can be more easily adjusted as the cash flow dictates.

4. ESTABLISH A CAMPAIGN TIMETABLE: Each state has areas of greater and lesser importance. The candidate's activities from now on should be geared to his campaign. He should make maximum use of media before his official announcement of candidacy. Each trip home should be planned to include a T.V. or radio appearance or an editorial conference. After the candidacy has been announced the campaign itself should be timed to give the media an opportunity to carry news features. Well publicized tours with a definite theme accomplish this in most cases.

5. FILMING FOR T.V. SPOTS: At this point, an accumulation of film of the candidate's activities should be available. This should be reviewed for pertinent content. If some area of interest lacks footage, plans should be made to obtain it.

6. CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: The planning and rough layout work for campaign literature should be commenced at this point. Plans for distribution should be devised. Estimates on which to base the quantities required can be derived from contacts with labor, party organizations, and other groups you plan to use as vehicles for distribution.
EIGHTEEN MONTHS BEFORE THE ELECTION:

1. BEGIN TO BUILD AN ORGANIZATION: You already have your basic organizational structure planned and your people chosen from the director (who should be the last word on all things) down to your area coordinators (probably a county sized unit). You must now begin to build your organization to include large numbers of people. There is a certain danger in involving large numbers of people, since you will find yourself burdened with them unless you keep them busy. What follows is a simple method of handling an organization of virtually limitless size.

   a) Supply your coordinators with "volunteer" cards to be distributed as they see fit. (You suggest methods but leave it more or less to their discretion--unless they show signs of not accomplishing their jobs.) The card should be a self-addressed business reply type; returnable to the central organization. The card should contain wording to the effect that the person volunteers to devote ten hours toward the election of your candidate.

   b) As the cards are returned, send a letter to the individual thanking him or her and explaining that they will be asked to participate in five projects which should require about ten hours total time. These projects can be handled by them on an individual basis, as their time permits. (Suggested projects follow.)

      1) The first project (which is assigned on the "thank you" letter) asks that they recruit two or more additional volunteers.

      2) The second project may be to have them circulate nomination papers where applicable. (Nomination papers should be limited to ten signatures.)

      3) The third project will be to have them each distribute ten bumper stickers (or other campaign material) on a given weekend.
4) The fourth project asks them to sell ten campaign pins (the inexpensive type) for $1.00 each.

5) The fifth project asks them to make ten telephone calls to relatives and friends within five days of the election, encouraging a vote for your candidate and asking that the persons called also make ten such calls.

These five projects involve the volunteer in virtually all phases of the campaign in a more or less painless manner—they are asked to be recruiters of volunteers, circulators of nomination papers, distributors of campaign material, fund raisers and participants in a get-out-the-vote drive.

c) As the volunteer cards come in, lists should be prepared by area to supply your area coordinators with a pool of volunteers to contact for more extensive campaign work.

d) Supply the area coordinator with the material to handle mailings to volunteers in his area. His local organization (built up through contacting volunteers for more extensive work) will handle all the mechanics of the mailings. Whenever the volunteer is to return something (as in the case of the recruited volunteer cards, nomination papers and money sale of pins), it should be returned to the central organization. This eliminates duplicate mailing and provides a check of your volunteer group.

e) A local campaign will be conducted by each local organization. This will include rallies, posting of signs, passing out of literature, etc. Some one person in the central organization should be put in charge of supplies for the local units.

2. KNOW YOUR PROBLEM AREAS: Determine what the problem areas of the State are, as to specific issues and specific political personalities. A judgment will have to be made as to the relative importance—and if important, a deliberate plan should be worked out to deal with the problem.
3) CONTACT WITH OTHER GROUPS: Party organization, labor, and other citizen groups should be alerted to the fact of early planning. You will want to coordinate your activities to eliminate duplication of effort and conflicts in scheduling. You will also want to get commitments, both financial and manpower-wise, from them.

PLANS FOR ELABORATE CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES: If you plan to highlight your campaign with one or more spectacular events, (for example, a whistle stop train tour of your state) work on it should begin immediately.

5. CAMPAIGN PARAPHERNALIA: Decide on bumper stickers and pins to be sold.

ONE YEAR BEFORE THE ELECTION:

1. PICK YOUR CAMPAIGN THEME: Be positive.

2. CAMPAIGN PARAPHERNALIA: Begin your distribution of bumper stickers and the sale of pins showing support.

3. AD AGENCY: There is divided opinion regarding what role an advertising agency should play. Some feel it should run the show—others that its role should be limited to technical matters pertaining to production and placement of time. Perhaps the choice should be made based on the availability of advertising talent. In any event, an ad agency should be engaged at this point. Decisions should be made regarding work commenced on the following:

   a) LITERATURE: You should know at this point what your strong and weak points are. You should know when you are going to need certain pieces. Caution should be exercised in planning so called "throw-aways." If they are poorly done, you will find people do just that with them. If effort and money is put into a piece, you will find it is less likely to end up on the sidewalk.
b) CAMPAIGN PARAPHERNALIA: Don't have too much variety. Pick a small number of items and carry through with the same theme and the same colors. If you vary the theme and vary colors, you end up competing with yourself for attention.

c) T.V. and RADIO SPOTS: These should be in their final stages of development.

d) NEWSPAPER ADS: Plan in final form.

e) BILLBOARD SIGNS: Plan in final form.

f) BUS SIGNS: Plan in final form.

g) TABLOID: A four or eight page tabloid designed as a rotogravure supplement is very effective. It requires a great deal of work. It should be started now--for placement during the last two weeks of the campaign. It could be used as a house to house handout piece also. However, by delivering it with the newspaper, you're assured it will get to each home; and that it will get into the hands of one or more persons living there. A house to house delivery by volunteers is a massive undertaking. No matter how well it is planned, a large percentage of the homes will not be reached. If it is in fact delivered, you still run the risk of having it discarded as just another piece of political literature before it's read. The cost of distribution as part of the newspaper is surprisingly low. The masthead of the newspaper in which it is delivered should dominate the top of the first page. If several papers are used, the masthead should be changed to coincide with the paper.

4. PLAN MAJOR EVENTS TO PACE YOUR COMPAIGN: Your campaign should be planned so that a newsworthy event occurs at regular intervals. Don't wait for lightning to strike--plan your events. If something newsworthy happens
spontaneously, you can always alter your plans or just let it compete with your planned events. It is particularly important that you open your campaign with a splash (suggestion: a flying announcement tour to all the cities in the State which have T.V. stations). You should also plan something special for a close. The competition for news space with your opponent and with other races is greatest in the closing weeks of the campaign. You should try to do something they "have" to cover (suggestion: whistle-stop train). As a part of any plan for an event involving your candidate, place major importance on crowd generation. The most brilliant idea for a gathering, even though planned to the split second, will fall flat if you fail to produce a crowd to display support for your cause. Don't rely on your candidate's innate drawing power. If necessary, physically transport a crowd to the scene.

5. BUILD A LARGE CAMPAIGN FORCE: This work has been started. You must now put forth an intensified effort. If the plan of volunteers recruiting volunteers is used it will be self-generating after the initial push. This activity should be encouraged to go on all during the campaign. Don't put a ceiling on the number of volunteers.

6. POLLING: Political polls have become an essential part of any major campaign. At this stage you probably will not know for certain who your opponent will be. However, a poll conducted on the basis of an educated guess will prove valuable. This is true since it puts you against the best of the opposition. A pollster requires definite information to properly phrase his questions—also keep in mind that it will take him some five weeks to complete his poll after you have supplied him with the information. Depending on the availability of funds, you should consider more than one poll.
BEGINNING OF THE ELECTION YEAR:

1. REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES: Your campaign should be substantially planned. A thorough review should be made of all phases of the campaign, which are under development. Final approval should be made of campaign signs, literature, etc. A final review of legal requirements for the election should be done. A check should be made on area coordinators to determine whether they are doing their jobs—if not, they should be replaced now.

2. STAFF PEOPLE: A plan should be devised for the use of the candidate's regular staff people. They should be used wherever it is legal to do so.

3. PAPER COMMITTEES: At least ten "paper" committees should be set up at this time for possible use during the campaign. They should be designed for use in a specific area of interest, if necessary. For example, you could set up an educators committee, labor committee, medical doctors committees, farmers committees, etc. They would be subordinate to your major campaign committee and may, in fact, never be used. However, if you have them waiting in the wings you will eliminate the necessity of hurriedly forming them if needed.

4. OUTSIDE PERSONALITIES: If you plan to use outside political and entertainment personalities, contact should be made to pin down dates. Care should be taken that you don't make your candidate look like a hanger on. Any event planned should have your candidate as the "star."

5. CANDIDATE'S ACTIVITIES: The candidate should be operating full speed at this point. Too often schedules are designed to fill the candidate's day with time-consuming, exhausting forays into territory which has been solid for him and shows no signs of deviating. Remember, he is a human being and subject to fatigue. Concentration on exposure on radio, T.V., and in the newspapers will bear far more fruit than a sunrise to the wee hours handshaking spree. This is not to say that the latter aspect should be ignored, but to-
day's communication set-up presents a better way.

SPRING OF ELECTION YEAR:

1. SEARCH FOR HEADQUARTERS: Unless there is an early primary situation, it will not be necessary to formally open a headquarters until summer. However, a search should be made to locate a convenient, reasonably priced headquarters which has enough room for your purposes and is on a street with a good traffic flow. It may be necessary to consider the opening of several such offices around the state. If this is the case, be sure one is designated as "the" state headquarters office; with all others looking to it for instructions.

2. ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN: Everything should be in the final form by now.

3. OPPONENT: By this time you should either know or be fairly certain who your opponent will be. You must get to know him as well as you know yourself. A team should research every public word he's uttered. Every speech he makes should be taped and transcribed in writing if possible. If you are not clear as to how he stands on a given point, use your people who are writing letters-to-the-editor on your behalf to find out for you through letters written directly. You should know him so well that nothing he says or does should come as a surprise to you.

4. CONDUCT TOWARD OPPONENT: If the polls show he has a name recognition problem, don't help him by engaging in debates or colloquys with him. Run your campaign as though he didn't exist. If the polls show the problem to be your name recognition, you should do all you can to draw him into public debate. Announced debate tours, at which you debate empty chairs, if necessary, have been effective.
5. DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS: All channels for material distribution should be set up. Teams should be ready to handle plant gates, state and county fairs, Fourth of July parades, convention, etc.

6. OTHER PARTY CANDIDATES: If your candidate is a well known political figure, lesser candidates will want to have their picture taken with him to use in their literature. You should encourage this type of exposure. If necessary, make arrangements for the picture session. In rare cases you will want to avoid a candidate. Often times candidates for local office use house to house distribution of literature effectively. They should be canvassed to determine their plans. You may be able to participate in a joint piece of literature or they may take a piece of your literature as a staffer to be delivered with theirs.

SUMMER OF ELECTION YEAR:

1. OPEN HEADQUARTERS: Do it with a flourish. It should be newsworthy. The headquarters should be set up in a comfortable and convenient manner. Too often a headquarters is set up as though it was going out of existence the next day. It will be your home for several months. A few dollars spent for counters and shelving at the start will save many times the cost in literature that would be destroyed by a makeshift operation.

3. HEADQUARTERS STAFF: Temporary volunteer help in running a headquarters is essential, but you must have a fulltime paid (if necessary) staff to provide continuity to the operation of your headquarters.

3. ALL OTHER ACTIVITIES: Activities of the candidate, your volunteer committee, other organizations, etc. should all be operating in full swing. They should be checked constantly. If some group volunteers to perform a vital function for you, don't merely rely on its good intentions; check to make sure that it was done and done properly.
LATE SUMMER AND EARLY FALL OF ELECTION YEAR:

1. T.V., RADIO, NEWSPAPERS: Depending on your budget, you will place your intensive media advertising for display during the last ten, eight, or six weeks of the campaign. A network of people should be set up in all media areas to monitor your radio and T.V. spots and check for placement of newspaper ads. Ask them for a critical appraisal of the ads as well as having them check to see if they were in fact run. Don't be timid about making substitutions for ineffective ads.

2. LAST MINUTE ATTACKS: Be prepared to answer last minute attacks by your opponent. If you know him well and you know your own vulnerable points, these can be anticipated. If you think you have been injured, respond, but in a positive way, still avoiding a direct confrontation if possible. Last minute attacks are generally desperation moves. They come across as such--and should be avoided unless the point is clearly and unmistakably valid.

3. LAST MINUTE EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS: One or more well prepared newspaper ads should be held in reserve for use in the closing days of the campaign in the event you have the happy experience of receiving more money than you budgeted for. At that late date you most likely can not buy more T.V. or radio time and time will not permit the production of more literature or its distribution.

AFTER THE CAMPAIGN:

Analyze it--write a full report--start on the next one.
The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee met in Room S-208, March 20, 1968, at 1:30 P.M. Present for the meeting were the Chairman, Senator Muskie, and Senators Tydings, Anderson, Bartlett, McGee, Proxmire, Sparkman and Symington. Majority Secretary Stan Kimmitt, Committee Executive Director Frank Hoffmann, Committee Counsel Berl Bernhard, and Secretary-Treasurer Don Nicoll were present also.

After some discussion the Committee authorized the Chairman to increase the salaries of Frank N. Hoffmann (from $24,600 to $25,600), Barbara D. Towles (from $7,800 to $8,272), and Vincent Puccio (from $4,200 to $5,452), effective January 1, 1968, in line with salary increases provided under the 1967 Federal Pay Act, and to increase Committee employee salaries in the future in accordance with salary increases provided in the 1967 Act.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald E. Nicoll
Secretary-Treasurer
DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Summary of Disbursements

March 1, 1969 to July 31, 1969

(Schedule B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Account - #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (Net)</td>
<td>$15,129.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers Federal Tax Deposits</td>
<td>4,437.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. N. Hoffmann Travel Expenses</td>
<td>228.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Supplies</td>
<td>311.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>579.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Supplies</td>
<td>1,281.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Maintenance</td>
<td>575.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Funds to Senators Account #</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Luncheons</td>
<td>765.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Tax Deposits</td>
<td>1,075.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Unemployment Tax</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable Expenditures</td>
<td>260.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers (Goodwill)</td>
<td>41.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senators Travel</td>
<td>1,986.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,685.68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acct. #
DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Balance Statement

March 1, 1969 to July 31, 1969

Cash Balance - March 1, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct. #</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 17,633.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 414.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $ 18,048.65

Add Deposits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct. #</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 15,454.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 308,546.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See attached schedules A and A-1) +$ 324,001.05

Gross Cash Balance

$ 342,049.70

Less Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct. #</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31,685.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 74,002.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See attached schedules B and B-1) -$ 105,688.32

Net Cash Balance - July 31, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct. #</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,402.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 234,958.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $ 236,361.38
DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Summary of Disbursements

March 1, 1969 to July 31, 1969

(Schedule B-1)

Senators Account - #

Senators Transportation $ 4,000.00
Campaign Assistance 33,000.00
Earmarked Funds 4,000.00
Printing 25,000.00
Transfer of Funds to
Administrative Account # 8,000.00
Bank Service Charges 2.64

Total Disbursements $ 74,002.64

Acct. #
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

Media Material Utilized by Senators and Staffs

Senator Burdick                  Film viewing
Senator Hartke                   Film viewing
Senator Bible                   Film viewing
Mike McCormick                  Borrowed 7 fund-raising ticket samples
  Senator Hartke's office
Steve Vossmeyer                 Two films, Kennedy and Humphrey, viewed in Capitol Studio with staff members
  Senator Eagleton's office
R. J. Msazek                    Borrowed 2 pamphlets, The Art of Winning Elections & How to Get Elected
  Senator Hartke's office
  Senator Spong's office
Peter Hart                      Borrowed Senator Gravel's Memo
  DNC
Dale Zabriskie                  Sent campaign films to Utah (Senator Eagleton's & Senator Church's 15mm)
  Senator Moss's office
Bill Spell                      Borrowed Radio Spots of DNC & viewed Senator Eagleton's campaign film Senator Church's 1968 campaign file
  Senator Stennis' office
Jim Meeker                      Viewed 1968 Campaign films
  Senator Burdick's office
Gary Thorne                     Viewed 1968 campaign files
  Senator Muskie's office
Bob Rawson  
   Senator Tyding's office  
Viewed 1968 campaign films

Norman Dicks

Eric Redman  
   Senator Magnuson's office
Viewed 1968 campaign films

Senator Tydings  
Viewed all 1968 campaign films
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Probable Candidates</th>
<th>Primary Date</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Winning Vote %</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Paul Fannin R</td>
<td>Stewart L. Udall D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Miriam L. Fong R</td>
<td>no mentioned candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Sen Ralph Smith</td>
<td>Adlai Stevenson D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Treas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>William Rentschler R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nixon Campaigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Vance Hartke D</td>
<td>John K. Snyder R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Treas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Ruckelshaus R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass. Att-Gen (U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Sen Edmund Muskie</td>
<td>No mentioned opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Joseph Tydings D</td>
<td>Rep. J. Glenn Beall R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnew's staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Stanley Blair R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Sen. Edward Ken-</td>
<td>Josiah Spaulding R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex State GOP Chm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sen Phillip Hart</td>
<td>Mrs. George Romney R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sen Eugene McCarthy</td>
<td>Hubert Humphrey D (ret)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Att-Ga n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>John Stennis D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Stuart Symington D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Mike Mansfield D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Roman Hruska R</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Howard Cannon D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Harrison Williams D</td>
<td>Nelson Gross R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Gop Chm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Joseph M. Montoya D</td>
<td>Gov. David F. Cargo R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson Carter R</td>
<td></td>
<td>ran for Sen in 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Charles Goodell R</td>
<td>Paul O'Dwyer D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Sorenson D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lost to Javits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Quentin Burdick D</td>
<td>Rep. Mark Andrews R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. lawyer now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Stephen M. Young D (ret)</td>
<td>John H. Glenn D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Metzenbaum D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland milliona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Casey D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest Klein D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis F. Waldmann D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>John Pastore D</td>
<td>Unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Albert Gore D</td>
<td>William E. Brock R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest Klein D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard R. Blanton D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis F. Waldmann D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tex Ritter R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Ralph Yarborough D</td>
<td>Rep. George Bush R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd M. Bentsen D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Robert Morris R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Frank E. Moss D</td>
<td>Rep. Laurence Burton R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Winston Prouty R</td>
<td>Gov Phil. Hoff D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Harry F. Byrd, Jr. D</td>
<td>no announced opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Henry M. Jackson D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Robert Byrd D</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>William Proxmire D.</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Sen Gale McGee D</td>
<td>Gov. Stanley Hathaway R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep John Wold R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Sen Paul Fannin (R)</td>
<td>Stewart L. Udall (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Sen. Hiram L. Fong (R)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State treasurer, Nixon Camp. Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Sen. Ralph Smith (R)</td>
<td>Adlai Stevenson (D) X</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Kentschler (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Treasurer, Ass't Att-Gen. (U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Vance Hartke (D)</td>
<td>John K. Snyder (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Buckleyshaus (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor, Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D)</td>
<td>No mentioned opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Sen. Phillip Hart (D)</td>
<td>Mrs. George Romney (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D)</td>
<td>Hubert Humphrey (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Head (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Sen. John Stennis (D)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Att.-Gen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Sen. Stuart Symington (D)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Sen. Mike Mansfield (D)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Sen. Roman Hruska (R)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Sen. Howard Cannon (D)</td>
<td>unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Sen Harrison Williams (D)</td>
<td>Nelson Gross (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Gov. David F. Cargo (R)</td>
<td>Anderson Carter (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate in '66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Sen Charles Goodell (R)</td>
<td>Paul O'Dwyer (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Sorenson (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Richard L Ottinger (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Sen. Quentin Burdick (D)</td>
<td>Rep. Mark Andrews (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Sen. Stephen Young (ret) (D)</td>
<td>John H. Glenn (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Metzenbaum (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland att'y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gov. James Rhodes (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. Robert Yost, Jr. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. John Bent (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Casey (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scranton Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. John Bent (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Casey (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester City Coun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Sen. John Pastore (D)</td>
<td>Unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen. Pitter (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Sen. Ralph Yarborough</td>
<td>Rep. George Bush (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd H. Bentsen (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>Sen. Pitter (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Robert Morris (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Once ran in N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Sen. Frank Moss (D)</td>
<td>Rep. Laurence Burton (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Sen. Winston Prouty (D)</td>
<td>Gov. Phillip Hoff (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D)</td>
<td>No announced opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D)</td>
<td>Slade Gorton (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Sen. Robert Byrd (D)</td>
<td>Unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Probable Candidates</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Winning Vote %</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Sen. William Proxmire (D)</td>
<td>Unopposed to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARED: January 24, 1970
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Actor/Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td>Yvonne Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart .</td>
<td>Sid Woolner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydings</td>
<td>Ken Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Sobsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd, Harry</td>
<td>Rettgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd, Bob</td>
<td>Ethel Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd, T.</td>
<td>Judge Cartland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore, A.</td>
<td>Bill Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartke</td>
<td>Jack Leroy--Some Spots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Brian Corchrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Paul Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Peggy DeMichele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGee</td>
<td>Dick Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoya</td>
<td>Paul Demos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>Midgley--Some of it Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>Nicoll-Wants Local Filming Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastore</td>
<td>Jim McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxmire</td>
<td>Ann Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symington</td>
<td>Stan Fike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Jim Dulaney--Goldsmith Hired Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough</td>
<td>Gene Godley--Yes in the Can-Not Edited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Done: Yes
No: No
Partial: Partial
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TO: Senator Daniel K. Inouye

FROM: Lester M. Goldsmith

RE: Democratic Senatorial Campaign Films

With reference to our meeting in your office this afternoon, I would like to make the following proposal as a revision of our original plans that we had been discussing.

Instead of the thirty minute structured formats which were previously outlined to you in my letter of December 19 and my memo of January 20, I feel we could effectively accomplish the type of professional film programs you are looking for with the following for each Senator:

2 Five minute films (on either Super 8 cartridge or 16mm TV print)

6 One minute television spots

6 30 second (or 20 second) television spots

2 10 second television spots

As before, the films would be produced in color with synchronized sound, etc., and would be personally tailored for each Senator. We would also provide the still photographer and 8x10 glossy prints for each Senator, as detailed in my memo of January 20, 1970.

The filming would be done in Washington, in and around the Capitol and, per our discussion, they would show the Senators in action and not be limited merely to "behind the desk" speeches. The same techniques would be used for production filming as we previously discussed for the original filming plans. The filming would be done, as previously planned, on a preplanned schedule that would allow us to film a few Senators per day. We would have some flexibility in our scheduling to allow for last minute schedule problems for some of the Senators. Additionally, all of the films would have the necessary television disclaimers as required, audio and visual.

The total package price for this proposal, including the above items for each Senator in the quantity indicated, would be $65,000. This would include one print of each item for each Senator. Additional prints for broadcast use would be extra, depending on the number of prints required, at standard print costs. Please note that should any Senator desire a slight modification in the number of units, this can easily be accommodated (7 minutes and 5 30's, for
example, instead of 6 minutes and 6 30's, etc.). Local campaign requirements may reflect different problems and I would certainly wish to be as accommodating as possible, particularly since some of the Senators seem to already have some of their own film. These type of adjustments can readily be made, and I would be happy to do so in an effort to really tailor the films as much as possible for each man.

I hope that the above revision plan can favorably meet your requirements and that we can move ahead on this most important and exciting project. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter. Any further help that I can give you in this area, I would be most happy to provide.

cc: Mr. Frank N. Hoffman

Lester M. Goldsmith
The 1970 Senatorial elections provide the Democrats with the strongest challenge to their control of the Senate since 1954. A net gain of seven Senatorial seats would provide the Republicans with majority leadership of the Senate.

According to the Republican National Committee documents which we have seen, there are twelve Senatorial seats which the Republicans are aiming to capture. These seats are in the following states: Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. Using this information, I thought it would be significant to see how much things have changed over the last six years in these twelve states.

Generally, we all know much that has happened since the 1964 elections in political terms, but in terms of population characteristics as well as specific voting behavior patterns, these twelve states present a formidable challenge for the Democrats to control.

In a majority of these twelve states, the suburban population has grown by at least 25 per cent and in some cases up to 50 per cent. For the first time in our nation's history, more people live in the suburbs than in the central city. These voters who are generally homeowners dependent on an income shrunk by inflation, have a new set of values which differ from those that they had as the big-city dwellers. They are divorced from the center city political organizations and tend to have a more Independent-Republican orientation.

The median family income is now around $9,300. One third of the voters in these twelve states have personal disposable income in excess of $10,000. For this
reason, these people will tend to look at liberal Democrats as spenders. If the incumbent Senators are unable to put the blame for inflation and taxes on the Republican Administration, they will find a skeptical electorate.

In 1968, law and order was the second biggest issue. In 1970, law and order appears to remain a major issue confronting all candidates. With the exceptions of Wyoming, Tennessee, North Dakota, and Indiana, the total crime index in the remaining eight G. O. P. target states is high. This fact puts another obstacle in the way of the Democratic incumbents who are certain to be targets of Republican criticism.

According to the Gallup Poll, party affiliation in the past five years has become decidedly more Independent and less Democratic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dem.</th>
<th>Rep.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these twelve states there are large numbers of Democrats becoming Independents. The traditional appeals to vote Democratic will not be sufficient in 1970.
Politically, the following things have happened in these twelve states over the last decade:

**PRESIDENTIAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>12 GOP Target States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1960, President Kennedy ran a far stronger race in these states than he did nationwide. Four years later, President Johnson carried all twelve states nearly matching his national popular vote of 61 per cent. In the 1968 Presidential election, Vice President Humphrey won only two of the twelve states, and received almost 3 per cent less than he did nationally. In the first eight years of the sixties, the Democratic Presidential standard-bearer has dropped a total of 5 per cent from his position relative to his national standing.

**CONGRESSIONAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Congressional Seats-12 GOP Target States</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of Tennessee and Nevada, the remaining ten states have experienced a loss in Democratic Congressional representation. In 1964, the Democrats had five Congressmen for
every two Republicans in the target states; today the margin has shrunk to six Democrats to five Republicans. This is another indication of eroding Democratic strength in the key states.

STATE LEGISLATURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total 12 Target States</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>+327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1964, Democrats held a majority of the combined seats of the state legislature in every one of the twelve states except New Jersey and Ohio. In 1968, Democrats were in the minority in seven of the twelve legislatures. Nearly 70 per cent of the legislative seats in these twelve states were held by Democrats in 1964. As this election year begins, not even half of these seats are in Democratic hands. Thus, even at the local level, Democratic fortunes have waned since these twelve Democratic Senators were last elected.

VOTER TURNOUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 GOP Target States</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-Off</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER TURNOUT (continued):

One of the hardships that these Senators will face in 1970 is the reduced turnout of an off-year election. When these Senators last ran in 1964 (a Presidential year), nearly two-thirds of the electorate in these twelve states voted. In 1966, an off-year, barely more than half showed up, a decline of 13.6 per cent. It is estimated that three-fourths of these voters are Democrats and, therefore, the smaller turnout works heavily against Democratic candidates. Each one of these Senators will have to wage strong campaigns to get these Democrats to the polls.

CONCLUSION:

The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee has undertaken elaborate research efforts on these twelve key states, and were it not for the outstanding Senators up for re-election, our cause would be lost. Even with these fine men, we have a great deal to do if we are to remain as the majority party when we convene one year from now.

If our best effort is to encourage our colleagues up for re-election in 1970, we might as well resign control of the Senate today. What is needed is for each of us pulling together through the Senatorial Campaign Committee to see that we are all here come January, 1970. As a team we can make it, but if it is each man to himself, our chances are slim.

Here are some suggestions on what we can do for one another:

1. If your staff has produced an unusually good issue paper, the Senate Campaign Committee will disseminate it to Senators up for re-election for their modification and use.

2. Jot down some of the better ideas from your last campaign, especially techniques which were effective in the suburbs, and let the Campaign Committee compile them in a booklet for everyone’s use.

3. If your state’s television extends into a colleague’s state, arrange a joint press conference on a problem of areawide significance, publicizing the work the
Senator has done.

4. If you or your wife has close ties with a particular organization or ethnic group, contact Nordy Hoffmann to arrange an endorsement appearance in a colleague's state.

5. If one of your staff people is particularly good on some facet of a campaign, loan his services thru the Campaign Committee to one of your colleagues for a month or so.

Each of these suggestions asks you to give up something of yourself, but if we are to remain the majority party in the 92nd Congress, it is indeed a small sacrifice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FYI</th>
<th>prepare reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comment &amp; advice</td>
<td>see me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval</td>
<td>as requested /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigate</td>
<td>as promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note &amp; return</td>
<td>P. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first name</td>
<td>file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reply for signature of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REMARKS:

OK to go this.
I have talked to Jo.
HUMPHREY-MUSKIE, CAMPAIGN 1968

OFFICE OF SENATOR MUSKIE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Nordy Hoffman  
FROM: Don Nicoll 
SUBJECT: 

DATE: November 20, 1968

Am enclosing a copy of a note I sent to Leo Kramer.

Has he sent us a bill for the cards? If so, we have to review it and pay him. I see no need to get involved in a dispute over the contract. We will chalk the unfortunate cost up to experience.
November 20, 1968

Mr. Leo Kramer
President
Leo Kramer, Inc.

Dear Leo:

Thank you for your note of November 1, 1968, and the enclosed material on the speech cards.

I am sure that many of the cards were useful to candidates. At the same time, I think it should be noted that the material on inflation and the references to Vietnam were presented in such a way that they tended to distort the Democratic record and were subject to misuse by the Republicans. I am sure we all learned from the experience.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Nicoll
Administrative Assistant to
Senator Edmund S. Muskie
December 5, 1968

Frank N. Hoffman  
Democratic Senate Campaign Committee

---

Final Bill:

Professional Services, Research, Writing, etc.  $14,935.53

Printing  10,488.96

Total Amount Due  $25,424.49
Dear Nordy:

Enclosed is our final bill.

You will recall that our original estimate was that the work would certainly be under twenty-five thousand dollars, hopefully under twenty -- excluding printing.

We have been able to do the job for $14,935.53. The printing bill would have been small, also, if it had been kept to just the Senators running for re-election. The expanded printing, the large number of cards, and the collating job became major items amounting to $10,488.96. It is a good thing that our part of the cost remained as low as it did.

The total bill is $25,424.49.

I have a date to see Don on Monday, December 9, at 10:30. Perhaps if convenient for you, I could drop by before or after.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

President

Mr. Frank N. Hoffman
Democratic Senate Campaign Committee
August 22, 1968

Frank N. Hoffman
Democratic Senate Campaign Committee

Project Research and Speech Card

Work Up To August 15, 1968 $3,882.00
September 26, 1968

Frank N. Hoffman
Democratic Senate Campaign Committee

Project Research and Speech Card
Services August 16 thru September 15, 1968   $ 8,565.48

Past Due:
Services thru August 15, 1968               3,882.00

Total Amount Due                            $12,447.48
I  Report on the Congressional Dinner

II  Distribution of Dinner receipts
   A. Distribution to date
   B. Basic Distribution
   C. Committee Administrative Expenses
      1. Wage increase for Committee Employees
   D. Distribution of balance on need basis

III  Report on future financing plans
   A. Meetings with Congressman Edmondson and Ken Harding
   B. Meeting with Pat O'Connor

IV  Report on meeting with Al Barkan and COPE

V  Addition of Senator Metcalf to Committee replacing Senator Anderson.
I  Report on the Congressional Dinner

II  Distribution of Dinner receipts
   A. Distribution to date
   B. Basic Distribution
   C. Committee Administrative Expenses
      1. Wage increase for Committee Employees
   D. Distribution of balance on need basis

III  Report on future financing plans
   A. Meetings with Congressman Edmondson and Ken Harding
   B. Meeting with Pat O'Connor

IV  Report on meeting with Al Barkan and COPE

V  Addition of Senator Metcalf to Committee replacing Senator Anderson.
AGENDA

I Report on the Congressional Dinner

II Distribution of Dinner receipts
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Dear Nordy:

The enclosed preliminary report of receipts and expenditures was received from Aiden Kirwan this morning, and I am sending it along to you for your Wednesday meeting.

Most of the outstanding unpaid obligations are approximations and since all bills are not yet in, the total of $14,676.67 cannot, at this moment, be precise.

Of course, we still have some $30,000 in contributions to be collected and I am hopeful that some or all of the entertainment item will be offset.

All the best.

Sincerely,

Neale Roach
# DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL DINNER COMMITTEE

## PRELIMINARY REPORT

### July 15, 1969

#### Cash Receipts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Account from 1968</td>
<td>$1,732.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts 1968 Dinner</td>
<td>$1,226.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts 1969 Dinner</td>
<td>$764,010.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash</strong></td>
<td><strong>$766,959.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash Disbursements:

- Payroll, Administrative & Clerical: $18,875.50
  - Less Texas Withheld: $150.86
  - **Total:** $18,724.64
- Outside Help: $2,046.75
- Postage: $3,717.62
- Office: $1,157.93
- Meetings: $2,206.90
- Rents, Office and Equipment: $10,058.33
- Telephone: $2,046.75
- Entertainment at Dinner: $5,600.00
- Parking, etc.: $231.50
- Photos: $1,574.00
- Printing: $4,730.52
- Petty Cash: $750.00
- Texas, Payroll: $643.63
- Refunds: $1,100.00
- Hilton Hotel: $32,745.40
- Souvenirs: $5,424.10
- Organist: $150.00

**Cash Expenses to 7/15/69:** $92,952.20

#### Bills Payable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Connors, postage &amp; Mailing</td>
<td>$895.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing add'l, approx.</td>
<td>$9,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O &amp; P Telephone, approx.</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Detective Agency, approx.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Union, approx.</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous office items</td>
<td>$87.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$167,628.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash Available for Committee: **$657,340.63**

#### Paid Senate Campaign Committee:

- **$45,000.00**
- **292,000.00**
- **$297,000.00**

#### Paid House Campaign Committee:

- **$55,000.00**
- **393,000.00**
- **$600,000.00**

**Deficit:** $65,340.63

Additional receipts are in transit which offset deficit.
DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE
July 23, 1969

AGENDA

I Report on the Congressional Dinner

II Distribution of Dinner receipts
   A. Distribution to date
   B. Basic Distribution
   C. Committee Administrative Expenses
      1. Wage increase for Committee Employees
   D. Distribution of balance on "need" basis

III Report on future financing plans
   A. Meetings with Congressman Edmondson and Ken Harding
   B. Meeting with Pat O'Connor

IV Report on meeting with Al Barkan and COPE

V Addition of Senator Metcalf to Committee replacing Senator Anderson.
Honoroble Daniel K. Inouye
Chairman
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you for your letter of 3 July inviting me to fill the vacancy on the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. I am pleased to accept your invitation and look forward to working with you in this capacity.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,
# Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

**DSCC LUNCHEON MEETING**

**July 23, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE ATTENDING-</th>
<th>COMMITTEE ABSENT-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senator Inouye</td>
<td>1. Senator Magnuson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Senator Nelson</td>
<td>2. Senator Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Senator Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Senator Hollings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Senator McIntyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Senator Mondale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Senator Ribicoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Senator Sparkman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Senator Spong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Senator Muskie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Senator Mansfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Eiler Ravnholt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Berl Bernhard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Barbara Towles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

There will be thirty-three seats involved in the election this November. Eleven of those seats are currently held by Democratic incumbents, sixteen by Republican incumbents and there are six states where no incumbent is running.

There are currently 55 Democratic Senate seats. Of this group, 14 are involved in this year's election. Thus, at the outside, Democrats would have to retain only ten seats to insure a majority. Republicans, on the other hand, have 19 of their current 45 seats up for reelection. They would have to retain these seats in addition to picking up an additional six, in order to attain the majority they haven't held since the Eisenhower years.

There are 11 states where incumbent Democrats are up for reelection. At this date 10 are considered relatively safe for the incumbents or other party nominees. These states include: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, Virginia and West Virginia. The seats held by William B. Spong (Va.), Thomas J. McIntyre (N.H.), Lee Metcalf (Mont.) and David Gambrell (Ga.) are not absolutely "safe" but are likely holdovers. Claiborne Pell (R.I.) will receive serious competition from former Secretary of the Navy Chafee.

The Republicans have sixteen positions up for reelection and of this group 12 seats look to be relatively safe. These Senators, none of whom will receive substantial primary opposition, are: Ted Stevens (Alaska), Gordon Allott (Colo.), J. Caleb Boggs (Del.), Charles H. Percy (Ill.), Jack Miller (Iowa), James B. Pearson (Kan.), Edward W. Brooke (Mass.), Clifford P. Case (N.J.), Strom Thrumond (S.C.), Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), Carl T. Curtis (Neb.), and Clifford P. Hansen (Wyo.). In these races,
however, Baker, Boggs and Percy are likely to receive significant challenges from the Democrats, Congressman Ray Blanton (Tenn.), Joseph R. Biden (Del.) and Congressman Roman C. Pucinski (Ill).

The four Republican seats that will be most closely contested are likely to be Michigan (Senator Griffin), Maine (Senator Smith), Texas (Senator Tower) and Oregon (Senator Hatfield).

The six states where incumbent Senators are not involved are: Idaho, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota and North Carolina. With the exception of North Carolina, all of these states have retiring senators. In North Carolina incumbent Senator B. Everett Jordan was defeated in the state's Democratic primary by Congressman Nick Galifianakis. With the state's strong Democratic majority behind him, Galifianakis should be a front runner in his general election race against the arch conservative Raleigh broadcaster, Jesse A. Helms. Of the remaining non-incumbent states, Democrats are certain to run strong in three: Kentucky (State Senator Dee Huddleston), Oklahoma (Congressman Ed Edmundson), South Dakota (Congressman James Abourezk). The Idaho Democratic primary involves five candidates at this point, but it is thought that several of the potentials would do well against the Republican nominee in November. In New Mexico the general election race is between former state representative Jack Daniels and the unsuccessful 1970 republican gubernatorial candidate Pete Domenici. This contest should be extremely close.

Concern has been voiced as to the effect that the national ticket will have on Senate candidates. At this date it is still early to discern precisely the impact that the probable nominee, Senator George McGovern, will have on Senate races. Southern and border state candidates have indicated that his liberal candidacy will hinder their cause.
It is still early for extremely accurate predictions and it is assumed that the above comments are accepted in that light. Barring an exceedingly strong vote for Richard Nixon in November, Democrats should retain a majority position in the Senate.

A substantial portion of the 25 million young people who will be eligible to vote for the first time this year are likely to support the Democratic party. Registration figures to date have shown a majority of Democratic registrants and a significant number of independents who are thought to be leaning toward the more liberal Democratic party.
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I. STATES WHERE DEMOCRATIC SENATORS ARE FACING REELECTION.

ALABAMA    Senator Sparkman

Senator Sparkman won the Democratic Nomination in a field of seven candidates; he had 50.3 per cent of the vote, only narrowly escaping a run-off with second place finisher State Auditor Melba Till Allen. Mrs. Allen had 29 per cent of the Democratic vote.

Former Postmaster General Winton M. Blount, 51, Montgomery won the Republican primary with 57 per cent. The Republican field included four candidates, among them second place finisher former Congressman James D. Martin.

The vote totals from the two primaries indicate a strong Democratic majority in the state of Alabama — 658,648 Democratic votes as opposed to only 50,437 Republican ballots. This fact, in addition to Sparkman's four term seniority and committee chairmanship indicate his most probable strength for November.

ARKANSAS    Senator McClellan

Long time Senator John L. McClellan, 76, won the Democratic Nomination in a close run-off contest against Congressman David Pryor. McClellan polled 52 per cent of the vote as opposed to Pryor's 48 per cent. The general election will pit the incumbent McClellan against Republican nominee Wayne Babbitt, 43, a Little Rock veterinarian. Babbitt was selected by the state Republican convention and is the unquestioned under-dog for the general election.

GEORGIA    Senator Gambrell    Primary Date August 8

At this date the Georgia race is somewhat obscured by the fact that these are sixteen candidates in contention for the Democratic nomination.
The four leading candidates are current Senator David Gambrell, State Representative Sam Nunn, State Treasurer Bill Burson and former Governor Ernest Vandiver (1959-63). The black civil rights leader Hosea Williams is also in the Democratic race and is thought likely to draw most of the black votes.

Representative Nunn recently received the backing of former Governor Marvin Griffin and the "approval" of current Lt. Governor Lester Maddox. Senator Gambrell is running an active campaign in the state at this date and he will likely receive his most serious competition from Nunn in August.

The Republican race includes a number of candidates that are led by Congressman Fletcher Thompson. Thompson has been actively campaigning in the state for some time and has vigorously pursued his stand against busing. Other candidates in addition to black Atlanta Attorney Howard Tucker, are Clarence Porter and Darrel Runyn.

LOUISIANA       Senator Ellender       Primary Date August 19

Six term Senator Allen Ellender is vying for his seventh term. While he must be rated the favorite in the state's Democratic primary, it is reported that he will encounter serious competition for former State Senator and recent Gubernatorial candidate J. Bennett Johnston. Johnston, who lost the Gubernatorial race to former Congressman Edwin Edwards by only 4,480, has a well established name in state-wide politics and is unlikely to have financing problems for the Senate venture.

Other candidates at this point include Democrat J. Frank Allen from Monroe and Hall Lyons, an American party candidate from Lafayette.

Senator Ellender's age (he will be 82 this fall) will undoubtedly be a main issue in the campaign. The still vigorous Ellender, however,
will argue that his record and his Appropriations Committee chairman-
ship are too important for voters to ignore. He also has the endor-
sement of Senator Russell Long and somewhat less vigorous approval of the
current Governor and Lt. Governor. It would be considered a major upset
if Ellender were to be defeated in the primary.

**MINNESOTA**  Senator Mondale  Primary Date September 12

The Republican nominee, chosen by a May 6 state convention, is
Philip Hansen. Hansen is a Lutheran Minister and is director of the
Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center at Northwestern Hospital in Minneapolis.
A newcomer against the respected Walter Mondale. Mondale is apparently
without opposition for the Democratic nomination.

**MISSISSIPPI**  Senator Eastland

Incumbent James O. Eastland piled up nearly a three to one margin
in winning the Democratic primary contest against attorney Taylor Webb.
Out of a total of over 280,000 votes cast, Eastland captured 70 per
cent.

The Republican nominee, auto dealer Gil Carmichael, won an easy
contest against the black civil rights leader James Meredith. Carmichael
had 80 per cent of the 23,000 vote total.

The final election contest should be won easily by incumbent Senator
Eastland.

**MONTANA**  Senator Metcalf

Senator Metcalf had only token opposition in the primary and won
easily with 86 per cent of the 115,000 Democratic votes cast. He will
face State Senator Henry S. Hibbard in the general election. Hibbard,
a wealthy rancher known for his hard-line conservative views, won the
Republican nomination with 48 per cent of the 71,000 vote total. His
nearest competitor was Harold E. Wallace (31 per cent) who drew 40 per cent of the vote when he challenged Senator Mike Mansfield in 1970.

Wallace recently announced that he would attempt to run as an independent in November. While it is not known if this is possible under state law, if Wallace should succeed in running such a campaign he would likely draw votes away from Gibbard.

At this date Senator Metcalf must be rated a favorite for the general election but depending on the national ticket in November, he could be seriously challenged by the more conservative and well financed Hibbard.

NEW HAMPSHIRE  Senator McIntyre  Primary Date September 12

Senator McIntyre is guaranteed the Democratic nomination but could possibly receive token competition from a former Democratic candidate for Governor (1968) Emile Bussiere.

At this time four candidates appear likely for the Republican nomination. Former Governor (1961-63) Wesley Powell is the most conservative candidate as evidenced by his support from Manchester publisher William Loeb. His competition will come from the more moderate Speaker of the House Marshall Gobleigh and another relatively unknown Republican candidate, 35 year old U. S. Attorney David Brock. The fourth Republican candidate is Peter Booras, a little known businessman who chaired a successful Vice Presidential write-in campaign for Spiro Agnew in the New Hampshire presidential primary.

McIntyre's opposition will most certainly come from a Republican who wages a more conservative appeal. His proven constituent concerns and his well oiled campaign organization make the Senator a favorite at this date.
RHODE ISLAND  Senator Pell  Primary Date September 12

The final election contest in Rhode Island will involve a close race between Senator Pell and former Secretary of the Navy, Chafee. Recent polls have shown Pell trailing Chafee by a small margin. Chafee lost to present Governor Frank Licht in the 1968 contest but is thought to be a good campaigner with financial support and publicity due to his recent position in the Nixon Administration.

Senator Pell has labor support and has been active for some time in formulating his campaign efforts, thus the race is guaranteed to be close.

Pell will have primary opposition from Providence attorney John Quattrochi.

VIRGINIA  Senator Spong

The Senate race in Virginia will be between the Democratic incumbent, present eighth district Congressman William L. Scott and Independent Horace E. Henderson.

Both party candidates won their nomination unopposed and will likely wage a spirited campaign in November. At this date Spong must be rated favorite. Depending on the national ticket in November, however, Spong could lose votes to the more conservative Scott. A state that it is capable of ignoring tradition and voting Republican.

WEST VIRGINIA  Senator Randolph

Incumbent Senator Randolph easily won nomination to run again for his Senate seat. His opponent in the general election will be State Senator Louise Leonard. She is not well known on a state-wide basis, but is thought to be a good campaigner.

In view of Senator Randolph's long time representation of West Virginians (28 years) and the state's democratic voting habits in pres-
identical years, he should be easily reelected.

II. STATES WHERE REPUBLICAN SENATORS ARE FACING REELECTION

ALASKA

Senator Stevens Primary Date August 22

Senator Stevens will be the Republican nominee and will undoubtedly run an efficient campaign. Since being appointed to fill the term of former Senator Bartlett, Stevens has spent a large portion of his time building an in-state organization. He will have strong administration support and some labor backing.

The Democratic candidate will most probably be Alaska House Speaker Gene Guess. Guess has been actively working on his campaign for some time and will run a strong race in November, he must be rated the underdog against Stevens, however.

COLORADO

Senator Allott Primary Date September 12

Allott will have no opposition in the Republican primary and the three term Senator will undoubtedly run a strong race in November. He must be considered the favorite.

The two declared Democratic candidates are former State Representative Floyd Haskell and the State Senator from Jefferson County Anthony F. Vollack. There could possibly be a third candidate for the Democratic primary but the above two are easily the strongest contenders.

DELAWARE

Senator Boggs No State Primary

The Democratic candidate in Delaware will most likely be New Castle County Counsel Joseph R. Biden, Jr. Biden has engaged in a well organized effort and is thought to be capable of running a good campaign against Boggs in November.

One thing favoring a strong Democratic ticket is the discontent of small town people concerning pressures to bring new industry to Del-
aware. An additional issue will be the matter of coastal zone protection and exploration of off shore oil-gas possibilities on the Atlantic continental shelf.

The Republican nominee will be incumbent Senator Boggs. At this date he appears to be a favorite for the general election.

ILLINOIS Senator Percy

Seven term Congressman from Chicago, Roman C. Pucinski is the Democratic nominee. He is thought to be a tough campaigner but will face an uphill battle against the incumbent Percy. At this date it is not clear to what extent Pucinski will be aided by the Daley organization. Some have speculated that since the Daley candidate for Governor was defeated, the Mayor may play a less active role in the state-wide campaign this year.

At this date Percy must be rated the favorite.

IOWA Senator Miller Primary Date August 1

Richard C. Clark, former administrative assistant to Congressman John Culver, is the Democratic candidate who will oppose incumbent Senator Miller in November. At the June 6 filing deadline, Clark was the only candidate to have entered the Democratic contest.

Clark has proven himself an energetic campaigner, but his lack of experience in state-wide politics and the fact that he has held no elective offices, makes him a definite underdog against Senator Miller.

KANSAS Senator Pearson Primary Date August 1

The Democratic candidate in Kansas is Johnson County physician Dr. A. O. (Arch) Tetzlaff. Dr. Tetzlaff is a German immigrant who received two medical degrees in Germany and moved to the U. S. in the early 50's. Formerly a Republican, Tetzlaff ran an unsuccessful primary

Although farming interests in the state are said to be unhappy with James Pearson's record, the incumbent Senator will be a definite favorite for the general election.

MAINE Senator Smith

Senator Margaret Chase Smith won renomination in Maine's primary by soundly defeating Robert A. G. Monks, a wealthy young Cape Elizabeth industrialist. She will be opposed in November by second district Congressman William Hathaway.

Hathaway, a strong campaigner, will wage a good contest against the aging incumbent in November. Senator Smith's astounding primary victory, however, would indicate that her support is not waning and she must be considered the favorite.

MASSACHUSETTS Senator Brooke Primary Date September 19

Senator Brooke has announced for reelection and will undoubtedly be the Republican nominee for November.

The Democratic state convention endorsed the candidacy of Middlesex County District Attorney John Droney in early June. Many feel however, that Boston City Councilman Gerald O'Leary will run a stronger race against Brooke. O'Leary has announced for the Democratic nomination, and will likely be Droney's major competition.

O'Leary supports the presidential candidacy of Senator George McGovern and is definitely more liberal than Droney. Either will face an uphill battle against Brooke.

MICHIGAN Senator Griffin Primary Date August 8

The Senate contest in Michigan will be between incumbent Senator
Griffin and State Attorney General Frank Kelly. Kelly is well organized but will run an uphill campaign against Senator Griffin in November. The busing issue is salient in Michigan and Griffin has come out strongly against, thus, preempting Kelly who takes a less adament stand. The economy issue could aid Kelly if unemployment is still bad in November. Griffin is the favorite but it is certain that he will face a close contest with Kelly forces.

NEBRASKA Senator Curtis

In a close race for the Democratic nomination State Senator Terry Carpenter was the winner. Carpenter won with 29 per cent of the vote, only narrowly beating his closest competitors who captured 27 and 22 per cent of the ballots respectively.

Senator Curtis won the Repubulican primary easily with 74 per cent of the vote. Vote totals for the two primaries were close -- the Republican contest had the majority by 8,349.

Carpenter is liberal on the war and generally more liberal than Curtis, but his age (he is 72) and the fact that he is running in a state with a lengthy Republican history are against him. Curtis is the easy favorite.

NEW JERSEY Senator Case

Former Congressman Paul J. Krebbs (1965-67) won an easy victory in the Democratic primary. Krebbs' main competition came from the more liberal advertising executive, Daniel M. Gaby. In the four candidate race Krebbs had 48 per cent of the vote -- Gaby 27 per cent.

Senator Case, the liberal Republican incumbent, won renomination easily over James W. Ralph, a little-known conservative. Case has drawn criticism from the right wing of his party, but he headed off organized opposition this year and must be considered a favorite in the general election.
OREGON  Senator Hatfield

The Democratic primary was won by former Senator Wayne Morse. The twenty-four year Senator has 44 per cent of the vote, and his nearest competitor, Robert Duncan, won 33 per cent.

On the Republican side Senator Hatfield won easily over three opponents with 61 per cent of the vote. Hatfield had been in trouble back home due to his national concerns and lack of support for the Nixon administration's foreign policy efforts. Apparently these problems have subsided and with Governor McCall out of the race, Hatfield looks to be the front runner against Morse.

Morse has a well organized campaign with good labor and volunteer support; assuming that his age (he is 72) does not become a big issue, the former Senator could run a close race with Hatfield.

SOUTH CAROLINA  Senator Thurmond

Democratic candidates are State Senator Nick Zeigler and Greenville lawyer John Bolt Culbertson. Zeigler is running a well organized campaign and is easily the leader. He will emerge a definite underdog in the general election campaign against the exceedingly popular Strom Thurmond, however.

TENNESSEE  Senator Baker  Primary Date  August 3

The four candidates in the Democratic primary race are led easily by the current seventh district Congressman Ray Blanton. Blanton is hopeful of winning the primary by a convincing margin, thus, propelling him into the general election.

Incumbent Howard Baker will run unopposed in the Republican primary, and his well financed campaign will be strong in November.
Both Blanton and Baker are conservatives, but the young two term Congressman will likely have support from the black voters and the large Tennessee blue collar vote. At this date Baker must be rated as the favorite, however.

TEXAS  Senator Tower

Barefoot Sanders, a Dallas attorney and former assistant U. S. Attorney General, defeated former Senator Ralph Yarborough (1951-71) in the June 3rd run-off primary. Sanders had taken positions to the right of the liberal Yarborough throughout the campaign. He finished with 52 per cent of the vote compared to Yarborough's 48.

In the primary campaign Sanders had the support of Texas business and oil interests. While he is to the right of former Senator Yarborough, Sanders must be considered a "liberal" by national Democratic party standards. His campaign is currently picking up support and will be aided further by the strong Democratic vote expected for gubernatorial candidate Dolph Briscoe.

Incumbent Senator John Tower, thought by many to be the Senate's most conservative Republican, was renominated without opposition. If Sanders is able to continue to organize effectively, the general election should be close.

WYOMING  Senator Hansen  Primary Date  August 22

Three candidates have filed for the Democratic nomination in Wyoming---all three are little known in state-wide politics. They include Doyle W. Henry, W. E. Fritchell and Mike Vinich.

Incumbent Senator Hansen will be unopposed in the primary and is the unquestioned favorite for November.
III. STATES WHERE THERE IS NOT AN INCUMBENT SENATOR

IDAHO

Primary Date August 8

Announced candidates for the Democratic primary are: Attorney General W. Anthony Parks, Dr. William E. Davis, President of Idaho State University, Rose Bowman of Boise and Boise Attorney Byron Johnson.

The democratic race will be extremely close. Attorney General Parks is the only one of the four candidates who has run in a state-wide race. He did very well in 1970, polling even more votes than the Governor. Johnson has also been engaging in a very active campaign and Davis is said to be quite popular in many areas of the state.

The Republican candidates are led by Congressman James A. McClure and include former Governor Robert E. Smylie, former U. S. Representative George V. Hansen and former White House aide, Dr. Glen Wegner.

KENTUCKY

Democrat Walter (Dee) Huddleston was the easy winner in the primary election. State Senator Huddleston had 71 per cent of the vote and his nearest competitor was a distant second with only 10 per cent.

The Republican primary also had an easy winner in former Governor Louis B. Nunn. Nunn had 70 per cent and his nearest competitor, Robert E. Gable, was second with 22 per cent.

The general election race between Nunn and Huddleston is certain to be close. Both have strong organizations. Nunn is well known statewide and has the endorsement of incumbent Senator John Sherman Cooper. Huddleston is a member of the majority party (Democrats cast 65,000 more votes in the primary than did Republicans) and has the backing of party regulars and current Governor Wendle Ford.
NEW MEXICO

Former State Representative Jack Daniels won the Democratic nomination in a rather chaotic primary that included 25 candidates after a court decision eliminated filing fees. Daniels had 32 per cent of the vote and his nearest challenger, Lt. Governor Robert Mondragon, was second with 18. Daniels, a wealthy businessman and banker, spent nearly 100,000 on his primary campaign and is thought to be in good shape financially for his general election run.

Albuquerque lawyer Pete V. Domenici had little trouble defeating former Governor David F. Cargo for the Republican nomination. In a field of eight candidates the vote split was - Domenici, 65 per cent and Cargo, 20 per cent.

Daniels and Domenici are likely to run a close race in November for the seat being vacated by retiring Senator Clinton Anderson. In 1970, both ran for Governor and were defeated by Democrat Bruce King -- Daniels in the primary and Domenici in the general election.

NORTH CAROLINA

Incumbent Senator B. Everett Jordan was defeated in the Democratic run-off by Congressman Nick Galifianakis. Galifianakis improved his initial primary margin of 49 per cent of the vote to 55 per cent in the June 3rd run-off. Assuming that Galifianakis is able to mobilize the state's strong majority of Democratic voters, he should do well against the Republican nominee in November.

Conservative Raleigh broadcaster Jesse A. Helms was the clear winner in the state's May 6 Republican primary. In a field of three candidates, Helms captured 59 per cent of the vote. Party vote totals for the original primary were Democrats 762,063 and Republicans 153,505.
OKLAHOMA  Primary Date  August 22

Congressman Ed Edmondson is the leader in a multi-candidate race for the Democratic nomination. With a possibility of six serious candidates, it is probable that the race will be decided in a September run-off. Edmondson's competition will come from State Corporation Commission Chairman Charles Nesbitt, Secretary of State John Rogers, former Congressman Jed Johnson and Senate Majority leader Al Terrill. An additional candidate is the black female Mrs. Clara Looper.

A recent UPI state-wide poll in Oklahoma gave Congressman Edmondson 50 per cent of the vote. The survey also showed a significant portion of the remaining voters undecided.

The Republican candidate will be former Governor Dewy Bartlett. Bartlett, the loser in an extremely close race for Governor in the last election, is thought to have unified support from the Republican party. An oilman, he will also have a well financed effort.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The Democratic primary in South Dakota was won easily by second district Congressman James Abourezk. Abourezk will face former State Senate majority leader Robert Hirsch in the general election. Hirsch won the multi-candidate Republican primary with 27 per cent of the vote and was eventually chosen the party nominee by the State Republican Convention (due to the fact that he did not win by a majority in the primary).

Abourezk is considered a favorite for the general election. The state Democratic ticket will be aided by a strong incumbent Governor (Richard Kneip) and by a likely national ticket led by Senator George McGovern.
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Speaker Jess Unruh today (Friday) issued the following statement:

"I am disturbed by newspaper reports that I am 'bitter' towards organized labor following publication of some of my views regarding the failures of labor to succeed fully in carrying out its social programs and in motivating its membership in the past political campaign.

"Nothing that I said should be construed as inferring that I am bitter towards labor. I have made my criticisms as a friend of labor, and I have voiced them because I want labor to succeed in its announced goal, not because I want it to fail. Labor can succeed only if its friends are courageous enough to look at its procedures dispassionately and objectively.

"I will continue to support organized labor and the cause of the working man in every way I can. I am proud that not one piece of anti-labor legislation has passed the Assembly in my seven years as Speaker.

"It is unfortunate that my remarks received the undue emphasis they did in one Northern California newspaper this morning."
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INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1968 I undertook a statewide campaign in California on behalf of Democratic candidates. The outcome of the following election casts some little doubt upon the practical political value of my campaign efforts, but as an attempt to salvage something out of a sour political year, I have compiled this collection of essays.

The campaign which we planned was so tightly scheduled that I realized that it would be impossible to take time out for speech writing once it began. It was necessary, then, to get that kind of preparation out of the way in the relatively few days before the tour began. This forced me to concentrate, within a short span of time, upon what appeared to be the central campaign issues and to prepare a few key speeches. It is extracts from those speeches which make up most of this collection.

After the election, I spent a few days at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, and in this detached, academic atmosphere I attempted to assemble my thoughts on the current state and future of the Democratic Party. The result of that effort appears as the last article of the collection.

None of these pieces is intended to be definitive, nor are they presented with a view to posterity. Political issues can and do turn stale. Perhaps the real value of the collection is as a case study. It represents what one politician was thinking in campaign year 1968; what he was thinking in the twentieth year of his political career; what he was thinking at the end of what had been the most eventful year of his life.
NEW PURPOSE IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING

It should be clearer today than ever before in our history that government by an elite is unacceptable. The society in which we live today -- the so-called affluent society which so many of us anticipated eagerly through years of depression and war -- that society is in convulsion. People are angry and some are militant. They have a right to be. The voices of demagogues are heard, and more and more, they are believed. Those among us who traditionally counterbalance these sudden thrusts to the extremes -- those from whom calm and reason are expected -- those with a stake in society and, yes, a profound love of country -- those people, who have been called on so often in the past, now seem tired and discouraged.

We must live in cities that are increasingly unlivable, surrounded by urban sprawl and polluted air and water, and increasingly, there is no escape. The familiar parks and beaches are too crowded, too polluted, or just not there anymore in the era of the high-rise condominium.

In this pressure-cooker environment, a shout for "law and order" is raised, and some men question whether it is a genuine expression of concern, or a thinly veiled threat against some of our fellow citizens.

Politicians can respond intelligently to this widely felt concern. We must recognize the special law enforcement needs of the various communities that make up the modern metropolis. We must provide the law enforcement officer with all the training he can absorb, both in improved techniques and in the unique problems and needs of the community in which he serves. We must provide him with the best equipment available for the job he has to do. Perhaps most important of all, we can reward him with a salary that will give him the status in his community that his calling deserves.

Before the deteriorating quality of urban life makes us insensitive to what we are losing, let us tell those who regard clean air as a hopeless anachronism, and those who regard open space as simply a commodity, that we are not helpless in their hands, that their right to a profit is not preeminent, and that we intend to extract from them full respect for the quality of human life.

In approaching these and other contemporary problems, government need not pretend that there are simple solutions or that some obscure blue-ribbon task force will soon produce them. What is essential now is to convey an honest concern with the problems and a real determination to solve them.
That should be the purpose of a political campaign -- to show our concern, to describe the problems as best we can, perhaps to propose solutions, but most of all to listen to what the people have to say about themselves and their neighbors. Politicians can bring government back to the people. This state and nation are governable on terms of renewed communication among people, and perhaps only on these terms. Indeed, this can be the time for laying the foundation of unprecedented progress.
DISSENT, PARTICIPATION AND PATRIOTISM

This country is suffering, and we must understand the causes.

Why are the young people and the blacks so militant and angry?

Why are so many people listening to the frightening and repressive doctrines of the Max Raffertys and George Wallaces?

Why is there a bone-weariness and discouragement with our country in so many of the people who want to work for it and be proud of it?

A lot of people are asking these questions, and it's not easy to answer them if one rejects the slogans which have clouded public discussion to date. It means you have to come down off the soapbox where slogans do for answers and stand level on the pavement with everyone else. Down off the soapbox, you are brought much closer to other people, and that can be terribly uncomfortable when the television commentators and the newspapers tell you that a lot of those other people fear or hate you.

The alternative, however, is not just uncomfortable. It is terrifying. The alternative is groups of people who have stopped talking to each other and who have become entrenched behind ugly little banners that have no place in a civilized democracy. We have all seen them: "Down with the Establishment," "Ship them back to Africa," "Don't trust anyone over thirty," "Burn Baby Burn," "White makes Right."

This sort of mass non-think, so prevalent in recent times, produces devastating results. Democracy, and all chance for social progress, stops dead. There is an explanation when people who profess belief in justice try to eliminate the public leaders who have worked hardest in its cause. There is an explanation when students who owe their education to the finest public University in the world are willing to destroy it.

They have given up. Finding no elevator to Utopia, they burn the stairs. Not having gotten what they wanted by ultimatum or by fiat, they lose all heart for the long haul. Between the New Jerusalem and the fiery pit people like this see no middle ground. They are willing to burn all that we have built in hopes of a just society in the fantastic belief that a perfect society will rise from the ashes.

Why has this happened?
Perhaps the primary explanation for this desperate behavior lies within the system so many people seem to be rejecting. The system -- the establishment, if you will -- has not provided enough leadership. But even more crucial than that, it has not provided enough opportunity for enough people to have their say in the decision making.

There have always been a few nihilists whose only response to social forces is the destruction of society. Normally, these people are irrelevant. But they find followers when large numbers of people who have just grievances, and who want to work within the system, are denied proper access to the mechanisms of change.

Then the nihilists become terribly dangerous. In an age of rising awareness of what is wrong with our society we have failed to provide increasing opportunities for people to come in and help set it right.

Most of the people who demonstrate on the campuses and in the ghettos really do love this country and would be willing to work for it given the chance. Clearly, many of them sense that the leaders of the mob have no worthy goal. The problem is that we have not always given these people an alternative, or, almost as bad, we have established fearful little programs which give them only the illusion of participation.

There are exceptions. They are numerous and generous enough to convince fair-minded people that the system can be made to work. We can build on them and, in so doing, refute those whose only counsel is disruption and whose only goal is destruction.

The most conspicuous of these exceptions is Senator McCarthy's dramatic drive for the Presidency. Starting his campaign in lonely dignity in a bitter New Hampshire winter, he attracted tens of thousands of people -- mostly young -- who got out and worked. They typed precinct lists, distributed literature, went door to door and raised money. Here was no token protest or token participation. People got off their soapboxes, saw that they were needed and took the only route that ever produces solid results in a democracy.

Senator McCarthy did not win, but his candidacy did give us the realistic hope that we could end the escalation of the war in Vietnam that was taking place with such horrifying regularity. And President Lyndon Johnson withdrew as a candidate for reelection -- a state of affairs no one would have predicted the year before.
There is another example of this kind of participation much closer to home. For a number of years the California State Assembly has been hiring young staff people out of our colleges and universities. These young people work with our legislators at the undramatic process of digging up data and arranging hearings, drafting bills and answering letters.

The results? In 1968, the State Legislature passed the toughest smog laws in the nation over the active opposition of the automobile and highway lobbies. Laws were passed to enrich our ghetto schools, against the pressures of phony economizers who said these sullen, silent kids could wait. The Legislature established a revolutionary new program for providing jobs and job training overcoming the power politics of federal bureaucrats whose vested interest lay in perpetuating the old, discredited, failing programs.

These young people found their own politics of confrontation. It has nothing of the intoxication of destruction about it, but it works. It works within the system and it changes the system. This is the answer to the nihilists and anarchists. It is the answer that so many found in the candidacies of Senator McCarthy and Senator Kennedy.

Those who still insist on destruction as a necessary prelude to human progress must also ponder how far they would take us. Things can, after all, be much worse. We can reach new levels of viciousness — new forms of inhumanity — on all sides that can produce cataclysmic civil war. The Far Right and the New Left are primed for battle. The leaders of both have sold out and given up on this country. The means of total self-destruction are well within our grasp.

We must not give up hope in this system of ours. It is not easy to make it work. You fight hard. You lose many of the important battles. But you don't quit.

We need to reach out and involve all the rest of the honest, caring people who believe in this country and are willing to help us make it work better. Robert Kennedy was fond of repeating this appeal by Albert Camus:

Perhaps we cannot prevent this world from being a world in which children are tortured. But we can reduce the number of tortured children. And if you don't help, who else in the world can help us do this?
GOVERNMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION
IN TIME OF CRISIS

In the United States at this time, it may well be impossible for the public university and for government to coexist without clashing. In times of calm we may delude ourselves into thinking that these institutions have common goals.

This, however, is an age of anguish. In these times the differences between institutions are laid bare. Until we understand these differences, it is extremely doubtful that we can reconcile the conflicts between the university and government.

The origin of all great universities is in the quest for truth. From the first times that men gathered to debate ideas, they have realized the danger of that quest. Truth has as little respect for California's officials and institutions today as it did for those of Athens when Socrates questioned basic social values and was condemned to death by the city fathers for doing so.

Many people think that the issue is as clear cut now as it was then. Let us at least hope that we will be able to resolve the matter in a more amicable fashion.

Over the centuries the universities have devised countless ways to camouflage their purpose. They have had to, or they never would have flourished under monarchs, Popes, parliaments and governors.

In the first place, universities were seldom established in capitals or religious centers. In a time when transportation was slow and dangerous only the most dedicated scholar removed himself to Oxford, Cambridge, Upsala, Heidelberg or Bologna, and only the most insecure officials felt threatened by the scholarly activity going on there.

The universities did not rely simply on physical distance to blunt the threat of their inquiries. Whenever the thrust of their learning developed too bright a glint, it was hidden in a scabbard of Greek or Latin. When these devices were penetrated, scholars quickly found ways to obfuscate their native languages. (Unfortunately this has often led to the conclusion that whenever the scholar is obscure, he must be saying something.)

It may be that the tremendous use of computer jargon by contemporary social scientists exploring problems of racism, family, religion or delinquency is but the most recent development in this ancient game of peek-a-boo.
The quest for truth was difficult enough for the university in a time when it was private and when it educated only the rich. Two major recent developments have greatly expanded the role and problems of the university.

In the first place, the rapid growth of our technological society has encouraged a corresponding growth of public universities to supply skilled managers and manpower. Technological education has proven to be tremendously expensive.

Increasingly the universities have had to rely on public support. In California, for example, the bulk of the university's expenses are met from state and federal funds. This has created new, and frequently uneasy, relationships with officialdom.

The second development underscores the first. It concerns the students. An advanced technological society requires fewer hand laborers and ever more highly trained technicians. The city planners, dentists, lawyers and physicists of tomorrow are today's students. Thus the university serves as a container for ever larger numbers of the brightest young people.

An additional element concerning the students is that half of our population is now under the age of 27. We will continue to have more and more young people in universities longer and longer -- young people who are already terribly impatient with the imperfections in society and government and who have yet to begin living adult life as most of us know it.

There are millions of young men and women in this nation right now to whom the university is the principal reality. It is these students who have, in recent times, demonstrated to us -- although not always as politely as we would like -- the problems of the alignment between government and the university, and the phenomenon of youth cut off from the major business of society.

The students have sensed the ambivalence in government's relation to the university. They are aware of their limited access to the decision-making process that governs their lives. They are, predictably enough, demanding a larger voice in university decisions as well as in the affairs of the larger world.
Academic freedom has long been recognized as prerequisite to the search for truth. The concept was troublesome even when universities were private, distant, and exclusive. Now universities are supported by the public. They are often in the middle of our cities and they are attended by almost everybody's children. Today the issue of academic freedom has become explosive.

All democratic governments derive their authority from the consent of the governed. Under democratic government, each citizen surrenders some of his personal sovereignty to the goal of orderly social progress. This may not always have much to do with truth, but it is absolutely basic to domestic tranquility and to justice. Here it becomes most obvious why the university and government are clashing.

American society at the moment is breaking into opposing camps. The minority is seeking immediate redress of grievances resulting from accumulated neglect and injustice. The majority is fearful and considers the minority's demands to be excessive. Here, surely, is the central fact of our lives.

Students all over the nation have recognized America's volatile condition. Students are asking for relevance in their education. They want what's happening in the classroom to have something to do with what's happening on the streets.

They want to participate in the challenging struggles to formulate new theories and new answers to our problems. They want their university world to provide new channels of participation. They want to feel relevant and they want their education to be relevant.

The university is more than a trade school. It is the central institution in the lives of ever larger numbers of our young people. They want to use it for more than a passport to a job. They want a passageway to where the action is.

Of course, not all action is good. Some of it -- as in student riots -- is terribly destructive. What can we do to make higher education relevant and to insure that the action which results is positive and helpful?

As a first step, we must candidly recognize the separate functions of the modern university. Truth seeking, job training, and the containment of eighteen to twenty-five year olds are probably incompatible functions. We should reappraise the current university structure and find new ways to keep these functions separate. In this effort, the university will have to take the lead, and hopefully it will find a favorable response from government.
The government's primary concern with education is that it produces the trained people necessary for the day-to-day work of society. The university has achieved a high degree of relevancy in this respect. Student engineers and physicists develop the techniques they need in the laboratory. Student dentists fix teeth. Student optometrists make eyeglasses. As a result, the university does produce thousands of young men and women each year for trained positions in the labor market.

What it does not do well is to give bright energetic people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five proper avenues for participating and contributing to the process of social change. If this were done, the university would have gone a long way toward solving its other problems.

In the first place students would become an integral part of the truth-seeking process. With their creative energies thus absorbed in real and pressing problems, they would have little time and, little tolerance for the destructive and profitless confrontations we see so much of today.

Surely it is inconsistent for us to say today that student technicians can participate in real work, deal with actual people, conduct genuine projects in the fields of the physical and health sciences, and then to say to the students who are concerned primarily with our social and political institutions that their participation in anything more significant than mock political conventions, and what is generally a powerless student government, is too dangerous for society to tolerate.

We face the most pressing problems of our day in the cities. These issues combine to form a complex and disheartening web of outmoded political and economic relationships; of racial and ethnic discrimination; of bad education, housing and transportation; and of crime and pollution.

On the one hand, government is terribly concerned about these issues; on the other it is very threatened by them. It is becoming increasingly obvious that facile theories from earlier days will not provide the answers. New approaches must be found.

The information necessary to these new approaches will not develop out of classroom discussion alone, and students today know that. It will have to come from the city ghettos and streets, and young people are well equipped to go out and get it.
In this respect, government has been ahead of the universities in using the vast capacities of youth. The Peace Corps and Vista at the federal level are well known. The California State Assembly internship program and staffing concept is not so famous, but no less significant. In each case, youthful spirit and imagination have resulted in tough-minded and humanitarian action.

The temptation to reject or ignore the expressions of concern of our best young people is very strong, but to do so increases their sense of frustration and channels their energies into less and less productive efforts. We know that young people are legitimately concerned with the society. We know that they can contribute and do when given the chance. It is time we started listening to them.
THE PRIORITIES OF PUBLIC SPENDING:
WHAT DO WE REALLY WANT?

A politician who visits college campuses regularly and talks to the students used to be able to predict fairly accurately that certain issues would always be raised in a discussion of the political process. Usually, the students would be a little cynical about the lack of idealism as a factor in governmental decision making, and more than a little dubious about the motives of a practicing politician on the campus. As the discussion progressed, they would begin to ask about ways they could become involved in the system and eventually change it and make it function more in accordance with their desires.

Among students now, however, there seems to be a strong undercurrent of confusion and hopelessness. Many of them feel that the democratic process isn't working as it should today. Government is neither responsive to the people nor adapting to the fast changing needs of modern America. Young people feel less and less obligation to working within the democratic framework, and it is not just the militant demonstrators who share this feeling.

This same sense of frustration appears off the campus, too -- among retired people in Los Angeles, businessmen in Fresno, farmers in the Central Valley and industrialists in the Bay Area. The attitude is pervasive and disturbing.

We long for the days when our problems were of more manageable proportions, but the newspapers and broadcast media constantly remind us that those days are forever gone. Everyone, at times, feels overwhelmed by the complexity and variety of contemporary problems, caught up in a hurricane of events they cannot control.

This sense of helplessness is reinforced by the seemingly limitless growth of the institution which is supposed to be solving the problems -- government itself. State government has grown rapidly in the last few decades, and shows no sign of slowing down. We have come to an uneasy, grudging acceptance of this growth.

Most of us are well on the road to recovery from the blow of 1967's billion dollar tax increase. And most of us will be able, eventually, to accept the idea of a state budget which will top six billion dollars in spite of all the talk about "economy in government". The gross cost of
government -- its sheer size -- has such a hypnotic fascination that we tend to become indifferent to the way government money is spent.

Perhaps this should not be surprising. The California Budget, as a document, is a crashing bore. In its over two thousand pages lies the whole of state government tediously listed in item-by-item fashion. This is not to suggest that a thorough familiarity with each year's budget is a duty of citizenship, but perhaps more than any other government publication, the budget lays out what is and is not important to Californians.

The way in which public money is spent speaks far more eloquently than any philosophical treatise about the values we hold. Our rebellious young tell us that our values are false, and more and more, the charge is heard in other quarters. A superficial glimpse of the way we spend money would indicate that our priorities are out of whack.

Nearly $20 million is spent every year in California to support agricultural research. This, of course, is an indirect subsidy. Agriculture is the only industry that has its research paid for by state government. We can afford to spend that twenty million dollars to subsidize the growers, and perhaps we should spend it. But at the same time we are told we cannot afford the $16 million it would cost to give our old age assistance recipients the $7.50 a month cost of living increase authorized by Congress.

And we are told that we can't afford the $14 million it would cost to provide basic reading teachers in more elementary schools to combat the dropout problem early when we know that many children, especially Spanish-speaking children, begin to fall behind.

Do we really mean to say that it is more important to subsidize the largest industry in this state than it is to relieve the elderly poor from the pressure of inflation, or to meet the educational needs of our school children?

In 1968, the Governor proposed legislation which would reduce the cost of welfare at the state level by reducing or eliminating aid for about 200,000 children in California. The state would have saved $8 million by shifting the cost to local government.

But in the next fiscal year, the state will spend over $8 million to support county fairs in California so that people can go and view some well-fed prize livestock and sample homemade jam.
In fiscal 1967-68, California spent over $25 million to build a new, money-losing state fair. But at the same time, we are told that the construction of new classrooms at our University and state college campuses must be postponed.

To continue that new fair construction is going to cost us nearly $2 million more. But at the same time, we are told that we can't afford the less than $2 million it would cost to create summer jobs for kids in the ghettos and get some neighborhood improvement projects started there.

We spend over $700,000 a year to maintain a Division of Fair Employment Practices to convince ourselves that we are doing something about racism in the labor market, and as conscience money goes, that may be pretty cheap.

But we spend nearly $2.5 million a year to maintain a Division of Apprenticeship Standards which exists largely to permit Big Labor to decide whom they will let in their unions, and who will be excluded.

And we spend over $10 million a year to maintain the Department of Professional Standards so that businessmen can dictate how much of what kind of competition they will tolerate in California's "free marketplace".

We can afford an annual capital outlay of $300,000 to improve National Guard armories in California, but we are told that we cannot afford half that amount to provide training for police in the special needs and problems of our ghetto communities -- training that would provide new understanding and prevent those incidents that make calling out the National Guard the grim summertime routine in our cities.

We can afford to spend over $250,000 to promote foreign trade for California manufacturers, but we can't afford to spend a little less than that to maintain the highly successful Youth Employment Service which found jobs for 56,000 California young people in the summer of 1966 -- its last summer of operation.

We spend about $1.5 million a year to maintain a State Lands Division which can't tell us how much land the State owns or where that land is located. We even spend $200,000 a year to continue the absurdity of teaching people how to build fallout shelters in their basements while we are being told that we can't afford to spend half that amount to maintain support for the most successful Service Center for the poor in the Los Angeles area.
These examples of misplaced priorities are disturbing, to be sure, but even in dealing with those problems to which we have given proper emphasis, government often spends the people's money ineffectively.

One of our most discouraging governmental efforts is in the field of social welfare. It is discouraging to the taxpayers who support it. It is discouraging to the people it purports to help, and it even discourages the social workers who are responsible for making the whole bureaucratic nightmare function.

And the problems of dependency are not easy to solve. Both at the federal and the state level, efforts have been made to reduce costs by making it tougher for people to get on welfare or by reducing the amount of benefits. But even a cursory analysis reveals that this approach is not the real solution.

In our society, we do not allow the poor to starve or fall ill and die in the streets -- at least not as a matter of policy. Those in need of help must get it from someone. So when you hear that economy in the welfare system is going to be achieved by limiting the number of people served or by reducing the amounts of aid, remember that is not real economy; that is passing the buck. The same taxpayers will be footing the bill through one level of government or another.

There is, however, a clear opportunity for true economy in this system by reducing administrative costs. California's present welfare machinery involves sixty distinct governmental units: fifty-eight counties, one state, one federal. Each unit has its own set of regulations and restrictions.

Sixteen cents of every welfare dollar is spent on administration. It is estimated that sixty to seventy percent of a social worker's time -- and there are ten thousand of them in California -- is spent behind a desk doing paperwork.

Clearly, it is in the area of administration that real economies can be achieved, and there are many ways to do it. One proposal would be to shift administration of the program to the state thereby eliminating fifty-eight of the subunits of government now involved. It may also be possible to integrate welfare payments with the state income tax which would shift a lot of the bookkeeping responsibility from social workers to those trained for it.
Whatever specific methods are used, savings in the administration of welfare would be substantial. Every ten percent reduction in administrative costs would save California taxpayers $16.5 million a year.

When it comes to public spending, people want practicality, not passion. First must come the hard-headed decision of what is worth spending our limited resources on and what expenditures we can reasonably eliminate or defer.

Surely rebuilding a ghetto school is more important than adding another building to the state fair. Getting jobs for our young people and giving them a sense of participation in society must come before improving the yield of our dairy cattle or developing a new strain of artichoke.

And we must continually review the way in which we make the expenditures we have decided upon. Governmental bureaucracies created in other times to meet other problems are irrelevant today. Perpetuating the status quo simply because it is the status quo is too expensive even for an affluent society.

To establish the new priorities and make the administrative improvements we need require the understanding and support of the people who pay the cost of running government. Governmental machinery tends to perpetuate itself through a kind of bureaucratic inertia. It may be expensive and ineffective, but there is little or no incentive for change within the structure itself. In our system, no really important changes in government are possible without the support of a significant number of concerned, aware citizens.
THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME IN THE AGE OF TECHNOLOGY

In California last year, every major type of criminal activity increased. The California Bureau of Criminal Statistics predicts that the increase will continue. In the Bureau's words, the rise in crime has joined those other traditional certainties -- death and taxes -- in our daily lives.

In 1968, the rise of crime was described by many as the central political issue, but it is questionable whether many of the politicians who raised the issue were concerned principally about what to do to combat crime, or whether they are really more interested in exploiting the psychological mood of the country.

It is because the issue of crime has such an emotional impact that responsible public officials must be sure to make their meaning clear in discussing it. Demagoguery here can be extremely dangerous because it can lead to repression which will do nothing to curb the rise in crime and only deprive some of our fellow citizens of their rights and increase their frustrations.

We can legitimately demand freedom from violence and the threat of violence in the urban and suburban environments in which we live and work. We can demand that our families feel safe both day and night in our parks and neighborhoods. We can demand that our property and the property of others be protected. We can demand that the apprehension of criminals will be certain and that justice will be swift and fair.

And we can demand that all of this be done without infringing upon the rights of any citizen.

These are the legitimate demands we can make of law enforcement, and these are the concerns of most of our people. If fear and other emotions cloud the issues, it is because these demands have not been met to society's satisfaction. But we must continue to make the demands and explore ways in which the demands can be met.

We may have drifted away from the basic understanding of what the law is in our society. We tend to think of it as a set of inflexible rules which cannot and should not be changed -- like the Ten Commandments. Indeed, it would be logical to conclude this from some of the campaign oratory devoted to the subject. But the fact is that the law is not inflexible. It changes, and it should change.
One hundred and twenty of us in the California Legislature spend seven or eight months in Sacramento every year changing the law. We are elected to enact new laws, repeal bad laws, and in general, keep the mechanism that is the law moving forward to meet the demands of a constantly changing society.

Law serves justice, and to do so, it must change continually. Few of us would be content with the laws of fifty years ago just as we cannot predict what the law will be fifty years from now. The law is an extremely flexible framework in which the orderly conduct of society is possible. To bring that orderly society about requires a good deal more than the simple enactment of laws. The problem is one of law enforcement -- the police and the courts -- and it is here that we are falling dramatically behind.

More and more, the police and the courts cannot meet the demands we place on them. The explosive growth of this state over the last few decades is all but legendary, but we have failed to provide our law enforcement agencies with either the manpower or the tools to keep pace with this growth.

We are willing to slap a slogan on our bumpers that says, "Support Your Local Police," but usually all we mean is give your local police your moral support. This kind of bumper sticker support is clearly not enough. We must be ready to offer substantial practical support as well.

The same persons who call the loudest for police support are often the first to oppose the level of financial aid that is necessary for the police to update their operations. From a technical point of view, the operations of our police departments have advanced little since the 1940's. The technology exists but has not been used because we have been reluctant to spend the money.

California will soon have the nation's most modern telecommunications system for use by all local law enforcement agencies, and we should be proud of that. At the same time, however, look what we are passing up. The communications tools exist that could insure that the exact location of a patrol car could be pinpointed at any moment and more rapidly dispatched to the scene of a crime. Yet this tool has not been made available to local law enforcement.
The technology exists that would enable the police to be constantly aware of the geographically shifting patterns of criminal activity in our cities, but the technology goes unused.

Even the technology that is available is often hampered by bureaucratic constraints. The Federal Communication Commission decides that the police in a particular city can have only a few radio channels. The police have no recourse, so they must continue to rely on the already overloaded channels they do have. Clearly, some of these administrative decisions as to what constitutes the public interest could stand some hard, public re-examination.

The same sort of lack of a sense of priorities also prevents planning sensibly the use of the men and the tools we do have.

The ability of the police to respond quickly and effectively to criminal activity depends not only on the number of policemen that are available, but also on the kinds of jobs they have to perform. We usually think of the policeman as being constantly involved in preventing crime or apprehending criminals. This is far from the case. At present, the field officers -- the patrolmen in the cars -- spend only about ten to fifteen percent of their time responding to criminal activity. The remainder is spent on administrative detail, court appearances, patching up domestic squabbles, and directing traffic.

The same kind of inefficiency slows down and obstructs our judicial processes. Our courts are seriously disabled by obsolete procedures and administrative restraints. Trials are unnecessarily expensive, time-consuming, and sometimes simply unjust. Our courts are also cluttered up with traffic violators and drunks and others that few of us would think of as criminals.

In spite of these pressures on the courts, conviction rates have gone up. The penalties which the courts have applied to offenders, contrary to much political oratory, have become more severe, not more lenient.

It is fair to say that our law enforcement agencies have responded extremely well to our demands within the limits imposed by our lack of practical support for their efforts. It is past time to remove these limits. Government, especially at the state and federal level, can well increase support for these agencies. Indeed, such an increase in support is a wise investment. A decrease in crime can be counted as a dollars-and-cents savings to citizens.
By and large, any such increase in state and federal support should have no strings attached. Minimum standards can be set, and we have already done this in California. Once those standards are met, local agencies should be allowed to act independently. Crime is a peculiarly local problem and the strategies to combat it should be developed at the local level, but some specific suggestions can be made which would not infringe on this local autonomy.

The profession of the law enforcement officer should be upgraded. Presently, there are few incentives that can be offered that will recruit young men into the police force. The starting pay of the field officers is often quite fair, but the upward limit is low and very quickly reached. Because of the administrative structures in many of our police departments plus the time demands on the field officer, there is little advancement within the department.

We have reached the point where we take for granted a huge variety of state and federal educational programs. In fact, government at these levels may have had more successful experience in providing education opportunities for various groups of people than in doing anything else in recent years. Clearly, the average police officer is going to need extra help if he is going to improve his education, and we can easily expand our education programs to include him.

Nowhere is there a more pressing need for technical knowledge coupled with wisdom than at the level of the policeman who must deal daily with a wide variety of people. There is a growing wall of misunderstanding between the police and our minority communities. This requires additional understanding.

The police must understand the neighborhoods they patrol. They must understand their characteristics and values. They must learn to work with the leaders in those neighborhoods and establish cooperation and mutual trust between law enforcement and the citizens they are charged with protecting. In 1968, legislation which would have established a pilot program of this sort to explore the possibilities of an educational approach to improved law enforcement in minority communities was vetoed by Governor Reagan, but clearly this is the direction we must take.

What is most essential now is that we open up the discussion of this volatile issue -- that we see the problem as it really exists and talk about specific effective programs to increase the capacity of law enforcement and reduce crime.
The criminal believes he has good reasons for what he does, but he is out of communication with the rest of society. No one tells him that his reasoning is invalid. He is not talking or listening anymore. He has dropped out of society.

If we feel that we must resort to slogans and emotionalism to combat crime -- if we abandon calm reasoned examination of this very complex problem and insist on simple repressive answers -- then we are dropouts too.

There is a great deal of concern in this country about the problem of crime. It would be a tragic waste if that concern were channeled down the rathole of senseless panic. The duty of leadership now is to formulate effective solutions through the give and take of the democratic process and motivate the people to support programs that will work with something more than bumper sticker slogans.
THE QUALITY OF URBAN LIFE

Most Californians live in the city. We have little choice, because that is where our jobs are. The cities we live in are nothing like we knew as young people. A city used to be a core of civic office buildings, hotels, shops and theaters surrounded by quiet streets of homes and bordered by the country.

This was the Los Angeles where Harold Lloyd performed his antics, the Fresno where William Saroyan delivered telegrams, the Salinas and Monterey where John Steinbeck's people worked and played, and the San Francisco Dashiell Hammett haunted. These cities had a sense of place and purpose, and the people in them had a sense of community.

In these cities the citizens met, discussed and resolved their common problems. They were problems of a size a man could understand and grapple with.

The cities we live in now are a blur of tracts and shopping centers glimpsed from an eight lane freeway or a jet, and receding limitlessly into a whiskey brown haze. There are hardly any people visible -- except downtown -- and millions of cars everywhere. The country is when the tracts and shopping centers finally stop, and each year there is less of it.

Our city problems now overlap whole counties or valleys: smog and congestion, polluted beaches and crowded parks, uncontrolled fringe development and freeways which divide our neighborhoods. Who can solve these problems? Where can the citizen go to make his voice heard? What can he do?

The experts tell us that there will be "urban corridors" from Santa Rosa to the Mexican border and from Redding to Bakersfield within the lifetime of most of us, and that most of us will live in them.

From the window of a commuter jet between Sacramento and Los Angeles, the land looks clean and open and full of promise. It is only when the airplane lands that the order and clarity viewed from five miles up begin to melt away. Why? What has happened?
Until quite recently California, as perhaps no place else in the world, provided its citizens with a rich sense of human scale and proportion. In this setting of fertile valleys and mountains, the oil wells and factories, the railways and power lines all fit in. If they left scum in the water or hid in a shabby part of town, no one seemed to notice much.

One did not have to be a poet to be stirred by the sweep of the Golden Gate Bridge. One did not have to be an engineer to appreciate the design and convenience of the first new freeways built after World War II. And the travelers over the bridge and on the freeways were confident of our ability to direct to the future benefit of California the abundance of the technology which made such projects possible.

Now, only two decades later, we sense the technology directing us. We feel powerless and disorganized before the assaults of technology even while we hear that the disciplined special interests who represent it are planning further assaults.

In Sacramento one can view the paradox daily. Concerned and dedicated legislators trying to channel technology to the best interests of all the people are denounced as impractical men by the very special interests which profit from chaos. Most of our legislators support the ancient and truly conservative values of space, purity of air and water, human dignity and human choice; whereas the fast buck boys -- the prophets of concrete -- are generally arguing for policies and prejudices that date back no more than fifty years and which inevitably result in overcrowding, in misuse of people and resources, and in pollution.

In California we have the finest highway system in the world. It is a tribute to the foresight of planners and legislators thirty years ago that we were able to build this toll free system in relatively smooth conjunction with the growth of our population. In the process, however, disturbing side effects have developed. In recent years those side effects have become pronounced and people are asking more thoughtful questions about the freeway program.

Why do freeways inevitably create urban sprawl along their flanks which disrupts and dominates all other efforts to encourage orderly development?

Why do we put over a billion dollars of public money yearly into freeways while other transit modes, which seem to offer promise, cannot be adequately financed?
What are the real costs of our reliance on highways when we take into account the individual expenses of car ownership, the increasing pollution and congestion, the millions of acres which are paved off the tax rolls forever, and the destruction of existing urban neighborhoods?

These questions have not been answered candidly. There is, in fact, a major effort by the special auto and highway interests to ignore them. These are the same people who kill all legislative efforts for rapid transit financing while buying special advertisements in newspapers throughout the state to promote a threefold expansion of existing freeways. These are the same people who killed a bill for coordinated transportation planning because, as they said, it was unnecessary. These are the same people who tried to kill the smog control bill we passed in 1968. A discussion of that bill is pertinent because it shows what can be done when citizens care enough to organize and fight for their environment.

When the Assembly Transportation Committee began its study of the smog problem a year ago, it quickly found that seventy percent of the smog that blights our state comes from automobile exhaust; that existing control measures had limited value; that smog was getting worse -- not better; that the technology to do something about it did exist; and that the primary obstacle to solving the problem was the powerful automobile lobby supported by other special interest groups.

Knowing the fate of previous legislative efforts in this area our Assembly committee went to the public and to the press with the information. We personally contacted every concerned group in the state and asked them for their help. We told them all that their active support was going to be necessary at every step.

A leading radio station offered free time so that the committee leaders could explain the legislation to the public at each new stage of development. An airline donated space to fly concerned citizens to committee hearings. Groups of every kind sent representatives to a public forum to tell us what needed to be done. Close to half a million citizens took time to write letters to their representatives endorsing strong legislation. Nine of California's top scientists, engineers, and air pollution experts donated scores of hours of their valuable time to review every technical provision in the bill.
The realists said no, it couldn't happen, no one beats the auto lobby when the chips are down.

The people said yes, and the people won. They won because they cared. California now has the strictest air pollution law in the world.

Where do we go from here? Will the same spirit rise to protect our diminishing parks and beaches and to plan cleaner, more convenient travel?

One can sense a new spirit in this state as he travels and speaks and listens. There is a growing unwillingness of Californians to let the worth of their lives be measured solely in units of material possession. More and more people ask what good is a rising standard of living if the quality of life keeps ebbing? Of what value are private belongings if their accumulation destroys the air, the land, the water, and the time to enjoy them?

A balance can be struck between technology and our environment, but it will not be easy. To do so requires wise and informed government, and that kind of government depends finally upon concerned citizens willing to participate in its decisions.

This is far more difficult today than it was when people met in the city hall to settle their problems. In those days, you could move to a new valley if the old one was crowded or smoky. You could fish or swim in another stream if the old one got polluted. But those days are past. A new valley and another stream are just not there anymore.

The forces that would perpetuate the myth that our resources are unlimited and that we can continue their spoliation as we have been are powerful. It will require our best efforts to change the dangerous course on which we are embarked, and there will be no reward but the gratitude of generations of Californians yet unborn.
AS DEMOCRATS APPROACH THE SEVENTIES

The Democratic Party is never so good as when it's broke, when respectable people speak of it in whispers, and when it has no leaders and only one principle -- to go in and take it away from the other fellows...

-- Finley Peter Dunne
("Mr. Dooley")

Once again, the sagacious Chicago saloonkeeper comes to the aid of the party with a concise description of the state into which it has fallen, indeed into which it has fallen frequently since his time. It would be hard to improve today upon the statement of purpose Mr. Dooley framed for his Democratic Party. The difference now is that the old way of going in and taking it away from the other fellows just may not work anymore.

The old dependable power blocs are deteriorating, and they are not being replaced. Organized labor is becoming increasingly politically and socially irrelevant. Farmers are solidly entrenched in the middle class or better, and their needs are expressed in arcane economic formulae understood only by federal bureaucrats. The Solid South finally found out what the Democratic Party meant by racial equality and has left it in a huff.

This process of deterioration has been going on for many years now and has been ignored by Democrats. But we have reached the point where Richard Daley cannot deliver Illinois, and where Texas is the only southern state to vote Democratic. Presumably, Democrats are now sufficiently shocked to look for the reasons why.

It is not so much that the New Deal coalition has left the Democratic Party as that the goals of the Democratic Party have changed in response, if in sluggish response, to the changing needs of society, and the blocs in the old coalition do not share these new goals. Clearly the South resents federally imposed integration. Farmers do not share the new, overriding concern with the cities. But most disturbing of all is the failure of organized labor to rally enthusiastically behind all of our social programs.
The failure may really be that of the liberal politicians who idealized the working man throughout this century into some kind of noble savage who would push the Democratic Party into whatever progressive direction it ought to go at any given time. It turns out that working people share most of the weaknesses of the rest of mankind, and the surprise at discovering this fact still has not worn off for many political leaders.

The United Auto Workers have made a significant effort in the ghettos, but they are clearly an exception. Minority unemployment is almost universally recognized as the principal canker in our central cities. The labor movement could be expected to be in the forefront in attacking this problem, but it is not. There is not even any very effective self-policing of discrimination in most labor unions. Racism in the building trades unions is a national scandal.

In California, the Division of Apprenticeship Standards reported in 1964 that 2.4 percent of apprentices were black. After four years of concentration upon minority employment, the Division reported this year that only 2 percent of apprentices were black. Clearly that was not progress, but legislation designed to correct this situation was vigorously opposed by organized labor in California. It can be most convincingly argued that the policies of the National Association of Manufacturers regarding minority employment are often more progressive than those of the AFL-CIO.

With regard to foreign policy, we witnessed a most interesting reversal of roles this year. The AFL-CIO went on record in full support of the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam, while the stock market responded extremely favorably to rumors of peace. The villains and heroes are not so easy for old-fashioned liberals to identify anymore.

Along with this decline of liberalism in organized labor, there is a parallel decline in its political influence. In the course of the state legislative campaigns of 1968, we polled many districts on the question, "Do you believe labor unions generally endorse the best candidate?" Republicans, not surprisingly, responded negatively three-to-one. But in none of the districts polled did a majority of Democrats respond affirmatively, and in only one district did a plurality of Democrats feel that a labor endorsement signified political worth. This trend may be accelerated in California with its highly mobile population, but it is increasingly evident nationally.
It is significant, too, that labor brought about the defeat of some of the Democratic U. S. Senatorial candidates who were for peace in Vietnam, not by withholding an endorsement, but by withdrawing campaign funds. The illiberalism of old guard labor leaders will not have its effect so much in a change of the policies of the Democratic Party as in making it tougher for many Democratic candidates to get elected.

If the New Deal coalition is no longer committed to the Democratic Party, it must also be admitted that the leaders of the Democratic Party have done little to bring those blocs or any other segments of the society back into the fold. Our long incumbencies in many statehouses and in Washington, and the complacency produced by the doubtlessly erroneous belief that certain large groups of citizens will always support Democrats no matter what, have led to a breakdown of communication with the voters.

Of course it remains true that lingering loyalties among many individuals who comprised the old blocs that were deliverable to Democratic candidates still account for many votes. But it is neither likely nor desirable that they determine the central thrust of the party. As a practical matter, it is probably not necessary to cater to them. Most of them will continue to vote Democratic for a few more years despite their disagreements with the new direction the party must take. In any case this is of short-term value. American voters have demonstrated an increasing ability to split their tickets with great sophistication, especially when the offices to be voted have high visibility. Party loyalty cannot sustain us over the long haul. We are going to have to start explaining what we advocate and why.

"Big Government" really is as large and complex as the new American nihilists of the left and right say it is. Modern government demands all the time and sophisticated effort that officeholders can devote to it leaving little time for the informational function. As the need for communication between government and the citizenry increases, the ability to communicate decreases. This, however, can be done by political parties. Indeed, the informational function may become the most important use of the party apparatus.

The day of the precinct worker going door-to-door with a bag of groceries or a bucket of coal is well gone. We may be reaching the point where the precinct worker going door-to-door prodding people to the polling place is equally anachronistic. A political party does not derive much long-range benefit from people who do not want to vote in the first
place and do not know what they are voting on once they are in the booth. It is better by far to produce some kind of self-motivation. The excitement of the Robert Kennedy candidacy turned out many more votes than the job offers and other blandishments of a Richard Daley.

A severe inflation has hit the entire political money market. Campaign funds just don't buy what they used to. It is becoming less and less likely that an election can be bought unless the campaign is fronted by an attractive, articulate candidate. But money does continue to exert too much influence in politics. In lower level races where candidate visibility is normally limited, it can be decisive.

In California, over the last few years, Republicans have been picking up Assembly seats by concentrating a great deal of money on a relatively few, marginal districts. This technique has produced their 1969 legislative majority.

There is nothing particularly wrong with this approach to political victory if the voters have a pretty good idea that it is going on. Generally speaking, however, they do not. Simply moving to a system of more detailed public disclosure of campaign finances is not enough. We need a great deal more openness about political money, and here the Democratic Party should take the lead.

The Presidential campaigns would seem to be the best place to start. We should admit at the outset that the political process is expensive, and indicate, at least roughly, just how expensive it is. This would set the stage for the, perhaps, drastic but attractive idea of total public financing of Presidential campaigns accompanied by an absolute ban on private contributions and a limit on campaign length.

Faulty as it was, Russell Long's ill-fated public campaign finance proposal was at least better than what we have now. Had it been in effect in 1968, Hubert Humphrey might well have been our new President.

A move toward honesty about campaign finance may not be nearly as traumatic as developing an honestly critical attitude about the policies of Democratic Administrations. Democratic candidates at all levels today have a special handicap resulting from our party's dominance at the federal level for so many years. We must begin to understand that it is not disloyal to admit the mistakes of other Democrats. In fact, the party fundamentalists who insist on candidate conformity in support of programs which have clearly not lived up to expectations are guilty of the great political sin of impracticality. The U. S. Senate and the Democratic Party are clearly better off for candidates
like McGovern, Ribicoff, Bayh, Church, and Cranston who consistently differed with Johnson Administration policies throughout their campaigns.

The War on Poverty has not been a smashing success. We should be learning from its failures and telling the people what we are learning. This, of course, is also what we should have done much earlier with respect to the Vietnam War.

Viewed from the state level, the great failing of the Johnson Administration is its approach to the solution of social problems. The Administration has continued to insist upon the central government's superior ability to formulate and administer programs apparently in some sort of continuing fascination with the New Deal. The fact is that there is a growing disenchantment with the programs and those who control them, and the beneficiaries of this disenchantment are the political conservatives.

If this trend was recognized by the Administration at all, the response was far from adequate. We were offered a slogan, "Creative Federalism," but when Democratic officeholders like Robert Kennedy and Edmund Muskie tried to give the slogan meaning, they got little sympathy from the Administration. The President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, originally a very promising organization designed to formulate policy in this area, has fallen under the lackluster, foot-dragging dominance of former Southern Governors.

This failure will loom large in the next few years. The Johnson Administration was far better suited to involve other levels of government and private business in social programs than the next Administration will be. If Richard Nixon embarks upon a program of incentives and awards to business and calls for local control and home rule, he cannot avoid the suspicion that he is rewarding those who have long supported the Republican Party. A Democratic Administration would not have been similarly accused.

Beyond the criticism of existing programs lies the necessity for proposing new ones. Here Democrats must understand that the proposed programs themselves are instruments of communication. The tendency to concentrate upon the very pressing problems of our minorities can lead to greater alienation of the majority. Each new program has the inherent danger of producing a new reason for resentment.

For example, to provide summer job opportunities for black youngsters in the ghettos at the expense of summer job programs for white kids in the suburbs may eventually produce a much more volatile situation than the summertime idleness of young black people produces. Democrats must take a disproportionate share of the blame for sponsoring such socially alienating if well intended programs.
Government's principal task remains that of dealing with the problems that affect the majority. The emphasis upon minority problems should ideally be made by other institutions in the society. The political task is to encourage the other institutions to devote their energies to problems of minorities. If businessmen can be convinced that there is a profit in meeting ghetto needs, there is no doubt that they will do so, and they will be able to act without fear of majority opinion.

If Democrats are going to participate in this transfer of function, a lot of them will have to understand the important thing is not who is making a profit or how much it is, but what is being accomplished. The residents of the ghetto do not share these prejudices about the profit motive, and they certainly will not forgive us if that is our excuse for denying them hope.

We can free ourselves of those old prejudices and free the electorate of prejudices about us if we can develop a more open political approach. The Democratic Party must commit itself to complete honesty both in the formulation and execution of policy and in the day-to-day functioning as a political apparatus. (Emphasis of this point is not intended to impute greater honesty to any other political party either living or dead.)

We must start by telling the truth during election periods. If people do not believe us then, we can hardly expect their confidence later.

Campaigns waged in terms of personal invective, outright mis-representation and contrived distortion may produce victories, but they make the task of governing all but impossible for the winners. An opponent who has been maligned and mistreated during a campaign can hardly be expected to cooperate with the victor who has used such tactics, and the supporters of the losing candidate can be expected to be even more resentful.

A more visible and potent Fair Campaign Practices Committee would be helpful in identifying those candidates whose concern for the truth has been suspended for the campaign duration, but the best answer is self-restraint. To the discredit of our party the outstanding example of such restraint under pressure is that of Senator Barry Goldwater during the 1964 Presidential campaign.

As far as intraparty policy is concerned, there must be a great reduction in the messianic insistence on party solidarity. The kind of obvious insincerity this involves is destructive of the image of politicians and underestimates the intelligence of the voters. Not every Democratic candidate is endowed with superior virtue, and the electorate knows we
don't really believe anything of the kind. Blind insistence upon this ritual makes politics in general about as credible as a television wrestling match.

The press is probably at least as culpable here as most politicians. The violation of the immutable principle Party Unity offers an extremely simple way to explain election results. No one questions an editorial attack on the hapless politician who fails to endorse one or another local candidate of his party.

All of this leads, of course, to greater honesty in the conduct of government itself. It would seem that the only really responsible recourse, in this period of grave doubt, is to open up the processes of politics and government to the people who are affected by them. In the area of domestic policy, this might mean a step as simple as a commitment to the full disclosure of all reports of Presidential Advisory Commissions.

It is obviously in the area of foreign policy that this need is critical. If we really mean, "No more Vietnams," our action must be drastic. We should make public some kind of catalogue of our degree of commitment throughout the world. We should state what we are spending, where, through what groups and for what purposes. We should be told which governments are now controlled by ours and to what degree.

It is likely that Americans would rebel at many aspects of our foreign policy if it were revealed to them in such open fashion, but as we have seen, a little voter rebellion over such issues is a healthy thing. It leads to a more successful foreign policy.

There is often no reason for clandestine political activities other than habit or tradition. No legitimate political activities are damaged by opening them up to the people. The California Delegation to the Democratic National Convention in 1968 never held a closed caucus. No one has criticized that delegation for making its decisions in public nor has anyone suggested that the delegation was less effective because of its openness.

A political party, however, is not necessarily effective simply because it is open and honest. It must be an apparatus with a direction. If we can abandon the debilitating commitment to the past that has brought us to defeat, the Democratic Party can become the most effective majority-forming mechanism in the history of democracy.
Some of the elements of a new majority are already apparent. They include the poor, the black, and the young. To these may be added those from the upper economic levels who are secure enough not to feel threatened by the demands of those at the lower end of the spectrum, and those so recently up from poverty as not to feel estranged from their former milieu. Finally, there are the idealists and intellectuals who see in the activist groups the motive force for bringing about the changes they advocate.

As things now stand, two or more of these blocs ally themselves occasionally in pursuit of some common goal. The alliances are usually temporary and fragile which leads to the conclusion that no really permanent coalition can be put together with these blocs. If, however, the Democratic Party can command their trust, it will become the accepted political mechanism of this emerging majority.

And the Democratic Party can merit the trust of these people. Again, the lesson of the Chicago convention this year was widely misread. The fact that the old pols ran the convention with such an iron hand was not nearly as important as the revolt of such large numbers of delegates. Forty percent of the delegates opposed the party leadership and the incumbent Administration, and this is an extremely high percentage when one considers the methods of delegate selection. These were conscience votes cast by grassroots party leaders and workers, and they have changed the character of the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party in California may be somewhat ahead of the parties in the other states in forming the new majority. This probably results from the fact that California made its sharp turn to the political right a couple of years before the rest of the nation. But the phoenix has yet to take wing in our state, and no one can confidently predict that it will.

To be specific, California Democrats, with a registration advantage of four-to-three over Republicans, were only able to get forty-five percent of the vote for our Presidential, congressional and state legislative candidates. The senatorial contest in California this year was an anomaly, although one should probably not quibble with a victory. Clearly, if there is a new grouping of people around the Democratic Party in our state, it is not yet a majority.

But whether or not any such new majority emerges, it should be clear that we cannot return to the politics of consensus. First of all, the isolated nature of life in our affluent society is not likely to change soon.
We will continue to live among our peers, work with them and educate our children with theirs. The problems of other groups will be perceived dimly if at all. Secondly, the problems with which we must deal today arise so suddenly and with such impact that it is downright dangerous to spend precious time in developing a consensus of support for a course of action.

What is needed is political leadership that is inspirational as well as intelligent and concerned as well as competent. It is necessary for the effective governance of this nation that our leaders have the sustained confidence of enough people to permit them to act free of the fear of a political collapse if they are wrong. It was the ability to inspire such confidence that permitted John Kennedy to survive the Bay of Pigs. It was the lack of it that made it impossible for Lyndon Johnson to survive the Tet Offensive.

This ability to inspire confidence, and to justify that confidence by dealing openly and honestly, free of commitments and traditional doctrine, is at the heart of that amorphous body of theory which has come to be called the New Politics. The New Politics is still too much of an abstraction to yield to a thorough discussion here, but it seems clear that none of the Presidential candidates this year could be described as a "New Politician".

George Wallace was no more than a hyper-demagogic Senator Bilbo. The New Nixon was more mature and relaxed, but not really all that new. Vice President Humphrey's image remained dimmed by the shadow of Lyndon Johnson. Robert Kennedy would most certainly have won this election had he lived to become the nominee, and Senator McCarthy would probably also have won.

The narrowness of the Nixon victory is likely to keep him shackled to the policies of the past, but the pressure for change is urgent. Richard Nixon's Presidency will be the last in the New Deal tradition. Some kind of change, for good or ill, will characterize the Administration which follows the next one.

It has been cynically observed that this election really didn't prove anything except that Hubert Humphrey is a better loser than Richard Nixon, but perhaps there is more to it. When one considers the manifest disorganization of the Humphrey campaign, the delay in starting, and the lateness of the campaign contributions, it is astonishing that he received virtually the same vote of confidence as did the victor. Hopefully, what this proves is that the Democratic Party, even in its current disarray, is a sound political instrument that is still highly regarded by the people.

##########
## I. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

### A. Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of State Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>35,531</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>18,325</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre</td>
<td>10,387</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>8,806</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpelier</td>
<td>8,782</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johnsbury</td>
<td>6,809</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Middlebury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>3,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>State Ranking (Among 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Square miles</td>
<td>9,609</td>
<td>2,615,123</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. People per square mile (1968)</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Land owned by federal government (1968)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Race and Nativity

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. White</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Negro</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Spanish surname</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Puerto Rican</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Foreign stock groups</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups over 5% of CD population: Canadian</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Negro % of largest cities</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Income, poverty, welfare (1968)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Effective buying income per household</td>
<td>$ 9,048</td>
<td>$ 9,592</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cash income per household below $5,000</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cash income per household above $5,000</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Public assistance recipients (old-age assistance &amp; AFDC 5/69)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>8,108,000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Average monthly AFDC payment (per family May, 1969)</td>
<td>$ 180</td>
<td>$ 168</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Medical</td>
<td>Physicians per 100,000 population</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Education</td>
<td>Median years completed (1960)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public school expenditures per pupil (1968)</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Crime</td>
<td>Total offenses per 100,000 population</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murders per 100,000 population</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglaries, breaking/entering, per 100,000 population</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggravated assaults per 100,000 population</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Government</td>
<td>State-local taxes per person (1967)</td>
<td>$321</td>
<td>$308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Taxes</td>
<td>Total state-local expenditures per person (1967)</td>
<td>$566</td>
<td>$472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public welfare</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and hospitals</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. State-local expenditures per person (1967)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public welfare</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and hospitals</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Federal Grants</td>
<td>Total grants to state and local governments (1967)</td>
<td>$53,000,000</td>
<td>$14,493,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of state and local revenues</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal grants per person</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. The Economy

40. Vermont is well-known for its stonework and forest industries, ranking second in asbestos production, fourth in talc and high in marble, limestone and granite. Agriculturally, Vermont is first in maple syrup production. Milk and butter are also important. Skiing has accounted for the rapid increase in the recreation-tourist business.

A. Employment distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Total civilian labor</td>
<td>180,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Civilian unemployment</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. White collar (1960)</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Blue collar (including agriculture, 1960)</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Non-agricultural employment (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>136,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and public utilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance and real estate</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Average weekly earnings of manufacturing production workers (1968)

|                                      | $108          |

B. Federal impact (1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$105,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense contract awards</td>
<td>$41,241,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Direct defense generated employment

|                                      | 3,900         |
|% of total civilian labor force       | 2.2%          |
|                                      | 2,932,700     |
50. Federal civilian employment 4,000 2,809,000 50

% of civilian labor force 3.2% 3.4%

C. Labor organizations

51. Union membership 22,000 18,325,000 45

52. % of nonagricultural employment 17.1% 28.8% 43

D. Products (1967)

53. Manufacturing: value added (in millions) $486 $259,301 41

54. Mineral production (in millions) $ 27 $ 23,736 44

Principal minerals—
stone, asbestos, sand and gravel, talc

Agriculture

55. Total farm marketings (in millions) $140 $ 42,471 42

Principal commodities:
dairy products, cattle,
eggs, apples, maple syrup

56. Government farm payments (in millions) $1.7 $3,070.9 42

IV. Politics

A. Elected official

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seat up for</th>
<th>Last elected</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Losing candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>election</td>
<td>elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Gov. Deane C. Davis (R) 1970 1968 17,731 (R) 55.5% John J. Daley (D)

58. Sen. George D. Aiken (R) 1974 1968 -- 100.0% Unopposed

59. Sen. Winston L. Prouty (R) 1964 1970 11,422 (R) 53.5% Frederick J. Fayette (D)

60. U.S. House: 1 seat, 1 Republican

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
<th>%total votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Robert T. Strafford</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. State Legislature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. B. Presidential Vote History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Vote</th>
<th>Democratic Vote</th>
<th>Republican Vote</th>
<th>Other Vote</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>123,382</td>
<td>45,557</td>
<td>75,926</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>30,369 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>153,557</td>
<td>43,355</td>
<td>109,717</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>66,362 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>152,978</td>
<td>42,549</td>
<td>110,390</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67,841 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>167,324</td>
<td>69,186</td>
<td>98,131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28,945 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>163,089</td>
<td>108,127</td>
<td>54,942</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53,185 (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>161,375</td>
<td>70,255</td>
<td>85,142</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>14,887 (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. C. Presidential vote by state and principal population centers

69. Not applicable

70. Not applicable

65. D. Party officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Committeeman</td>
<td>Daniel J. O'Brien</td>
<td>Edward G. Janeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committeewoman</td>
<td>Margaret Hartigan</td>
<td>Consuelo Northrup Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Chairman</td>
<td>Francis Esposito</td>
<td>Russell F. Merriman*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Merriman is also a National Committeeman.

66. E. Governorship

74. Deane Chandler Davis (R) of Montpelier, Vermont

75. Born: Nov. 7, 1900, in East Barre, Vermont

76. Schools: Names not reported.

77. Colleges: Boston Univ., 1922, LL.B; Univ. of Vermont, 1957, LL.D, Middlebury College, 1964
78. Race: White

79. Profession: Attorney; Director, National Life Insurance Co.

80. Securities owned: None reported.

Military Service

81. Branch, rank, years of service: None reported.

82. Major assignments: N.A.

83. Major decorations: N.A.

84. Reserve duty: N.A.

85. Veterans organization memberships: N.A.

Family Status

86. Married twice

87. Wife's name and year married: Corinne Eastman, 1924 (dec., 1951); Marjorie Smith Conzelman, 1952

88. Children: Deane (dec.), Marian, Thomas C.

Memberships

89. Civic and social: Trustee, Vermont College; incorporator, New England Deaconness Hosp.; director, Life Insurance Medical Research Fund, 1955-57; Delta Theta Phi; Mason

90. Professional: American, Vermont Bar Associations; Life Insurance Association of America; Institute of Life Insurance.

91. Religious affiliation: None stated.

Public Service

92. Years of gubernatorial service: 1969 to date

93. Office up for election in 1970

94. Previous elective office held: Barre, Vt., city council, 1923-24


96. Political party positions held or campaigns managed: Delegate to Republican National Convention, 1948

97. Previous unsuccessful campaigns for elective office: None.
F. Biography of Senior U.S. Senator

98. George D. Aiken (R) of Putney, Vt.


100. Schools: Brattleboro, Vt., high school, 1909

101. College: None

102. Race: White

103. Profession: Farmer, nurseryman

104. Honoraria reported, 1968: None

Military Service

105. Branch, rank, years of service: None reported.

106. Major assignments: N.A.

107. Major decorations: N.A.

108. Reserve duty: N.A.

109. Veterans organizations membership: N.A.

Family

110. Married twice

111. Wife's name and year married: Beatrice Howard (dec.); Lola Pierotti, 1967

112. Children: (by 1st wife), Dorothy, Marjorie, Howard (dec.), Barbara

Memberships

113. Civic and social: Odd Fellow

114. Professional: Putney Grange

115. Religion: Protestant

116. Years of Senate service: 1941 to date

117. Seat up for election in 1974

118. Previous elective offices: Vermont House of Representatives, 1931-35; Lt. Gov. of Vermont, 1935-37; Gov. of Vermont, 1937-41; Moderator, town of Putney, 1940-44

119. Appointive offices held: First Hoover Commission; U.S. Representative to the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly; President's Commission on Status of Women, 1962; National Forest Preservation Commission, 1963
120. Committee and subcommittee assignments: Agriculture and Forestry (Ranking Republican): Subcommittees on: Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification; Soil Conservation and Forestry. Foreign Relations (Ranking Republican): Subcommittees on Far Eastern Affairs; Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs; U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad; Western Hemisphere Affairs. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittees on Communications; Legislation; and Research, Development and Radiation.

121. Previous major committee assignments: Senate Committee on Civil Service, 1941-47; Senate Committee on Pensions, 1941-47; Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 1941-49 (Chairman 1948-49); Education and Labor, 1941-54.

122. Political party positions held or campaigns managed: Senate Republican Campaign Committee, 1963-64.

123. Previous unsuccessful campaigns for elective office: None

Legislative Profile

124. Areas of principal legislative interest: Aiken's chief concerns have been those matters coming before his agriculture and foreign relations committees. He was an early critic of the Johnson Administration Vietnam policies, an early proponent of federal action to rid the nation of hunger, and a strong supporter of a Congressional code of ethics.

125. Voting Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloture</td>
<td>1/16/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Treaty</td>
<td>3/13/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commitments</td>
<td>6/25/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharge</td>
<td>7/31/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>8/6/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Contracts</td>
<td>8/7/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8/12/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>9/24/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-poverty</td>
<td>10/14/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynsworth</td>
<td>11/21/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See appendix for vote description.

126. Special interest group ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA:</td>
<td>(1968) 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA:</td>
<td>(1968) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPE:</td>
<td>(1967-68) 87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Biography of Junior U.S. Senator

127. Winston Lewis Prouty (R) of Newport, Vermont

128. Born, September 1, 1906, Newport, Vermont

129. Attended schools in Newport, Vermont, and Bordentown Military Institute in New Jersey


131. Race: White

132. Profession: Businessman; (Prouty and Miller Lumber Company)

133. Honoraria reported (1968): Associated General Contractors of America, speech, $350; United Business School Association, speech, $500.

Military Service

134. Branch, rank, years of service: None reported.

135. Major assignments: N.A.

136. Major decorations: N.A.

137. Reserve duty: N.A.

138. Veterans organization memberships: N.A.

Family

139. Status: Married (twice)

140. Wife's maiden name and year married: Frances C. Hearle (dec.); Jeanette Herbert Hall, 1962

141. Children: Currie, Elizabeth, Ann

Memberships

142. Civic and social: None stated.

143. Professional: None stated.

144. Religious Affiliation: Congregationalist

Public Service

145. Years of Senate service: 1959 to date

146. Seat up for election in 1970.

147. Previous elective offices held: U.S. House of Representatives, 1951-59; Vermont House of Representatives, 1941, 45, 47 sessions, (Speaker, 1947); Mayor of Newport, Vermont, 1938-41.


150. Previous major committee assignments: House Committee on Foreign Affairs; House Committee on Veteran Affairs; Senate Select Committee on Small Business; Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems.

151. Political party positions held or campaigns managed: None stated.

152. Previous unsuccessful campaigns for elective office: Lt. Governor of Vermont, 1948 (lost in primary)

Legislative Profile

153. Areas of principal legislative interest: Prouty has been most active in areas dealing with education and labor, including manpower training programs, poverty programs, tax credits for education expenses and increased social security benefits.

154. Voting Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloture</td>
<td>1/16/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Treaty</td>
<td>3/13/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commitments</td>
<td>6/25/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharge Extension</td>
<td>7/31/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM</td>
<td>8/6/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Contracts</td>
<td>8/7/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8/12/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>9/24/69</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-poverty</td>
<td>10/14/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynsworth</td>
<td>11/21/69</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See appendix for vote description.
155. Special interest group ratings:

ACA: (1968) 63%
ADA: (1968) 43%
COPE: (1967-68) 78%

156. 1970 race for Governor: Davis, a conservative elected in 1968 on promise to "clean up the fiscal mess" is not expected to have any major primary opposition. Davis inherited a deficit of $5-7 million and asked and received, from legislature, a three per cent sales tax, a 15 per cent surtax to state income tax and increased splinter taxes. These new taxes, however, are expected to produce a surplus of $8-12 million and Democrats already have attacked him for "overtaxing Vermonters." But Davis has spent record amounts for education and welfare and plans to spend even more next year and also has increased spending for other state programs. Most mentioned as Democratic candidates include former Lt. Gov. John J. Daley of Rutland, defeated by Davis in 1968; State Sen. Leo W. O'Brien, Jr. of South Burlington; State Rep. Thomas Salmon of Rockingham and State Sen. Robert Boardman of Burlington. None considered top drawer candidate and Davis is favored.

157. 1970 race for Senator: Prouty, little known to Vermonters, is expected to face former Gov. Philip H. Hoff, D (1963-69) in biggest political battle in Vermont in decades. Prouty, though colorless, has reputation of hard worker and loyal Republican and will receive massive aide from Nixon Administration for his key support on such issues as Haynsworth and ABM. Alerted to challenge, Prouty has stepped up efforts to gain wider voter recognition. Hoff can expect large amounts of money from liberals opposed to Vietnam war who see good opportunity to pick up a Senate seat in a small, less costly, state. Hoff was first Democratic Governor since birth of GOP, skilled campaigner and makes a good impression. Hoff may face nuisance primary opponent in State Sen. Fiore Bove of Burlington.
MEMORANDUM TO: Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman

FROM: Nordy Hoffmann

SUBJECT: COPE Leadership Conference - San Francisco
        June 27-28, 1969

HAWAII - Attending were Francis Kennedy, AFL-CIO President, Fumi Inge, President of the Women's Auxiliary, Walter Gray and Margaret Thornburg, AFL-CIO.

It appears that Gill is going to oppose Burns in the Primary. Kennedy does not feel that Fong can be defeated.

The Republican and Democratic coalition in Honolulu has been broken up. One of the major issues which has arisen evolves around the economy of tourism. It is felt that some controls must be put on tourism, and further industry must be brought into the Islands. There are special shipping problems involved and conservation problems. This is all part of the power struggle.

Burns is aligned with the developers and Magic Island. The Mayor has taken a strong stand on Conservation.

No one has been able to determine where Patsy Mink stands in the whole operation, but if Fong is to be defeated, the Democrats must now start to cut him up. No one in Congress, as of now, is really hitting at Fong. There will be some ILA support for him and some from the Federal employees. Both House seats are now safe but if either Patsy or Sparky run, it could create a problem.

Labor is going to attempt to organize the groups in the outer Islands which are now being developed. The IBEW supplied a full time person during the 1968 campaign and some of the local Unions also supplied a full time person. The biggest problem confronting Labor in the Islands is the political minds of their own people, and the only person who can bring any unity toward the unseating of Fong is Senator Inouye.
ALASKA - Attending were Dwayne Carlson and Henry Hedberg, AFL-CIO.

Alaska Democrats have to reconstruct their Party. It appears that Bill Egan will run for Governor. Napolitan is now taking a poll which should be completed in August.

Miller, Brad Phillips and Pollack will be the candidates on the Republican ticket. There is a strong possibility that Stevens will be the Republican opposition in the Primary. Wendell Kay will not file against Governor Egan. Stevens has a good Labor record and will have Labor support.

Gravel has not shown the leadership that was expected, and Goffstein is the backbone of the Party. Gravel has not done much, as yet, to help rebuild the Party.

It is too early to tell for 1969. They expect to have great registration in the Winter months. The native minorities have a problem and there must be a reworking of the program. This includes individual operations for the Indian, Eskimos and the Negro groups.

UTAH - Attending were Everett Burger, President, AFL-CIO; Betty Beck, WAD Director; Lamar Gulbranson, COPE Pacific Coast Director; John Klass and Mike Dirksen, State Democratic Committee.

It is thought that there will be trouble in Utah to re-elect Senator Moss. There is a tremendous amount of money to be spent to defeat him.

The State Democratic Party is the strongest it has ever been; however, there is a conflict between the County Party in Salt Lake and the State Party. This breach is being worked on now and it is hoped that it will be successfully healed.

The legislative posture has improved in Utah and Governor Cal Rampton is very strong. It is assumed that Congressman Burton will run against Moss. In 1964, Moss and Rampton carried Utah - they ran 20,000 votes ahead of LBJ.

Labor must get its own House in order which they are in the process of doing at the present time, but Senator Moss must schedule more time with the Labor movement in Utah than he is presently doing. Unquestionably, Burton is the strongest candidate against Moss. An early registration is paramount in 1969.
The Democrats in Weaver County (Ogden) have arranged a Fund-Raising check off from Democrats from $1-$10 per month. This is a new innovation in fund-raising and it bears watching for success or failure. They are endeavoring to find a new, strong face from Ogden to run for Burton's House seat. It is assumed that Dan Berman will run against Congressman Lloyd.

Labor must take a positive position firmly behind Ted Moss. His voting record is beyond question. However, all parties agree that there must be some changes in the administration of his office in Salt Lake. It is estimated that approximately 80% of the Labor membership in Salt Lake are now registered. This is conceded by Labor and the Democratic Party to be a fair figure.

WASHINGTON - Attending were Joe Davis, State President AFL-CIO; Mark Williams, Sec.-Treas. AFL-CIO; Jim Bender, King County President, AFL-CIO.

The political situation looks fairly good. Senator Jackson now recognizes the problem which will face him with the new politics group, in his Primary, because of his military stand. It is assumed that his opposition in the Democratic Primary will spend somewhere between $250-500,000 against him. One of the problems which is contributing to Jackson's dilemma is Congressman Brock Adams' attitude, and that of his Administrative Assistant Seidwell, who has been so strong in his opposition to Jackson that the Machinists (Boeing) are not going to support Brock Adams for re-election, and are hoping to field a strong moderate Democrat to run against Adams. Jackson will have a strong Republican candidate against him in State's Attorney Gordon. Jackson has much work to do in the field and has not made the rounds with the Labor people. It is felt that he is "Boeing's Senator".

For the rest of the Congressional Delegation, Meads, Hicks and Foley are in good shape. Representative Pelley could be a marginal race, however the Maritime unions will probably support him. Julia Butler Hansen is a safe situation, as is Katherine May.

The problem basically is registration and King County (Seattle) has an archaic system. It is almost a preventative registration.

NEVADA - Attending were Al Bramlett and Lou Paley, along with Dorothy Jackson.

Paley feels Laxalt will run against Cannon and will be a tough opponent. If not, it will probably be Raggio. The most paramount program is immediate registration.

Ralph Lecon, who has been with the Machinists, is retiring and it is hoped that he will head up the COPE operation in Nevada.
Money will be available from National COPE to help with the overall program. It is of great necessity to set up a full time operation with the Negro minorities on the West side of Las Vegas through Earl Davis of COPE.

It is hoped that on July 17th, a meeting can be held with Al Bramlett, Lou Paley, Al Barkan, Senator Cannon and, if possible, Senator Inouye, to discuss the Nevada situation. There is approximately 60% of the Labor force in Las Vegas registered and it is aimed to bring this as close to 100% as possible. In 1964, when Senator Cannon won by a few votes, those votes came from the minorities on the West side of Vegas. It is, therefore, imperative that some full time work be put in this direction.
May 13, 1969

Dear Friend:

Our Sixth Annual Democratic Congressional Dinner will be held on Thursday, June 26, 1969, at the Washington Hilton Hotel and we cordially invite you to participate.

The dinner is being held to raise funds for the Campaigns of Democratic Senators and Representatives up for election next year.

As you know, Democrats now control both houses of the Congress and manage the flow of legislation through Congressional Committees to final voting action. Our objective is to not only retain the present majority but increase it!

I am enclosing a reservation card for your personal use and do hope we will see you at the dinner. However, if June 26th conflicts with your usually busy schedule, a contribution in lieu of your presence will be gratefully appreciated. We need your help in this very important drive!

Your assistance will be immediately called to the attention of the House and Senate Leadership, as well as Chairman of the Congressional Committees.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel K. Inouye

Michael J. Kirwan

P.S. In the event you wish to credit your contribution to a particular Senator or Representative, space is provided on the reservation card.

Dinner, Thursday, June 26, 1969 - - - - Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.
YOUR SUPPORT

HELPED CHANGE NATIONAL DIRECTIONS LAST YEAR

But the danger is not over. President Eisenhower "told it like it is" when he spoke of the danger of the military-industrial complex. It is with us now, devouring our resources - and destroying our sons.

More than $80 billion a year goes to support a war no one wants, and for future wars too horrible to contemplate. Instead of redirecting some of this vast treasure to solve pressing human problems - in our cities, in education, in fighting pollution - the administration moves to spend more billions for an ABM system. It asks for civilian budget cuts of as much as 10%, but for little more than 1% reduction in the military money grab.

Will you join with us in telling the Administration, the military, and war industry that the headlong rush to destruction must be stopped? You can do it by attending the -

NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION DINNER

May 24 - Sheraton Park Hotel - Washington, D.C.

Speakers: Senators

GEORGE McGOVERN - TED KENNEDY - HAROLD HUGHES

Hundreds of liberals whose support last year was so important will be there. Can we count on you to be there? Dinner tickets are $100 each. $1,000 reserves a table for 10 and your name will appear as a Sponsor. If you cannot attend your contribution will be most welcome. Funds will be used to provide the national coordination so necessary for the fight.

Talking about the insanity of senseless wars, about the bankruptcy of the present leadership, about the misdirected application of our talents and treasures is no good. We must do something about it.

Can we count on your help? Send your check today and let the amount be a measure of your determination to call a halt - while there is still time.

...speaking for the NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION

Ted Sorensen  Blair Clark  Cesar Chavez  Hon. Richard Gordon Hatcher
STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION

Co-Chairmen: MR. DON PETERSON, Wisconsin
MR. PAUL SCHRADE, California

MRS. BELLA ABZUG
New York

MR. HERMAN BADILLO
New York

MR. JULIAN BOND
Georgia

MR. DAVE BORDEN
New York

MR. THOMAS BRADLEY
California

MR. SAM BROWN, JR.
Massachusetts

DR. JOHN CASHIN
Alabama

MR. WM. CLARK
Illinois

MR. BERT CORONA
California

MR. JOHN CONYERS
District of Columbia

MR. RONNIE DUGGER
Texas

MR. HARVEY FURGATCH
California

MR. CURTIS GANS
New York

MR. JACK GORE
Colorado

MR. SANFORD GOTTLIEB
District of Columbia

HON. CURTIS GRAVES
Texas

MR. PAT GREEN
Nebraska

MR. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
New York

MR. GERALD HILL
California

MR. DAVID HOEH
New Hampshire

MR. PHILIP H. HOFF
Vermont

MR. JOSEPH L. HUERTA
Arizona

MR. ARNOLD KAUFMAN
Michigan

MR. ALLARD LOWENSTEIN
District of Columbia

MR. PATRICK LUCEY
Wisconsin

MRS. MIDGE MILLER
Wisconsin

MR. RUDY A. ORTIZ
New Mexico

MR. ALBERT PENA
Texas

REV. CHANNING E. PHILLIPS
District of Columbia

MR. A. A. RAYNER
Illinois

MR. DON ROTHENBERG
California

MR. ABE TAPIA
California

MR. ADAM WALINSKY
Virginia

Executive Director: EARL D. CRAIG, JR., Minnesota
MEMORANDUM

Senator:

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL DINNER
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

$266,095.00 Contribution
57,500.00 Pledges

Withdrawals to date:

House $55,000
Senate 45,000

Balance: $166,095.00 plus pledges

Amount available in Senate account for distr. $50,293.45

Administrative cost approx. $2,000 balance.
### Democratic Congressional Dinner Ticket Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAAS</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Byrd, Va.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Byrd, W. Va.</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cranston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dodd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Eagleton</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fulbright</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/0</td>
<td>Inouye</td>
<td>$20,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jordan, N.C.</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Magnuson</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/4</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>$625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McClellan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGee</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntyre</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondale</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoya</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastore</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxmire</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribicoff</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkman</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spong</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stennis</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symington</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmadge</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydings</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, N.J.</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Ohio</td>
<td>$7,312.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHARLES GUGGENHEIM: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Charles Guggenheim, a Washington, D. C. based film maker, has achieved an international reputation in the area of social, political and historical documentary films. Described by film critic Hollis Alpert as "the most accomplished maker of documentary films in the country," Guggenheim has won top awards in every major international film competition. His receipt of the Venice Film Festival's XI Gold Mercury Award earlier this year for "Monument to the Dream" marked the first time in the Festival's long history the award has gone to an American producer.

Guggenheim, who has received four Academy Award nominations, won the 1965 Oscar for his "Nine from Little Rock" which portrayed the Arkansas school integration crisis and the changes wrought in subsequent years.

One of his recent motion pictures, the Robert Kennedy memorial film shown at the Democratic National Convention and on network television has become a part of political as well as film history. Described by the Chicago Sun Times as the convention's "first genuine touch of class, of honest emotion, of sure dignity," the tremendous response to the motion picture led the Minneapolis
Tribune to declare that "Robert F. Kennedy captured the Democratic Party in death Thursday night as he had never quite been able to win it in life. The party's national convention...came to a complete standstill for more than twenty minutes last night when spectators and delegates stood to applaud a film memorializing the dead New York senator."

Norman Mailer wrote, "Even dead, and on film, he was better and more moving than anything which had happened in their convention, and people were crying. An ovation began. Delegates came to their feet and applauded an empty screen."

The Guggenheim philosophy of film making was recently summarized by drama critic Richard Coe in the Los Angeles Times in terms of "keeping the operation small enough for each creation to have a hand made rather than a machine look", adding the "Guggenheim's strong sense of social obligation limits him to projects in which he believes."

Guggenheim's feelings about the problem of disadvantaged children in the urban schools led to "Children Without", commissioned by the National Education Association. The company's involvement with its original home town of St.
Louis developed into some early films on urban problems. One of these, "The Big Issue," not only helped win a victory for the cause of civic reform, but also won Guggenheim top honors at the Edinburgh Film Festival, with the Saturday Review acclaiming it "the first honest American documentary to be shown in Europe in twenty years."

It also marked the beginning of a new era in the use of television for political persuasion. As a recent article in the Wall Street Journal described, Guggenheim became "a pioneer in the art form" of the political documentary. Guggenheim's involvement in national election campaigns dates back to 1956 when he served as television adviser to Adlai Stevenson. Since that time he has produced television films for more than twenty campaigns including Robert Kennedy's New York senate race and this year's presidential primary campaigns.
Guggenheim has produced films for two American Presidents: President Johnson and the land of his birth is depicted in "A President's Country", and President John F. Kennedy and his efforts on behalf of the Alliance of Progress are portrayed in "United for Progress," both done for overseas distribution by the United States Information Agency.

Two current projects Guggenheim has underway are designed to become long-run exhibits in Washington, D. C.. A "sound and light" production evoking the Civil War and the events leading up to the assassination of President Lincoln will be presented on a permanent basis at Ford's Theatre. A second "landmark" will be a motion picture dramatizing the men and events that shaped the nation's capital. Filmed for multi-screen projection, it will be featured in the new National Visitor's Center scheduled to open in 1970.

Although Guggenheim's documentary films have varied greatly as to subject matter and scope, they are most often described in terms of their common denominators: a consistent point of view, a fundamental concern with the great issues confronting Americans as individuals and as a people, and a commitment to excellence. This quality was singled out and expressed in the Venice festival jury's citation of
"Monument to the Dream" for "high ethical purport and the meanings of purity and strength which ruled in its conception."

Guggenheim has also produced two feature length motion pictures. "The Great St. Louis Bank Robbery" which was sold to United Artists in 1958, gave actor Steve McQueen his first starring role. A more recent film is "The Fisherman and His Soul," based on an Oscar Wilde fable and filmed in Brazil. The recipient of top awards at the Beirut and Edinburgh festivals, it has not yet been released in the United States.

Charles Guggenheim entered motion pictures in 1951 producing films for NBC, and a children's series for ABC which brought him the Peabody Award. After accepting an appointment for a year as chief producer for the Ford Foundation's experimental adult education television project, he headed up a community operated educational television station in St. Louis before establishing his own film company.