

NYTimes MAY 15 1974
**G.O.P. Chiefs in the States
Unhappy Over Transcripts**

By R. W. APPLE Jr.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 14—
"I'm disappointed," said Kent B. McGough, the Ohio Republican chairman, "It showed the operations around the White House not to be on the high plane I anticipated. It was very disenchanted."

"It was demoralizing and devastating to the morale of the average party worker," said Mrs. Nancy Palm, the Republican chairman in Harris County (Houston), Tex. "I see nothing but harm from it."

"I think it was just devastating," said Dwight A. Hamilton, the Colorado Republican chairman. "The moral tone, or the moral standards I think most Republican stand for, was just really lacking."

The comments were typical of those offered by Republican professionals in a dozen states—east and west, north and south—interviewed about their reactions to the edited Watergate transcripts released by President Nixon on April 30.

Continued From Page 1, Col. 3
guilt or innocence.

Three reasons for adverse reactions to the transcripts were cited by the national cross-section of party pros.

A few, like Mrs. Colis Moore, Republican National Committeewoman from Oregon, objected to what they interpreted as coarse language—represented in the transcripts by the marking, "expletive deleted."

"That has hurt the President, and it's a little hard to understand why, in some ways," she said. "They thought it was cute when Harry Truman said it. I think that a lot of people expect the Presidents to be better than they are."

Some Are Disturbed

Some were disturbed by discussions of illegal acts, although none of those interviewed said they thought Mr. Nixon had been shown definitely to have committed crimes.

"He gave some consideration to paying hush money, but he didn't approve it," commented J. Kenneth Doty, chairman of the Multnomah County (Portland) Republicans in Oregon. "The kind of thing has got some people upset—the fact that he would even consider it."

But most of the comments centered on the over-all tone of the transcripts, which even the

With a single exception—S. L. Kopald Jr., chairman of the Tennessee Republican executive committee, who said Mr. Nixon had not been hurt—the party officials agreed that the President had been harmed by the transcripts.

But none of the officials was willing to go so far as to say that the transcripts had doomed Mr. Nixon's Presidency, and none planned—at least for the moment—to call on him to resign. Like the majority of Republicans in Congress, they appeared to prefer to let impeachment proceed.

The Republican professionals around the country took much the same stance as their counterparts in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, as reported in this morning's Times. The metropolitan party leaders said, for the most part, that Mr. Nixon should not resign and withheld judgment on his

Continued on Page 32, Column 1

professionals—presumably injured to the rougher side of politics—found "disturbing" and "unseemly."

Robert E. Hughes, the Republican chairman in Cleveland, one of the party's most respected professionals, spoke sadly of "the cynicism of it all."

Regardless of the impact of the transcripts, there appears to remain a substantial residue of support for the troubled President within the Republican party structure. Some typical comments were as follows:

"I don't think he's guilty, so I don't think he should resign"—Mrs. Patricia Lindh, vice chairman of the Louisiana Republican party.

'Never Been Convicted'

The man was elected to do a job. And I think he should fill out his term. He's never been convicted in a court of law. I'm going to stick by him; a lot of people tend to forget his good points"—John Short, the Republican chairman in Springfield, Ill.

"I think he's a pretty intelligent guy and a pretty strong individual. He gets a lot of good advice, and I'd just let him do what he thinks he should do"—Harold L. Jones, the Maine party chairman.

There appeared to be no regional pattern in the comments. In fact, the perceptions of different individuals within the

same state often varied substantially.

In Texas, for example, Mrs. Palm, the Houston official, reported the rank-and-file had been "devastated and demoralized." She noted that of the 4,000 to 5,000 delegates expected at a district party convention last Saturday, only about 2,000 had showed up.

"Barry Goldwater is the real spokesman for the Republicans now," she added, "and if he should break with Nixon, you will see a rapid crumbling of the President's support in the party."

But the state committee, meeting today, adopted a resolution avowing "our faith in our system of government, in the office of the President and, until such time as he may be constitutionally impeached and convicted, in the person of the President, Richard Milhous Nixon."

A number of the politicians expressed concern about the impact of the transcript revelations on Republican candidates running in November.

"I'd appeal to the voter's sense of fair play," said Don Adams, the Illinois chairman. "The honest, innocent, qualified Illinois candidate shouldn't be the victim of Watergate fallout. I'm naturally concerned about that."

Richard D. Hewes, speaker of the Maine House of Representatives, stopped short of calling for Mr. Nixon's resignation, but said it "would be the best thing for the party" because he "is going to hurt Republicans across the state."

"I was nauseated and sickened," said Mr. Hewes after reading 20 pages of the transcripts.