

The original documents are located in Box C43, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 6/25/1976” of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Dick Cheney

very interesting.

Volume V, Number 20
June 25, 1976

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN....

The American Political Report

Kevin Phillips, Editor-Publisher

Published by the American Political Research Corporation
4720 Montgomery Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Telephone (301) 654-4990

THE FORD ADMINISTRATION

Thanks to a few late-week breaks, Gerald Ford remains the favorite for nomination in Kansas City. Every news media count seems to be different, with estimates ranging from clear Ford edges (Newsweek) to August pre-convention stand-offs. But behind the jumbled numbers, there is general agreement that the ultimate result will pivot on a) the small group of uncommitted delegates and b) Fordist ability to repel planned Reagan wooing of nominal Ford delegates in N.Y., Pa., N.J., and Dixie. If Ford doesn't take a hard line, using poll data to paint Reagan as a fatal drag on Northeastern Republican candidates -- and so far he hasn't (see p.2) -- he could be in trouble.

Watch N.Y. GOP Chairman Richard Rosenbaum, who has a pivotal job trying to hold N.Y., N.J. and Delaware in line. Brooklyn (N.Y.) GOP Chairman George Clark says 40 New York delegates are privately for Reagan, including 7 uncommitted in Suffolk County. But Rosenbaum says it's just a "question of timing" for Ford in Suffolk. In Delaware, the Wilmington News (6/17) reports "evidence of cracks" in Ford support. The Trenton Times (6/20) reports the pro-Ford New Jersey delegation avoided a delegate poll, waiting until late July to determine Ford support. Michigan Senator Robert Griffin told the Detroit Free Press (6/13) that Ford has to worry about losing committed delegates in the South.

For all these reasons, it's clear that Ford forces are stacking the GOP convention, and planning -- if necessary -- to challenge Reagan delegates. Virginia and a number of other states would be involved. Reaganites are openly worried that Fordist control of the GOP National Committee can be used to keep challenged Reagan delegates from being seated. Fordists, meanwhile, know they must win on the first ballot (as one Ford strategist told the Chicago Daily News) or "lose at least 55 delegates eager to defect to Reagan" in 9 border and western states. "If only a handful of our committed delegates pass on the roll call, we're dead," the Ford source said. "Indiana is the only place we can look for second ballot gains."

Given Ford's delegate leads and seemingly hardening tactics, we continue to see him as about a 2:1 favorite to get the nomination. But that nomination may be almost worthless. The Republican Party is coming apart. . .state party fratricide is growing, factions are trying to scuttle other factions' congressional candidates, rightists are dead set on using third-party efforts to beat Ford in November, polls suggest that either GOP nominee faces fatal defections to Carter, and the GOP is on the verge of reaching critical non-mass (see pp. 2-3). At the moment, Carter looks like a November landslide victor.

If the GOP does come apart after this election, it could have an unexpected impact on a Carter Administration. With old party lines crumbling, Carter would be much freer to pitch over the head of Congress to a center and right-of-center constituency not all that different from Richard Nixon's. Traditional conservatives may not like Carter, but we think liberals may also find him a great disappointment (see pp. 4-6).

FORD OR REAGAN: THE ELECTORAL LOGIC

Ford's weak tactics and seeming inability to play political hardball against the Reagan challenge is providing a substantial offset to national polls that show Ford stronger against Carter than RR. By refusing to label Reagan a sure loser, Ford is a) failing to take advantage of poll data; b) showing softness and a non-jugular instinct, reinforcing arguments that he may indeed be a poor November candidate; and c) allowing RR to play up the unlikely theme that RR's autumn campaigning ability could indeed turn the tide. In the meantime, here is our analysis of comparative Ford and Reagan strength.

1. The Polls: New Gallup and NBC News data put Ford in a much better position than Reagan.

	Gallup (June)		NBC (June)		Gallup (June)		NBC (June)		
	Carter	Ford	Carter	Ford	Carter	Reagan	Carter	Reagan	
North	50%	41%	49%	39%	North	56%	36%	53%	33%
South	61	32	60	30	South	61	30	65	30
Nation	53	39	52	37	Nation	58	35	55	32

The upshot of these is simple. Neither Republican is within hailing distance in the South, and only Ford is within range in the North. If Carter runs into personal trouble, and if Eugene McCarthy catches on at all, Ford has an outside shot at Northern-based victory. Reagan's victory prospects are almost negligible. He has no opportunity in the South beyond (maybe) Texas, Louisiana, Florida and Virginia. The probability that he can win 4-6 of the 8 Rocky Mountain states is relative electoral vote chickenfeed. Right now, polls suggest that RR would be hard-pressed to carry a single Midwestern state. Only in the Plains states could RR hope to win (although Topeka Capital-Journal polls show him trailing Carter in Kansas by 44-40%).

2. The Northern GOP Infrastructure: With his relapse into unity and "no grudge" themes, Ford has so far sacrificed a critical argument. . .the devastating effect a Reagan candidacy would have on the shaky Republican party infrastructure in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and New York. Here's the point: Northern GOP strength in legislatures, courthouses and Congressional seats has been whipsawed by two elections in the last 12 years -- 1964 and 1974. From New England to the Upper Midwest, another devastating election could complete the collapse. Twelve years ago, Republicans controlled the bulk of the state legislatures, most non-big city county governments, and three-quarters of the non-big city Northern Congressional seats. Now that power is crumbling. We don't have the space to detail the numbers, but consider the once-lopsidedly Republican House delegations from Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan. Rural and small-city districts elected a phalanx of Republicans, and these delegations were the bulwark of pro-business strength in the House. New England Republicanism is already virtually collapsed, and a Reagan candidacy would extend the process to Pennsylvania (where the GOP could lose 5 House seats), Ohio (a possible loss of 4) and Michigan (a possible loss of 3). That would tip the Ohio delegation to the Democrats, and make the Pennsylvania and Michigan delegations 3:1 Democratic. Nor is the Reagan impact confined to the Industrial North. . .recent local newspaper articles report Democrats thinking that a Carter-Reagan campaign could give them a chance at beating GOP Senator Bill Brock (Tennessee), Rep. Gene Snyder (Kentucky) and even Gov. Kit Bond (Missouri). Even in the places where Reagan would run stronger than Ford -- the Deep South, Texas, Oklahoma, the Southwest -- he would a) probably win only in the Southwest and b) pro-

vide little boost to local candidates. But Sun Belt Reaganites don't have much of a local legislator-county official infrastructure to worry about.

3. The Third-Party Threat: None of the above should be taken as an argument that Ford is strong in the Northern states. . .he isn't, and he, too, could be a drag on local candidates (but less than Reagan). Meanwhile, though, Reaganites do have a good argument to offset Ford's greater Northern strength (and possible help from Eugene McCarthy). According to ex-Nixon aide Pat Buchanan, whose brother is Reagan's campaign treasurer, "If Mr. Ford is nominated, plans are already being laid to mount a serious third-party effort in the fall, supported by ex-Wallaceites and Republican conservatives, a primary purpose of which would be to siphon off enough votes to guarantee Republican Party defeat." APR believes that is true. . .also bear in mind that ballot positions in key states -- California, Michigan, Pennsylvania -- are already secured, while others (in New York, New Jersey, Indiana and the Upper Midwest) can be. Moreover, this plan extends to lower offices. Richard Viguerie's "Right Report" newsletter has just announced rightwing plans to run independent conservative candidates to try to beat moderate GOP Reps. Pritchard (Washington), Jeffords (Vermont) and Sarasin (Connecticut). Other rightwing organization reports have previously discussed growing independent efforts to deny re-election to liberal GOP Rep. Whalen (Ohio) and moderate Rep. Johnson (Colorado). There is also a growing likelihood that Hank Grover, barely defeated 1972 Texas GOP gubernatorial candidate, will run as an independent conservative in Texas in hope of either winning a three-way race or defeating the moderate Republican Senate nominee, Rep. Alan Steelman. If the havoc Reagan would bring in the North is an argument for Ford being a better candidate, this third-party potential is an argument for Reagan. (APR will carry a full minor-party update in the next issue. . .the rightwing and McCarthy efforts make these details important).

4. Republican Disintegration: Back in 1974-75, APR began reporting that intra-party GOP divisions were probably fatal, once Watergate had robbed the party of any New Majority cohesion and potential, and that the 1976 candidate would probably be able to count on the support of only 70-80% of GOP voters (see APR Nov. 14, 1975). This has come to pass. New poll data is extremely revealing. June Harris polls show that about 30% of Republican voters will pick Carter over Reagan, while one-quarter of the GOP will pick Carter over Ford. Fresh Gallup data (June 11-14) has 28% of the Republicans voting for Carter against Reagan and 25% choosing Carter over Ford. Focusing on Reagan and Ford primary supporters, CBS-New York Times polling (in California and Ohio) found that 35% of each group would vote for Carter if their man wasn't the nominee. Nearly simultaneous (June 10-11) polling by NBC News found even more emphatic division. . .45% of the Fordists would go for Carter rather than Reagan, and 45% of the Reaganites would pick Carter over Ford! At the moment, Gallup finds only 66% of Republicans saying they'll support Reagan and only 69% saying they'll vote for Ford. By November, we think that figure would rise to 70-80% in both cases. But -- and this is critical -- 70-80% party support for a GOP presidential candidate is disastrous. Here's the Gallup record: in 1952, only 9% of GOP voters bolted; in 1956, 4%; in 1960, 6%; in 1968, just 9% went Democratic; in 1972, only a handful. The principal exception is 1964, when 20% of GOP voters picked LBJ rather than Goldwater. As of now, the 1976 percentage should be higher. Moreover, bear in mind that the 1964 20% bolt came when 24-28% of the electorate still called themselves Republicans. A 20-30% bolt from a 1976 party commanding only 18-21% of the electorate could well be fatal. To repeat a phrase we used before, the Republican Party is verging on critical non-mass. It is so weak -- and looks to have so little claim on the future -- that party loyalty is dissolving on left and right alike.

JIMMY CARTER: A STRONG ANTI-BUSINESS PRESIDENCY?

There's a lot of concern in business circles that Jimmy Carter's clear inclination towards a strong, activist presidency -- coupled with alleged "populist" concern for the poor -- will draw him towards an anti-business stance. This is possible, because Carter pollster Pat Caddell's surveys (see below) show that Americans are hostile to Big Business, with only 28% supporting the "present economic system." But our research suggests that Carter's strong presidency -- like his primary campaign -- would focus more on moral, bureaucratic and Washington institutional upheaval than on anti-business efforts. Carter was simply not much interested in economic programs during the early (and psychologically revealing) part of his campaign. Although business may be on the receiving end of some heavy-handed White House power, and the economy may move in a corporate state direction, dominating anti-business themes are unlikely.

1. Carter and a Strong or Authoritarian Presidency: Several weeks ago, we raised the analogy between recent U.S. circumstances -- defeat in war, inflationary destabilization of the middle class, political alienation, loss of faith in leaders, hostility towards the cultural elite -- and the kindred circumstances in Weimar Germany that helped turn that country towards authoritarian leadership in the 1930s. Several other historical analogies (as well as March, 1976 Gallup polling) also support the probable receptiveness of Americans for a stronger chief executive. First, the king-legislature-strongman pattern: most major European countries have experienced one critical overthrow or execution of a ruler which has disrupted the monarchy, briefly given power to an incompetent legislature, and then seen real power flow to an emergent strongman. Charles I led to Cromwell, Louis XVI to Napoleon, while the overthrow of dynasties in Germany, Russia and Spain led within a few years to Hitler, Lenin and Franco. Using that parallel in the United States, Nixon's resignation constituted the overthrow of the "imperial presidency," the 1974-76 period unraveled pretenses of "Congressional government" (by Democratic Rep. John Brademas and others), and the 1976 election -- with Congress now discredited -- may see the emergence of the strongman. Second, British historian J.H. Plumb has discussed in great detail how the inflationary "Price Revolution" in late 16th and early 17th Century Europe stimulated a) the erosion of legislative power, and b) an increasing concentration of executive power, plus attempts to curb inflation through state economic controls and regulation. Plumb sees continued inflation doing the same thing in the 20th Century. Even without Carter's own very blunt statements that "the President is the only one who can lead," circumstances favor the emergence of strong executive leadership.

2. The American Mood Toward Business: Will a power-seeking Carter use business as his public whipping boy? He certainly knows the chance is there. . . First-quarter 1976 surveys by Carter's own pollster, Pat Caddell, show that a) only 28% of Americans support the present U.S. economic system; b) improving 1976 economic conditions and consumer confidence have not improved hostile public attitudes towards business; and c) strong support exists among Americans for strong government restrictions in such industries as petroleum and food (47% of those polled, for example, favor oil company divestiture). Other pollsters have come up with similar data. . . Peter Hart (who polled for Mo Udall) has found deep hostility towards big business and deep doubt about the present U.S. economic system. And Philadelphia pollster Albert Sindlinger, who is close to the John Connally/Corporate State line of thinking, is also privately very blunt in his analysis of public anger and doubt regarding our economic system. Even George Gallup (July, 1975) noted that "Big business currently rates lower with the public than all other institutions comprising what is frequently termed the U.S. power structure."

3. Carter's Personal Attitudes Towards Business: We can't buy the "populist" theory advanced in The New Republic and elsewhere. . .the idea that Carter, with his concern for the poor and the blacks, may be another Georgia populist like Tom Watson. That's nonsense. Unlike Watson's, Carter's national political career was launched under the auspices of one of the biggest companies in Georgia -- Coca-Cola (Neal Pearce, in his book, The Deep South States, describes the Coca-Cola Corporation as a longtime "money tree for many Atlantans"). It is difficult to pin down Coca-Cola's early financial support of Carter's presidential campaign, but a March 2, 1975 Des Moines Register article (written after Carter had just spoken to their editors) said: "Carter was asked to whom he was beholden (in Georgia). . .Had he been pushed, he would have answered Coca-Cola, whose Atlanta-based officers have figured heavily in raising his \$60,000 budget last year and are counted on heavily for half of the \$600,000 he needs this year. Coca-Cola -- he never says Coke -- has a worldwide operation, and every place Carter has gone, he has counted on that firm rather than the U.S. State Department. 'I've not done much more than make a courtesy call on the Ambassador,' he said. 'Coca-Cola has helped me with the important things -- like arranging a meeting with the top man in economics.' " Lockheed is the other major national corporation in Georgia, and according to The Village Voice (April 5, 1976), Carter press secretary Jody Powell admitted that a 1972 Carter visit to Brazil was partly intended to sell Lockheed C-130 aircraft. Said Powell: "Lockheed paid for a portion of it. I don't know exactly what portion of it. I am sure the major portion of it. And the state paid for a portion of it. One of the major reasons we were down there was to sell Lockheed airplanes." Also, when Carter reorganized Georgia state government, about half of the 100 reorganization whiz kids used were lent by businesses (Coca-Cola, Sears, Delta Airlines, etc.) that continued to pay their salaries.

Far from being a Watson-type populist, Carter has been close to big business. His personal background also ought to be reassuring. . .agribusinessman, military officer and technocrat (nuclear physicist and management/systems expert). Note that this is simply not the background from which an economic populist springs. In New Times (June 11, 1976), Robert Shrum, the well-known Democratic speech writer who left the Carter campaign, says the candidate wouldn't take a strong stand on mine health and safety legislation because he was close to a mine-owner in Virginia, and Shrum describes Carter this way: "public compassion, private callousness; public indignation over tax loopholes, private sympathy for the military-industrial complex. . ." This is probably an exaggeration, but Carter's concern for the poor seems paternalist/managerial rather than populist. Also bear in mind that a populist would want to raise liberal economic issues from the very start of his campaign, and Carter did not. Mostly he tried to avoid economic issues, to the point where Birch Bayh and Mo Udall started saying that he sounded like a Republican. For all these reasons, we don't see Carter's programmatic activism developing a real anti-business thrust.

4. Managerial Populism: In several recent issues, we have quoted polls to show how public fear of government has displaced previous public fear of business and labor. That seems to be the underlying premise of Carter's politics. Instead of economic populism aimed at business, his is managerial populism aimed at existing government. Carter's whole background -- a fetish for organization and punctuality, immersion in the politics of management and bureaucratic reorganization, technocrat-military training -- suggests that his focus will be on bureaucracy, inter-governmental relations and Executive-legislative relations. If anything, Carter's focus on first overhauling and reorganizing government rather than indulging anti-business populism may be reinforced

by Caddell polls showing public opposition to too much government involvement in the economy. Although 1st quarter 1976 Caddell polls found 42% support for a major restructuring of the economy to decrease concentrated corporate power, 47% support for oil divestiture, and major hostility to food companies, Americans were also found leery of too much government power and intervention replacing corporate power. In a specific situation, Caddell finds fear of government intervention and politicization of energy policy after oil divestiture to be the single concern causing most public reluctance over divestiture. Back in October, Caddell characterized his poll results this way: "While the public supports short-term changes in the government's role in the economy, we find that the public resists government management or any move that violates basic values they hold about the economy." On government management of the economy, Caddell found "mixed opinions". . . "A majority of Americans, 58%, favored a government planning council that would set generalized goals for the economy and 24% opposed. An equally large majority opposed a government management council that would take active roles in the management of firms. And -- as a side issue -- a majority of Americans worried that the planning council might turn into the management council if it was ever established." In Caddell's March 1976 economic polling, only 35% of Americans said they favor federal regulation of industry while 39% opposed regulations and 27% were undecided. All of this reflects current suspicion of government partly cancelling out hostilities to big business. A trusted government would have a lot more scope, though.

5. A Corporate State: If in the short term, Carter would be likely to target big government for overhaul rather than big business, his obvious fascination with management and strong leadership suggests that increasing federal control over business decisions would not be too far behind. A management-oriented technocrat, backed by Democratic party pressure for Humphrey-Hawkins central planning, a Consumer Protection Agency and stepped-up OSHA authority (and Carter has already moved further toward these party positions), would be likely to move in the direction of a "corporate state" rather than "populism." This has been the pattern of other messianic, efficiency-oriented national leaders whose principal issues were non-economic in derivation, and who generally maintained private enterprise but looked for power and leverage over it. Independent presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy has already linked reorganization and efficiency fetishism to the mentality of Mussolini and Hitler (interview with McCarthy, "Washington Watch," May 14, 1976).

6. Corporate Support of Carter: Through late Spring, Jimmy Carter had not received help from business-related national political action committees. In May, Carter's campaign received \$36,000 in special interest money, most of it from labor unions, textile interests and dairy groups (milk money accounted for 23% of the \$58,000 total special interest money sent to Carter this year -- \$13,000 from Associated Milk Producers, Dairymen, Inc., and Mid-American Dairymen, Inc.). Through May, all the major oil, defense, insurance, banking, medical, lumber and other business-oriented political organizations put their money on Ford (whose 1976 special interest receipts came to \$90,000). Of course, many corporate owners and executives have made private contributions to Carter -- in Massachusetts and New York, quite a few GOP businessmen have shown up on his donor list. But so far (and June tabulations will probably show a shift), business political organizations have remained curiously aloof from a middle-of-the-road Democratic probable President accused by primary rivals of "Republican" economics.

(Note: On June 11, we noted a political action committee run by the "California Telephone Company". There is none. . . This mistake apparently originated in NCEC PAC tabulations. General Telephone officials tell us their GTE Good Government Club is the only California Telephone PAC.)

U.S. HOUSE RACE UPDATE

This extends the analysis of marginal Democratic House seats begun on June 11 with Northeastern and Southern districts. Here are the Midwestern and Western marginals:

Ohio: Four seats. Wayne Hays is favored to hold on in the 18th District, and bank lobby favorite Lud Ashley (9th District) could find his personal life a tough burden in a rematch with strong (47%) 1974 opponent Carleton Finkbeiner. In the 19th, old pol Charles Carney (D) is favored over Youngstown Mayor Jack Hunter (R), while suburban Cleveland Rep. Ron Mottl (23rd) has an early lead over Michael Scanlon (R).

Indiana: Four. GOP candidate David Crane is a slight favorite against freshman David Evans (D) in the 6th District. Republican Belden Bell is rated roughly even with Democrat David Cornwell in the open 8th District. Democratic incumbents J. Edward Roush (4th) and Philip Sharp (10th) are favored in serious races with Republican nominees Dan Quayle and William Frazier. June reports in the Indianapolis News see Carter's evangelical Christian appeal fueling a strong Indiana run, helping local Democratic candidates overcome previously expected GOP ticket help from Gov. Otis Bowen and favored Senate candidate Richard Lugar.

Michigan: Three. Leftish freshman Robert Carr (6th District) is even-money at best in a rematch with strong 1974 GOP opponent Clifford Taylor. The Detroit News (May 31) says that GOPers believe their best hopes, beside Carr's seat, lie in the 8th District (where a "strong" candidate, Saginaw County prosecutor Brady Denton, will oppose incumbent Democrat Bob Traxler) and in the 5th District, where there is a "modest chance" of unseating Richard Vander Veen.

Illinois: Three seats. Incumbent Abner Mikva is favored in the 10th District, but freshmen Tim Hall (15th) and Martin Russo (3rd) are locked in tight races with Republicans Tom Corcoran and Ron Buikema. Hall and Russo are invariably listed among the dozen freshmen seen most likely to lose.

Kentucky: One -- State Senator Walter Baker (R) has an uphill race, but possible shot at victory against senior Democrat William Natcher (2nd District). Carter coattails should help Natcher.

Missouri: Six marginal seats, nominees to be picked in August primary. Careful analysis must wait until then, but late Spring newspaper reports gave GOP a particularly good chance in the 2nd District (where Democrat James Symington is quitting), 4th District (where Democrat W.J. Randall is stepping down), the 9th District (where Democrat Bill Hungate is retiring), and the 6th (where Jerry Litton is running for a Senate nomination). Here again, Carter will be an unusually strong Democratic nominee, and his coattails are cheering previously apprehensive local candidates.

Iowa: The Des Moines Register (June 9) says political professionals rate Reps. Blouin (2nd District), Mezvinsky (1st) and Harkin (5th) as facing "toss-up" races. Mezvinsky faces a rematch with 1974 GOP opponent James Leach, likewise Blouin faces a rematch with ex-State Senator Tom Riley (R). In the heavily rural 5th, Harkin faces what may be a very rough challenge from upset June 8 GOP primary victor Ken Fulk, the folksy, energetic conservative head of the Iowa State Fair.

Wisconsin: Only one shaky Democratic seat -- the 3rd District, where freshman Rep. Alvin Baldus faces a strong challenge from surgeon Adolf Gunderson, head of the Gunderson Clinic. Rep. Robert Cornell appears well ahead in the 8th District.

Minnesota: One marginal. . .leftish Richard Nolan (6th District), another on the dozen-most-vulnerable freshman list.

Kansas: GOP hopefuls are competing for the nomination against Rep.

Martha Keys, who is now Martha Jacobs (after divorcing Keys and marrying Indiana Rep. Andrew Jacobs). Ms. Keys-Jacobs is seen vulnerable, and the GOP nomination fight is shaping up as the big August GOP primary contest (Kansas City Times, 5/28).

Oklahoma: One shaky Democratic seat -- Tulsa's James Jones, a Gulf Oil money recipient. State Senators James Inhofe and Frank Keating are competing for the GOP nomination in the August 24 primary.

Texas: Freshman Rep. Jack Hightower (13th District), opposed by ex-Rep. Bob Price (R), is an early favorite. The strongly Baptist Panhandle will give Jimmy Carter a good vote. The other Democrats look safe.

Colorado: Two. First District Rep. Pat Schroeder is an early favorite against a divided GOP, while 2nd District Rep. Tim Wirth is seen ahead in a tough re-election fight against the September GOP primary victor.

Utah: Sex scandal-injured Rep. Allan Howe is likely to lose to the winner of the September 14 GOP primary.

Montana: Two seats. The GOP has a chance if Ford-Reagan party wounds can be healed, but for the moment, incumbent Max Baucus leads in the western district, while Democrat Tom Towe is ahead in the eastern district being vacated by John Melcher.

Washington: Another late primary state. Only one Democratic seat could fall -- that held by nuclear power advocate Mike McCormack (4th District). Three Republicans are fighting for the nomination. Local analysts rate moderate Clark County Commissioner Richard Granger the best GOP November bet (Seattle Argus, 5/21).

Oregon: The Eugene Register-Guard now sees 4th District Rep. James Weaver (D) facing a real race against free-spending GOP lumberman Jerry Lausmann. First District freshman Les AuCoin (D) is rated as safe.

California: Everybody agrees on the three obvious GOP targets here -- Democratic Reps. Mark Hannaford (34th District), Jim Lloyd (35th) and Jerry Patterson (38th). The Los Angeles Times reports (June 10) that "Republicans consider their best prospects. . .to rest with (nominee) Daniel E. Lungren of Long Beach in the 34th District and former Covina Mayor Louis Brutocao in the 35th." The California Journal (April) more or less agreed with this ranking, putting emphasis on Brutocao ("a strong candidate").

Hawaii: Ex-State Sen. Fred Rohlfing (R) has a fair outside shot at the 1st District seat being vacated by Rep. Spark Matsunaga (D). The Democratic hopefuls are Cecil Heftel (backed by Sen. Inouye) and John Craven (backed by Gov. George Ariyoshi). In the 2nd District, being vacated by Rep. Patsy Mink, Democrats Daniel Akaka and State Sen. Joseph Kuroda are the prime contenders.

Overall, it still looks like the GOP can hope to capture no more than 20-30 Democratic-held seats while losing 10-20 Republican-held seats. This means a very limited Republican pick-up potential. If anything, the GOP is likely to do worse than expected rather than better for these reasons: 1) As a result of Ford-Reagan state-level fighting, local parties are caught up in fratricide and parochialism unlikely to be repaired by autumn; 2) rightwing forces are launching independent efforts designed to sink key moderate Republican Congressmen (moderates are likely to reciprocate); and 3) awareness that the Republican Party is coming apart (and may already have one foot in the grave) is spreading among the electorate. This could be a wild-card factor in November's races. In the next issue, we'll resume our usual Senate-House-Statehouse election update summaries.