



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 2, NO. 7

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

FEBRUARY 1969

## Patronage Is The Name Of The Game

Ever since Richard Nixon won the Presidency in November 1968, the press has been filled with variations on this principal theme: *President Nixon can fill only 1,500 to 3,000 Federal jobs — the rest of the Federal employees are locked in by Civil Service.*

This claim is preposterous, and Republicans at every level should call the bluff of the Democrats and the liberals who are trying to put it over. The American people voted for a change in November 1968. There is no way that the wishes of the majority of Americans can be fulfilled if President Nixon can replace only 3,000 employees out of 3,000,000 — leaving 2,997,000 holdovers from previous administrations.

On Inauguration Day, *The New York Times* stated on the front page: "Mr. Nixon will be leading barely 100 associates into top jobs in a Government of more than three million employees. They will be guided for months by Democratic holdovers, even in policy posts, and they will have to master a bureaucracy that has been trained and nourished by Democrats in all but eight of the last 36 years."

Republicans should not permit the Nixon Administration to be strait-jacketed by the retention of 99.9% holdovers from the LBJ Administration.

It is wishful thinking to hope that the election of a new President and his appointment of an outstanding Cabinet will in itself bring about the change in policies which the voters want. Policies are made by the thousands of middle-echelon bureaucrats who give the advice, determine what information is sent to their superiors, draft the "working" papers,

prepare the "options," "interpret" the regulations, and summarize the "intelligence."

Immediately after the Nixon victory, the Federal payrollers began building bureaucratic barricades to perpetuate themselves in power. They moved into high gear to hire Democrats for every available position. Jobs which had been vacant for months or even years were hurriedly filled in the weeks between the election and the Inauguration in order to blanket additional Democrats into Civil Service. Many others were transferred from political jobs to permanent jobs just prior to January 20.

Meanwhile, the Federal bureaucrats are adopting the attitude that four years of Nixon are merely an interlude to be endured. The word is being spread in Washington that nothing should be done to reinstate Otto Otepka to his post in the State Department because this would be "bad public relations" for the Nixon Administration. This is untrue. Everyone who knows anything about the case knows that Otepka was framed. Unless justice is given to Otepka, morale among the many good Federal employees will disintegrate.

### The Democrat Record

The Democrats have never permitted Civil Service to impede their political objectives. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson ruthlessly got rid of Republican holdovers — Civil Service to the contrary notwithstanding — and used every possible tactic to put Democrats on the payroll and keep them there. No holds were barred in their purge of Republicans and payroll padding with Democrats.

Franklin Roosevelt set the precedent in the Commerce Department in the early days of the New Deal.

Under "emergency" powers, he fired several hundred holdovers from the Hoover Administration and put a freeze on all new hirings. Then he established the NRA in the same building — with all new personnel. Where did the new employees come from? They were hired through the employment office of the Democratic National Committee — not transferred from the Commerce Department or other Federal bureaus. Two years later when the NRA was declared unconstitutional, all the NRA employees were hired directly into the Commerce Department and blanketed into Civil Service.

When President Truman wanted to load his friends in the Pendergast machine onto the Federal payroll, he peremptorily closed some agency offices and then reopened them in Kansas City. This shook many employees off the Federal payroll, and opened up plenty of Government jobs to take care of the politicians who elected him.

After Kennedy became President, he abolished the entire Federal agency dispensing foreign aid, thus eliminating all the Eisenhower appointees. Kennedy then immediately created a new foreign aid agency under a new name — and hired a new staff of all Kennedy supporters.

These are just samples of the way Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson used the tool of Federal patronage skillfully and ruthlessly in order (1) to carry out the liberal policies of the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and Great Society, (2) to build a political machine in order to reelect themselves, and (3) to enjoy the power of spending Federal billions down to the letting of the last small contract.

(Continued on page 2)

# Patronage Is The Name Of The Game

(Continued from page 1)

## The Eisenhower Mistake

Now let us contrast the patronage policy of the Eisenhower Administration. If the election of Dwight Eisenhower in 1952 meant anything at all, it meant a mandate to clean out the State Department. The State Department was the focal point of the entire campaign: all Republican orators inveighed against the stalemate war in Korea, Communists in Government, and the State Department sell-out of China. The 1952 Republican Party Platform promised:

"We shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office, all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves. We shall also sever from the public payroll the hordes of loafers, incompetents and unnecessary employees who clutter the administration of our foreign affairs."

It is a blot on the Republican record that this promise was never kept. Only a handful of top jobs were changed. The State Department which lost China, and announced that South Korea was outside the U. S. "defense perimeter," remained virtually intact.

The few Republicans who did receive high appointments were told they could not even hire a secretary of their own choosing, but had to continue with the holdover from the Truman Administration. As the Republican Party faithful became impatient with the lack of available patronage and with the lack of meaningful policy changes, they were forever frustrated by this stock reply from Republican Senators, Congressmen, and other high officials:

"Nearly all Federal jobs are under Civil Service and President Eisenhower can appoint only a few thousand jobs at the top. There is nothing we can legally do to dismiss Democrats and hire Republicans." Apparently Eisenhower and most top Republican officials believed this because it was the policy of the Eisenhower Administration.

This policy was wrong because it meant that the Eisenhower Administration could not give the American people the policy changes they voted for in 1952. With the same crew manning the Eisenhower ship, as the French say, "the more things change,

the more they remain the same." The American people were entitled to receive the change for which they voted. Civil Service has some merit, but it should not be allowed to frustrate the constitutional wishes of the American people.

The bitter harvest of this failure to clean out the State Department was Castro. Our Ambassador appointed by Eisenhower, Earl E. T. Smith, was never deceived by Castro. Ambassador Smith sent back accurate reports that Castro was a Communist and should not be aided by the United States. But these reports came into the hands of a Truman holdover named William Wieland who pigeonholed them. Wieland knew that Castro was a Communist but never passed this information to his superiors.

The assistance that the State Department gave to Castro is the worst blot on the hundred-year record of the Republican Party — and it could have been so easily avoided if the Eisenhower Administration had used Federal patronage with the same skill displayed by Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson.

This failure to use Federal patronage is also probably the principal reason why, in every subsequent year of the Eisenhower Administration, the Republican Party steadily lost ground and more of its candidates were defeated.

## Doing The "Impossible"

Unfortunately, there is now a defeatist attitude among many Republican Congressmen and Party officials about large-scale patronage to be dispensed by the Nixon Administration. Whereas Democratic Congressmen are consistently vocal and aggressive in putting their constituents on the Federal payroll, Republican Congressmen are often reticent and resigned to refusal.

This is wrong. There should be thousands of Republicans flooding into Federal office from every State in the Union — especially from the states which contributed substantially to Nixon's victory. This is the *only* way we can secure the change for which the American people voted.

Don't let your Senator or Congressman tell you that it can't be done — tell him to find a way to do it. The great Seabee slogan of World War II was: "The difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes a little longer." Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy

and Johnson did it. Patronage is the name of the game and, if Republicans do not use it skillfully as the Democrats do, Republicans are not going to win future elections.

Here are three principal ways that the new Republican Administration can proceed in order to bring about the change the people voted for.

**1. Abolish the unnecessary jobs and cull out the employees who are not doing anything.** Under Kennedy and Johnson, 619,397 civilian employees were added to the Federal payroll — most of them unnecessary.

The Federal Government is loaded with thousands of extra employees who walk up and down the corridors with little to do. They fill the cafeterias for coffee breaks at 10, 11, 3 and 4 o'clock. There are so many of these political hangers-on in nearly every agency that they are known in Washington as the "corridor corps." They write memos to one another and do "busy" work in order to camouflage the fact that they are really just holding political jobs — playing a cat and mouse game to see if the new Republican Administration has the nerve to fire them.

The elimination of this payroll padding would be a fulfillment of Republican campaign promises and a service to the overburdened American taxpayers. The financial saving would be the least important benefit. Far more significant would be the substantive changes from the disastrous LBJ policies and the improved morale of the many dedicated employees who work hard and really earn their salaries.

**2. Use the technique called "reorganization" in order to bring Republicans into the Federal Government at every echelon.** This is a perfectly legal and ethical administrative device for outmaneuvering Civil Service in order to fire Democrats and hire Republicans. The President can abolish agencies, bureaus, divisions and jobs — and then create new ones. He can make up different titles for the same old jobs so they are available for new personnel.

After all, isn't that what the American people voted for last November 5? Civil Service should **not** be permitted to stand in the way of the policy changes for which we voted so decisively.

The technique of "reorganization"  
(Continued on page 3)

# What Clifford Revealed As He Left The Pentagon

The day before Clark Clifford went out of office as Secretary of Defense, he sent to Congress a 155-page "posture statement" on the U. S. defense program and budget for the 1969-70 fiscal year. In this statement, Secretary Clifford made two revealing admissions of truths which he had sought to hide during the 1968 election campaign. In October 1968 he had issued political statements designed to elect Hubert Humphrey by deceiving the American public about the way Soviet nuclear power is growing and U. S. nuclear power is declining.

This is another example of the significant difference between what Secretaries Clifford and Robert McNamara told the Congressmen (who have access to the truth), and the claims Clifford and McNamara made to the public (whom the bureaucratic Democrats consider — in Harry Hopkins' famous words — "too damned dumb to understand").

In his January 18, 1969 statement to Congress, Secretary Clifford conceded that "the rate of increase [of the Soviet missile force] over the past year has been somewhat greater than estimated over a year ago."

In other words, Clifford admitted that the earlier figures given out by himself and by McNamara were erroneous, and that the Soviets in fact are increasing their missiles faster than Clifford, McNamara and the

Pentagon Whiz Kids had calculated with their "computer" brains.

Clifford then concluded: "However, we believe the rate of [Soviet] increase will be considerably smaller over the next two or three years." He offered no evidence to support that prediction. In fact, the evidence is completely contrary as shown by the Center for Strategic Studies Report entitled *The Soviet Military Technological Challenge*.

In his January 18 statement, Clifford conceded that the U.S.S.R. has **nearly quadrupled** its missile force in the last two years. During these same two years, McNamara and Clifford did not permit a single new strategic missile to be added to the U. S. force, but kept our number stationary and allowed the Soviets to catch and surpass us.

Clifford then stated that the Soviets have slowed down work on their anti-missile defenses. He cited absolutely no evidence in support of this (as pointed out by *U. S. News & World Report*). In fact, the evidence is that the Soviets are proceeding very rapidly with new defensive and offensive weapons.

Clifford made a very revealing admission about the U. S. anti-missile system which should silence its opponents once and for all. In defending the Sentinel, or "thin," anti-missile system, on which construction is scheduled soon to begin, Clifford said: Without a Sentinel defense sys-

tem, as many as 23 million Americans could be killed in a nuclear attack; but with such a system, they could be held to a million or less.

Using Clifford's own arithmetic, this means that the Sentinel would save 22 out of 23 million possible fatalities — a survival factor of 95%.

Inadvertently, Clifford has thus, given the best possible argument in favor of expanding the Sentinel into the "thick" anti-missile system which the U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously recommended for more than three years. If the anti-missile system is so good that it would save 95% of the 23 million Americans who would be killed in a nuclear attack from Red China — then it would save a substantial majority and possibly up to 95% of the 160 million Americans who would be killed in a nuclear attack from the far more powerful Soviet Union. Any defensive system which is up to 95% effective is so very "cost-effective" that we MUST build it as soon as possible.

Thus, Clifford's last statement before leaving the Defense Department proves that:

1) the LBJ Defense Department erroneously, foolishly and dangerously underestimated the growing missile power of the Soviet Union, and

2) erroneously and willfully stalled for 3½ years and refused to build a U. S. defensive system which Clifford now admits is 95% effective against an enemy missile attack.

## Patronage Is The Name Of The Game

(Continued from page 2)

requires a few smart and skillful lower-echelon employees to do the necessary detail work. If the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations could find such employees, there is no reason why the Nixon Administration cannot do it, too. It is simply a matter of having the will to do it.

The Democrats used this political tool with consummate skill in order to pack the Government with liberal Democrats. If Republicans fail to use this tool, no one will thank them for their gentlemanliness. The verdict at the polls will be that Republicans just don't know how to run with the ball after it is handed to them.

**3. Eliminate all the "consultants" on the Government payroll.**

There are thousands of so-called "consultants" who work varying amounts of time for various Federal agencies at a *per diem* of \$75 to \$100. One of Kennedy's first acts after becoming President was to send all the consultants then on the payroll a cordial soft-soap letter thanking them profusely for all their past services, and informing them that the new Administration was eliminating all consultants and therefore would have no further need of their services. A couple of months later, Kennedy hired all new consultants of his own choosing.

The new Republican Administration not only *can* — but *should* — do likewise if we are to have real policy changes in Government.

### Your Part In The Task

Every Republican Governor, Senator, Congressman, National Committeeman, National Committeewoman, State Chairman, and State Vice Chairman should already be pushing hard to get his or her Republican constituents on the Federal payroll. They should reject the nonsense that there are only some 3,000 Federal jobs to be filled. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs which must be turned over to Republicans if we are to accomplish policy changes.

The new Republican Administration is already feeling the pressure from the holdovers who want to remain. We must see to it that the new Republican Administration feels a greater pressure from Republicans for

(Continued on page 4)

## Women's Convention To Be In Washington, D.C. (!)

The 1969 Biennial Convention of the National Federation of Republican Women will take place in Washington, D. C. in September, it was announced in January.

Well, well. In her bid for continued control of the National Federation, President Gladys O'Donnell does not dare to hold the Convention anywhere in the United States except in Washington, D. C., where her office can manipulate credentialing of delegates and other Convention business, and where the eastern liberals can be conveniently bussed in to dominate the voting.

The tradition of the National Federation of Republican Women was always that Conventions should alternate between east and west and be held in a different city each year. In 1965, the then NFRW president, Mrs. Dorothy Elston, forced two changes in the NFRW Bylaws in order to take the Convention away from California, where the Board had voted to hold it, and stage it instead in Washington, D. C.

There were two reasons behind this move. (1) Mrs. Elston's candidate to succeed herself was Gladys O'Donnell, who hailed from California, and it was generally known that she could never be elected if the Convention were held in her own state because

the women who knew her best did not support her. (2) Having the Convention in Washington enabled the Rockefeller-Romney group to bring in busloads carrying hundreds of women directly from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan. These women were not legitimate delegates, many of them were not eligible to vote because their states were delinquent in NFRW dues, they were not registered as required by the Bylaws, they arrived after the polls were opened, they never went to the Convention floor, they were taken directly to the polling area to vote for Mrs. O'Donnell, and then bussed immediately back to their states.

Furthermore, holding the Convention in Washington, D. C. made it easy for the Convention business to be controlled by the staff from the Washington office, instead of by delegates elected from the Federation clubs.

By scheduling the 1969 Convention *again* in Washington, D. C., Mrs. O'Donnell has confessed that she dare not risk a majority vote of the clubs in the National Federation of Republican Women. What a farce for an organization which calls itself "National"! What an admission of weakness by the O'Donnell clique! What a demonstration of steamroller

control from the top down — instead of grassroots control from the bottom up! What an insult to all the women in the middle west, southern and western parts of the United States who are tired of trekking to Washington so often — especially for meetings in which they are treated like sheep and denied an honest vote!

Who picked the location of Washington, D. C.? Mrs. Elston changed the Bylaws so that this authority was taken away from the Board of Directors, on which all states are represented, and given instead to the hand-picked Executive Committee.

The National Federation of Republican Women should change its name and call itself the Washington, D. C. Club of Republican Women. It has forfeited its right to call itself "National" and it has forfeited its right to call itself a "Federation" of voluntary, independent clubs.

It is most unfortunate that the Conventions of the Women's Federation are now controlled by those who publicly refused to support the Republican nominee for President in 1964, who bitterly opposed and criticized the nomination of Richard Nixon at Miami in 1968, and who refused to cooperate with conservatives in order to carry their states for Nixon last November 5.

## Patronage Is The Name Of The Game

(Continued from page 3)

patronage so that it will be compelled to find the skillful experts in "re-organization" who can do the "impossible."

Some 30,000 Republicans jammed into Washington to celebrate President Nixon's Inauguration. If every one of these people were hired to replace Democrats, this would be only one percent of the three million Federal employees. This would only be a healthy start on the turning over of Federal jobs.

Every State should keep a scorecard on Federal appointments. Make sure that conservatives get their fair share of appointments. Make sure that women get their fair share of appointments. Above all, make sure that Republicans are appointed. Until every State has received appointments in the thousands, it is not possible to have any significant change in policies. Just as precinct workers oft-

en rate their county chairman by the number of jobs he can get for his county, State Party officials can also be rated on how many Federal jobs they secure for their constituents.

Among the most active of Republican workers are the volunteers who labor — not for a job or political favor — but simply because they want their children to grow up in a free and independent America. These volunteers must realize the importance of patronage to the achievement of their idealistic objectives. It is the key to policy changes. It is the lifeblood of politics because it means money, power, influence, and votes. If patronage is not properly used for the objectives of good government, it will surely be used very powerfully against us. President Nixon must have the help of employees who believe in good government — **not** be handcuffed by the architects of the mess we are in.

## A Choice Not An Echo

On January 8, the Huntley-Brinkley TV Newscast showed Senator Barry Goldwater speaking before a large audience of newspaper editors in Washington. He started his remarks with these words:

"It certainly is good to be back in the Senate. I guess this year I was the choice, and not the echo."

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.  
Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund — \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15c each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4.