

12/15/72 One Day in the Reporting of the Progress of Repression and Authoritarianism.  
Please return. The attached clippings, ordinarily, would go into different files. However,  
for the possible use I can now foresee, I want them all together because in my thinking they  
belong together. All but one are from today's Post, which does not put it all together.  
This is the story that includes centralization of authority and control in the hands of  
the President or, perhaps, those who control him, un Constitutionally, anti-democratically,  
and with authoritarianism the obvious end if not the exclusive intent. Extending it to the  
party machinery seems a bit unusual. I'll file WG, for that is increasing a central thing  
in all of it, not just dirtworks, not just hack politics a bit more extreme than the  
unethical and in oral normal low. HW

HW

# Domestic Policy Staff Is Unified

By Carroll Kilpatrick  
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Nixon moved yesterday to consolidate the authority of his Domestic Council in dealing with all domestic problems, including relations with state and local governments.

The President signed an executive order transferring the operations of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations to the Domestic Council and promoted Kenneth R. Cole Jr. from deputy director to executive director.

President aide John D. Ehrlichman, who has been executive director, will continue to maintain supervision over the Domestic Council but will be freed from day-to-day details to work on longer range problems.

Ehrlichman will concentrate on specific assignments and continue to be the President's chief domestic adviser, White House Press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said.

The President established the Office of Intergovernmental Relations in 1969 under the chairmanship of Vice President Agnew to facilitate communication between the White House and state and local governments.

Officials insisted that the consolidation of the office in the Domestic Council in no way diminishes Agnew's responsibilities since he is also vice chairman of the Domestic Council. The President is chairman.

Agnew will continue to keep

in close touch with governors and mayors, an official said.

The President said that the move was made on the Vice Presidents' recommendation "based on his extensive experience in intergovernmental relations."

Cole will "act as my principal point of contact with the executive and legislative officials of state and local government" and encourage "closer cooperation" between federal and local governments, the President said.

A spokesman for the Vice President said that Agnew and the President discussed the change and agreed on it since the Domestic Council is one place where policy is made affecting state and local governments.

In other reorganization moves, the President accepted the resignations of six top Labor Department officials and announced that three top officials in the department would remain in the second term.

Under Secretary of Labor Laurence H. Silberman, who has held the position since September, 1970, has been offered another administration post but has not yet decided what he will do, Ziegler said.

Assistant Secretaries Malcolm R. Lovell, Richard J. Grunewald and George C. Guenther plan to return to private life, as will Elizabeth D. Koontz, director of the Women's Bureau, and Geoffrey H. Moore, commissioner of labor statistics.

Assistant Secretaries W. J. Usery Jr. and Michael H. Maslow and Richard F. Schubert, solicitor of the department, will remain, Ziegler said.

William D. Eberle, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, and his two deputies, William R. Pearce and Harald B. Malmgren, will remain in office, as will Thomas S. Kleppe, head of the Small Business Administration, it was announced.



# Elect Nixon Unit Remains In Business

12/15/72  
By Lou Cannon

Washington Post Staff Writer

The receptionist says "four more years" rather than "re-elect the President," but the Committee for the Re-Election of the President is still doing business at the same old stand one block from the White House.

Press spokesman DeVan Shumway says the committee is in "the closing down process" and that no decision has been reached on whether to keep it in business pending any prospective congressional hearings on the burglary and espionage of Democratic headquarters at the Watergate.

But other informed sources say flatly that the committee has three reasons for continuing in business. One of them is to issue statements, if necessary, during the trial of the seven Watergate defendants, which begins Jan. 8.

The other purposes are the preparing of financial statements required to be filed by Jan. 31, and the disposition of "valuable materials" that include computer lists of pro-Nixon voters and data bank materials on the 10 major states.

This material presumably will be transferred to the Republican National Committee but not right away.

"We don't want to transfer it to a committee that's so much in flux," says one Republican source.

Chairman Bob Dole and many of the Republican National Committee employees are leaving. Dole will be replaced Jan. 20 by George Bush, now the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations.

See GOP, A7, Col. 1

## GOP, From A1

The disposition of this material, rather than the financial or Watergate purposes, was described as the major reason for the delay in closing down the committee, which usually is known by the acronym of CREEP.

Neither CREEP nor the Republican National Committee fully trusted each other during the campaign and this relationship has persisted in the aftermath of President Nixon's landslide victory.

Despite the official insistence that no formal decision has been reached on when to close down the re-election committee, it is considered certain that CREEP will remain open through the Water-

gate trial and will probably close down soon afterward no matter what a congressional committee does.

"The trial is really our hearing, involving as it does ex-committee employees," says one well-informed source. "After that, it's up to the White House."

At this point it is unknown whether there will in fact be any congressional hearings. There is considerable doubt whether Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), who is supposed to lead this investigation, is interested in pursuing it.

There are heavy political risks in such an investigation for Kennedy, whose own prospective presidential candidacy would doubtless become

a subject of controversy. Even if such an investigation is launched, there are questions about whether it would be vigorously pursued.

Kennedy, in a recent Los Angeles speech, went out of his way to be complimentary of the Nixon administration, declaring that "there is more good will in Congress now toward Mr. Nixon than perhaps at any time in his career in public life."

The belief that hearings are unlikely is shared at CREEP, where the concern is focused on the upcoming trial. Several employees of the committee are expected to be called as witnesses during the trial, perhaps by both sides.

Of the 30 employees remaining at the re-election commit-

tee, about 12 are involved in political tasks and the remaining 18 in preparing reports on financial contributions to comply with the legal Jan. 31 deadline.

The finance staff is under the jurisdiction of Maurice Stans, who heads the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President. Jeb Magruder, a deputy director of the re-election committee, is in charge of closing down the entire operation.

Campaign Chairman Clark MacGregor took a job in private industry the day after the election and Fred Malek, the campaign's other deputy director, is preoccupied with recruiting personnel for the job reshuffle in the Nixon administration's second term.

The re-election committee is playing no role in the Nixon inaugural, which is being directed by a separate committee headed by Magruder and headquartered at Ft. McNair.



# Reformers Seek to Strengthen Senate

12/15/72  
By Spencer Rich

Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate is heading for a series of fierce battles with President Nixon next year over the division of powers between Congress and the presidency.

A big bloc of senators—including men of such otherwise disparate views as Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.) and Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.), Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) and John Stennis (D-Miss.)—is convinced that in one area or another, the White House in recent decades has encroached on the powers of Congress in key areas of decision-making.

Unless the trend is reversed, Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) asserted last week, Congress will soon become a "third or fourth-class power," a meaningless Roman Senate rubber-stamping the decisions of Caesar.

Plans are already under way to block the President from "impounding" major program funds voted by Congress just because he doesn't favor the program; to limit to specified emergency situations his right to wage undeclared war; to curb presidential refusal to provide a wide range of information to Congress on grounds of "executive privilege"; to

forbid him to station U.S. troops overseas without the assent of the Senate; and to curb him from shifting funds from one budget account to another in order to undertake programs which Congress has cut.

Whatever the outcome of these clashes over the next two years, a broad and powerful body of opinion both on Capitol Hill and among some citizens' organizations holds that, in the long run, Congress will never be able to stand up against the proliferating powers of the presidency unless it cleans its own house first. The two issues are absolutely inseparable.

See REFORM, A14, Col. 1

## REFORM, From A1

Hamstrung by massive inefficiency and rules by which insure delays, boredom and interruption of business, run by crotchety and sometimes senile men who can shelter behind the seniority system and ignore the public will, so the argument runs, Congress today cannot hope to compete with the presidency. It must first loose the cleansing waters of reform to wash away the procedural debris left by decades of operating according to things-as-they-are.

A powerful and persuasive—though not in every respect convincing—argument for congressional reform was made last week at a series of special hearings organized by Sens. Mathias and Adlai E. Stevenson III (D-Ill.).

The two senators themselves, plus witnesses like Common Cause chairman John W. Gardner, the NAACP's Clarence Mitchell, Russell Hemenway of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, and other senators like Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio) and Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), flailed away at the seniority system, Congress' horse-and-buggy methods of obtaining information about national problems, and dawdling and meaningless debates with only one or two Senators on the floor.

The witnesses made an excellent case for improved

professional staffing and technical information systems, and for tighter discipline by party leaders over committee chairmen. Their case for major structural reforms to dismantle the seniority system and restrict the tradition of unlimited debate was less compelling.

Behind all the discussion was the recognition that in one area, at least, Congress can probably do nothing to overcome an inherent presidential advantage which has grown far greater with the advent of television: the capacity of the President to sway public opinion.

### Power of TV

As chief of state, clothed with the majesty of his office, receiving enormous news coverage from all media and able to speak in a single, magisterial voice for the entire executive branch, the President can put his views across to the public in a way that no body of 535 quarreling and quibbling members of the House and Senate can hope to rival. Even if he should lie, it is extremely difficult to refute him.

Granted this, however, the witnesses contended that, by archaic and absurd procedures, Congress is hobbling itself.

Many of the witnesses battered away at the seniority system. Purely on the basis of longevity, they argued, a man becomes committee chairman, and it is virtually impossible to dislodge him regardless of what he does. His views may be com-

pletely unrepresentative of the majority of the Senate or his own party (groups like Common Cause usually cite Judiciary Chairman James O. Eastland of Mississippi).

A chairman may be so old

that, even though perfectly lucid and forceful when awake, he may doze off during committee hearings—like the late Senate Appropriations Chairman Allen J. Ellender (D-La.), and House Judiciary Chairman Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), both in their 80s.

He may use his position to obstruct legislation overwhelmingly favored by the House or Senate. He may be a suspected crook, or too ill to perform the job. No matter; he stays chairman by virtue of seniority—a system, incidentally, which witnesses said no other body in the free world employs.

Also sharply criticized was malapportionment in committees. The Finance Committee, which handles all trade, tax and welfare legislation, is loaded with conservatives.

The filibuster rule, whereby a two-thirds vote of the Senate is needed to cut off debate, was scored as tending to help minorities thwart the will of the majority.

Regardless of political views, there was widespread agreement that Congress doesn't have adequate staffing to rival the executive



branch in decision-making.

The executive is said to have 6,000 computers cranking out information. Congress has none.

The executive has many thousands of people working up budget information for each federal agency, plus a 700-member Office of Management and Budget review the whole situation and draw up an overall budget relating income to outgo. Congress has 85 staffers on the two Appropriations Committees. It has no mechanism for matching federal appropriations against federal revenues.

Covert pressure on Congressmen by concealed lobbyists and campaign givers, and the apparent gross disorder in the flow of floor business, also were bitterly criticized.

#### Boring Sessions

For a citizen coming to Washington to view "his" legislative body, the fitful pace, irrelevancy and poor attendance at Senate debates must be extremely disheartening. Votes can be postponed for two or three days because a single Senator has a speaking engagement and insists on a delay. Attendance on Monday and Friday during most of the year is sparse. Repeated procedural roll calls on the floor can completely disrupt

committee meetings for no real purpose. And debate can be inane and barely audible.

All these factors, argue the reformers, cause public confidence in Congress to plummet. Gardner cited a recent Harris poll showing that from 1965 to 1971 Congress's "positive" rating plunged from 64 to 28 per cent.

An easing of the filibuster rule, an end to seniority, a 70-year age limit, considerably better staffing, speedier floor business, new ways to curb campaign contributions by "the interests" and to bare lobbying to the public—these, the reformers argue, might give the Congress a better image and a more efficient operation and



Sens. Adlai Stevenson III (D-Ill.), left, and Charles Mathias (R-Md.) are leaders in the current movement to streamline and update Senate organization, operations.

enable it to curb the trend toward an authoritarian executive branch.

However, there is another way of looking at it. Reformers tend to lump all their proposals together, but it may be that only some of the changes would help Congress to assert itself.

Many believe that the seniority system, the rule making it extremely difficult to cut off Senate debate, the disproportionate power of minority blocs and the rather loose discipline which obtains in both parties are actually a protection against executive tyranny. They serve to frustrate the President when he seeks to manipulate public opinion and stampede his program through Congress.

#### Filibuster Defenders

Many Northern Democrats then it could tell the President that if budget cuts are needed, Congress will decide where to make them—instead of aridly telling that, while Congress is incapable of making the cuts, he mustn't do it either because it would encroach on the legislative power of the purse.

According to this argument, the arrogant independence of some chairmen, or dawdling and time-wasting on the floor, can be handled without major structural changes in the rules.

The party caucus can exert pressure on chairmen, perhaps by making them subject to roll-call election by the caucus, thus creating the threat of removal later (as proposed by Common Cause).

Considerably greater personal pressure on chairmen from the low-keyed Majority Leader, Mike Mansfield, would be useful. So would



refusal to honor requests for voting delays because one or two senators want to go out of town. Toward the end of the 1972 session Mansfield ceased paying any attention to such requests and it speeded things up wonderfully.

Another useful reform within both caucuses: more ideological balance on committees like Finance, Labor, Foreign Relations, Armed Services.

#### Computer Aids

Some of these changes are coming. A Senate Rules Committee study of computerization has concluded that a comprehensive legislative information system is feasible by 1976 or 1978.

The Democratic leadership has already adopted a system whereby any nominee for committee chairman can be challenged in the caucus and a vote demanded. The Republicans next month might well adopt a Taft proposal to do the same.

A joint Congressional

budget committee, to study income and revenues and evaluate national priorities, probably is on the way, though perhaps not this year.

But whether all these changes, even if made rapidly and completely, will guarantee Congress equality with the Executive Branch is far from certain.

The move to revive Congress's role has gained its greatest strength during the last four years, when a Democratic Congress has been facing off against a Republican President. Divided government exacerbates executive-legislative differences.

Not all the weapons in the world will work if the will—"guts," as Mathias called it—is lacking. Whether the Democratic fervor would continue if they recapture the White House in 1976 is an open question. Except for Fulbright, they were notably docile about Executive Branch encroachment when Lyndon Johnson was President.

crats, the strongest advo-

cates of filibuster reform when Southerners used the filibuster to talk civil rights legislation to death, now see the filibuster rule as a protection for them against a conservative Senate majority. The filibuster was used to kill anti-busing legislation last session.

Both Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and Frank Church (D-Idaho) have converted to this view, and even Common Cause now puts filibuster reform low on its priority list.

The seniority system is another protection for minority Senate groupings. Pro-business senators may dominate the Finance Committee, but northern pro-labor senators have completely disproportionate power on the Labor Committee. And there is little likelihood for example, that J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) could be Foreign Relations Chairman if committee heads were elected by the Senate as a whole, there there is, indisputably, a strong "defense majority"

far to the right of Fulbright on foreign policy issues.

Also, the Senate, unlike the House, has neither a general germaneness rule for floor amendments nor a "closed rule" to bar all floor amendments. This means that any Senator, at any time, may introduce virtually any amendment to any bill and usually get a vote on it. Thus the power of a tyrannical chairman to bottle up legislation and block any votes is less than in the House.

In the view of many, the Senate, at least, doesn't need too much radical surgery to assert itself more in relation to the White House.

More top-notch professional personnel on committee and personal staffs; a mechanism (perhaps a joint committee) to study the budget as whole and weigh income against outgo; computerized information retrieval on legislative proposals and government programs so that Senators aren't overwhelmed in factual disputes with the Exec-

utive Branch—all these would enhance the Senate.

#### Strong Tax Staff

In one area, at least, Congress has already had for a number of years the kind of staffing help that it clearly will need more of in the future.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which operates under the direction of House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) and Senate Finance Chairman Russell B. Long (D-La.), has an extremely able 20-member staff whose sole function is to study tax matters and help the two committees with tax bills.

This is one reason why, from a technical point of view, Mills and Long move with great assurance and subject mastery on tax matters.

Similar units in a number of other areas—overall national security policy, overall budget review—would be extremely helpful to Congress.





*F Post  
12-15-77*

## More Big Changes In Wind for Later

By BRUCE BIOSSAT

WASHINGTON (NEA)

President Nixon gave himself until Dec. 15 to finish sweeping his new broom through the Cabinet and other agencies. But significant signs exist that some big changes may come months later.

Denials would be issued now. But there is word from good sources that before 1973 is far advanced, we will see the departure of three other Cabinet officers—Secretary of State William Rogers, Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, Treasury Secretary George Shultz. Rogers and Shultz, of course, have been announced as staying, and Kleindienst's retention has been confirmed.

The pattern at work here is a familiar one. When the heat is on and forecasts of change are rampant, action is least likely. To dismiss Kleindienst now, for instance, would lend too much credence to the idea the President is unhappy with him in his conduct pertaining to the Watergate bugging affair.

The prototype was the case of former Interior Secretary Walter Hickel. After he wrote (and released) a letter to the President with stinging comment about how to deal better with dissident youth, he was pictured in the press as a marked man sure to go soon.

He didn't. I was told then it would happen much later, in cooler times, but that it would still be messy—because Hickel would stubbornly refuse to resign and would force Mr. Nixon to confront and fire him. That's exactly the way it went.

Just so, it is said, Kleindienst's time will come. As for Rogers, word is he wants to go. But to let him do so now would seem only to support accounts of his alleged deep displeasure over Henry Kissinger's long-dominant role as the President's chief foreign policy adviser and diplomatic negotiator. Thus, again, this simply isn't the right moment, especially with Kissinger so deeply involved in the peace talks with Hanoi and Saigon.

The occasionally wafting rumors that Kissinger himself might decide to check out seem incredible. As one presidential friend put it:

"What would Henry do? Go back to Harvard and watch somebody else make the history he could be making? That's what those professors do, you know."

The Shultz matter is a bit more complex. While Rogers is a good personal friend of the President's, Shultz came in originally a stranger but made his way with Mr. Nixon quickly as secretary of Labor. He was forthright, imaginative, and evidently seemed to make good sense both to the public and to the President privately. His high favor seemed confirmed when he was named head of the newly powerful Office of Management and Budget.

But in fact his star began to wane when his views were effectively rejected as wage-price controls were slapped on in mid-August, 1971. His shift to Treasury is described by one source as a "demotion," even though the post had been held before by prestigious John Connally.

The net effect of the President's face-changing in and around the Cabinet may not have all that much impact on the swollen bureaucracy, despite Mr. Nixon's professed intention. Personnel cuts and money savings may prove fairly superficial.

Yet it is just possible that some domestic departments may get a little more running room, free of White House pursuit. It is truer than ever that the President wants to make his mark in foreign policy. And this time he doesn't have to worry as much about the voter effect of domestic problems.

# Ichord Says Peace Will Not Halt Activities of 'Revolutionaries'

AP 12/15/72  
Associated Press

The chairman of the House Internal Security Committee says peace in Vietnam will not put an end to activities by "hard-core revolutionaries." He predicts they will regroup and "try to find new issues to exploit."

The "sharp ones, the ones who really constitute serious threats, know that they are in no position to overthrow the government of the United States at the present time," said Rep. Richard H. Ichord (D-Mo.), head of the committee.

He said they will therefore seek to exploit issues "with which a large number of peo-

ple that are loyal to the United States will agree, just as the issue of the war in Vietnam was one."

In an interview, Ichord said: "The name of the game is issue exploitation. In fact, this has been one of the disagreements between the various revolutionary groups within the country, as to what issues they can exploit."

He said there has "already" been an effort by subversive groups to exploit the issue of prison reform.

He said some subversives have advocated "taking the ecology issue to the streets." Busing is another "very ripe issue for a revolutionary group," he added.

He said the Vietnam war "provided the issue which could be exploited, and this has cloused the police forces, the security forces, within the United States a great deal of trouble. "So the end of the war in Vietnam is going to bring to an end the principal issue of exploitation."

Ichord said he would press anew for legislation — which died during the past Congress — to bar unauthorized trips by Americans to a nation in armed conflict with U.S. forces. There will "still be a need for the legislation," he said, even with peace in Vietnam.



## State GOP Leaders Wanted Sen. Dole Out, Too

THE UNBRIDGEABLE gap in political goals between Republican politicians and the White House was dramatized by one particularly embarrassing moment during the generally uncomfortable Nov. 29 meeting at Camp David between President Nixon and Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas.

Mr. Nixon had decided weeks earlier to sack Dole as Republican national chairman and replace him with George Bush, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, at the Jan. 19 national committee meeting. But, as is his habit when trying to fire somebody, the president meandered. He asked Dole to consider when he should quit in order to better prepare his 1974 senate reelection campaign and also to think about who should succeed him as national chairman when that time, soon or distant, arrived. Dole delayed setting a date but quickly suggested a successor: Melvin R. Laird, voluntarily retiring as Secretary of Defense. A brilliant political thinker and tireless

organizer, Laird commands unmatched respect among party leaders.

But the President hurriedly passed over Dole's suggestion without comment. Laird's relations with White House major domo H. R. (Bob) Halde- man deteriorated progressively the last four years, and he would be the last man desired as chairman by Halde- man's palace guard. Laird would exercise the same independence at Republican headquarters that he did at the Pentagon. The palace guard believes Bush, though a public figure of wide accomplishment, will take orders.

THAT'S PRECISELY why Republican politicians are morose about the Bush selection. "George won't go to the bathroom without asking the White House," one bitter party leader told us. Such Republicans believe Bush as chairman marries the party to the White House staff. The upshot: deep- ening pessimism about the Republican

future, particularly the next presiden- tial election.

Ironically, both politicians and White House staff agreed Dole should go. Their widely divergent reasons, how- ever, show the gap between their polit- ical goals.

The palace guard long ago tired of Dole's irrepressible bluntness. Presi- dential staffers were infuriated by his post-election criticism of Mr. Nix- on's non-involvement in senate races. In characteristically heavyhanded style, the White House leaked reports about Dole's departure before he was told—no help for Dole's 1974 reelec- tion campaign.

But state party leaders gave Dole no backing either, preferring a full-time professional to rebuild a Republican Party exposed by 1972 state races in dil- apidated condition almost every- where. They want the new national chairman to provide not speeches but financial aid and varied technical as- sistance, particularly in candidate se- lection.

TO PERFORM that role, many state chairmen wanted Ohio state chairman John Andrews, an effective full-time professional of 18 years experience with well-defined ideas about what a national chairman should and should not be. A more controversial possibil- ity was national committeeman Keith Bulen of Indiana, an innovative cam- paign strategist and organizer.

But the White House job description for national chairman fits Bush much better than Andrews or Bulen: an articulate spokesman to travel the country recruiting candidates and set- tling local disputes. Mr. Nixon's top political advisers want the national committee's budget radically pruned, obviating the technical assistance de- sired by state leaders.

This prospect can scarcely be appe- tizing to Bush, who would be a possi- bility for President in 1976 had he won his 1970 Texas race for the senate. He would have preferred a Cabinet post, but Mr. Nixon and his Cabinet-makers preferred faceless businessmen to poli- ticians in filling vacancies.

Republican politicians, discreet by nature, will confirm Bush as Chairman Jan. 19 without a whimper—but also without joy. Whether their frowns turn to smiles depends upon Bush shaping the chairmanship to suit them rather than Haldeman & Co. As of now, that is one of the longest shots in Washington.



# Public TV Fight

Part 2/15/72  
By John Carmody

The feud between the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting Service, its semi-independent television network, intensified yesterday as CPB's board of directors announced a tentative 1973-74 national program lineup notably devoid of public affairs shows.

Missing in the fall, 1973, season would be such PBS public affairs staples as William F. Buckley Jr.' "Firing Line," and "Washington Week in Review," the two most popular shows on the network in this category.

Public broadcasting sources say that the deletion are a further indication of a CDB effort to either take over the network or do away with it entirely.

In the first instance, these sources say, the current PBS staff would be reduced to technicians now maintaining the 223-station "interconnection" while CPB beefed up its programming staff, previously a one-man operation. On the other hand, the network could be dismantled, leaving pro-

gramming to regional networks or local stations, with major programs circulated by mail—a throwback to the early educational TV days.

Negotiations are currently underway between the two organizations to determine "roles." The talks reportedly are at an impasse.

The announcement itself was evidence of the deterioration in relations between the federally-funded parent organization and PBS. In past seasons, the network, with its own board of directors' approval, has drawn up schedules which were usually ratified pro forma by the CPB board, subject only to non-partisan, budgetary considerations. Announcements of such decisions were usually left to PBS officials.

Although the lineups released yesterday followed PBS board recommendations generally in the fields of drama and childrens' fare, the public affairs cutback went to the heart of

See PUBLIC, E12, Col. 3

## PUBLIC, From E1

the relationships between the two boards. The 16-member PBS board is led by a 12-man majority of public-TV station managers; the presidentially-appointed CPB board has an increasingly political 8 to 7 Republican majority.

Network officials have become increasingly alarmed over what they consider usurption of PBS' role in national program selection by the CPB, which began when Henry Loomis, a strong supporter of President Nixon, replaced John Macy Jr. as CPB president in October.

Even before he took the post, Loomis announced to the network's 230 public-TV station managers that he intended to switch all authority in programming to CPB. He argued that since it was CPB that must answer each year to a balky Congress, it should have the responsibility over programming decisions that sometimes affect its relations on the Hill.

At the same time, Loomis repeated administration complaints about PBS public affairs which currently

comprise about 30 per cent of the network's weekly prime-time programming (against a commercial network rate of about 2 per cent).

The administration has been wary of an "Eastern liberal establishment" viewpoint in PBS's national public affairs programming. Spokesmen, including Loomis, say the need is for more shows at the local and regional level. They contend that current PBS efforts, originating in Washington, New York and Boston for the most part, tend to needlessly duplicate commercial networks news.

PBS considers itself the voice of the local station managers. This year, when the PBS board drew up its schedule suggestions, they made a "compromise" response to the Loomis criticisms.

Instead of submitting its current package of eight public affairs programs for renewal, the PBS board suggested a \$100,000 study be made to determine if programs filmed by regional public TV production centers could be "mixed" into the network programming on a



**"The administration has been wary of an 'Eastern liberal establishment' viewpoint in PBS's national public affairs programming. Spokesmen say the need is for more shows at the local and regional level."**

nightly or weekly basis. These regional efforts would then lend political and geographical "balance" to whichever current PBS public affairs shows the board of both organizations would choose to retain.

CPB's board rejected the proposal early in November and set about drawing up its own plans, those announced yesterday.

Besides the Buckley show and "Washington Week in Review" at least two other current programs would be retired. "America, '73," produced by the National Public Affairs Center for Television (NPACT) here and set to replace its "A Public Affair, '72" next month, would be dropped. "Bill Moyers' Journal," produced in New York, is also slated for retirement.

Only Elizabeth Drew's "Thirty Minutes With..."

the lone NPACT survivor, the Boston-produced "The Advocates" and "Wall Street Week" are retained. "Crime Gazette," a show on law and order to be produced in Boston would join the public affairs schedule next fall.

The announcement yesterday stressed that a decision on other shows—presumably including "Black Journal"—that are largely in the public affairs area, was deferred until the board receives additional information on possible alternative programming.

Included in yesterday's lists of programs was "two series of black programming as yet undetermined," "Black Journal" is believed to be one of the two programs, according to a CPB official.

Network sources believe the "alternative" loophole keeps alive hopes for an

NPACT proposal to broadcast major speeches that often are missed by the commercial networks.

Further program cuts are expected. Yesterday's announcement was based on a

budget of \$70 million for fiscal 1974, about \$35 million over the present funding provided by a continuing resolution.

A more realistic 1974 figure, public broadcasting sources believe, would be a slight increase over the \$45 million finally approved by the President in August, but which was lost when he vetoed the Labor-HEW money bill to which it was attached.

A CPB official yesterday acknowledged that alternate budgets for the \$35 and \$45 million figures have also been drawn up. In either instance, sharp cuts in other categories of programming, except probably the children's fare, would be made.

The PBS BOARD meets here Jan. 5, and the CPB board Jan. 10. Both sides are then expected to take the issue to Congress and the public.