



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 2, NO. 12

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY 1969

## Shift To The Right — Rift On The Left

The conservative swing in America today is now so obvious that it cannot be denied by even the most extreme liberals. Law-and-order candidates scored upset victories over liberals in mayoralty elections in such widely separated and different electorates as in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York, and left the liberals howling in anguish. The optimism of conservatives has been dramatically restored — if liberals can be defeated in New York City, then it should be easy to save the rest of the country!

The cup of the conservatives is overflowing with success when they reflect on the June 24 ratification of the nomination of Otto Otepka by the U.S. Senate by the comfortable margin of 61 to 28.

President Richard Nixon expressed by word and gesture the clear message of the 1969 conservative election victories when he said at his press conference on June 19: "The American people in our cities, in our small towns, and in this country are fed up to here with violence and lawlessness, and they want candidates who will take a strong stand against it. And I think that is the message for the candidate in the future."

Indeed it is! Conservatives have been telling candidates this for a long time. But some politicians had to learn their lesson the hard way. Here are some revealing press comments about the recent shift to the right:

James Reston, the oracle of *The New York Times*, concluded: "If you have any doubt about the political swing to the right in the United States, all you have to do is look around. The reaction has set in from California to New York, and the main question now is how far it will go. . . . Probably the most obvious indication of the turn to the right was President Nixon's appointment of Warren Burger of Minnesota to be Chief Justice of the United States. . . . It is not the politicians who are driving the people to the right, but the people who are driving even liberal politicians in that direction."

The liberal *Newsweek* simply couldn't believe what happened. Showing its shock at the way the pollsters bit the dust when the results of the Los Angeles election came in, *Newsweek* offered this explanation for the "surprise turnabout" in Los Angeles: "Something happened to L.A.'s voters on the way to the polls."

The liberal *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* remarked:

"Political observers have little doubt that what appears to be a growing national trend toward conservatism was evident in the New York primary."

The columnist Victor Riesel wrote a most astute column on the new conservative wave: "In this nation there is a draft to the right and a rift on the left. The citizenry, weary of power brokers, irritated by being pressure-cooked, no longer is deliverable or predictable. . . . The liberals are cannibalizing each other. The conservatives are not. No liberal bloc can deliver — whether it is liberal labor, liberal Democrat, liberal Republican. . . ."

"There was just no bloc delivery to any candidate. The White House couldn't deliver. The Cabinet couldn't. The old "Ike" coalition of Tom Dewey and Herbert Brownell couldn't. The Kennedys couldn't. The labor movement couldn't — neither its Committee on Political Education (COPE), nor the Teamsters, nor the auto workers. The ethnic and racial groups couldn't."

### Surprise in the Big Cities

The base of liberal power has always been in the big cities. If the liberals are to win anywhere, it must be in the big cities. Yet, on May 27 in Los Angeles, the conservative candidate, Sam Yorty (an independent Democrat who had backed Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon), defeated Thomas Bradley, a Negro liberal (who had the backing of the powerful *Los Angeles Times*, the Democratic organization, most prominent leaders of both parties, and out-of-staters including Teddy Kennedy and Charles Percy).

The *Los Angeles Times* groaned afterwards: "Yorty's triumph was even more significant because it proved the validity of his campaign strategy to capitalize on the 'law and order' feeling among citizens frightened and disturbed by student and racial unrest."

On June 10 in Minneapolis, the conservative candidate, Charles Stenvig (a police detective who had never been elected to anything before), won a landslide 2-to-1 victory over the liberal candidate, Dan Cohen (who had the backing of both Republican and Democratic party organizations, Governor Levander, and President Nixon). Stenvig proved that a conservative-oriented candidate can win in the big cities without the support of a major political party. Stenvig's campaign slogan was "strong, fair, impartial law enforcement toward everyone."

(Continued on Page 2)

# Shift To The Right — Rift On The Left

(Continued from Page 1)

On June 17 in the Republican primary in New York City, the conservative John Marchi defeated the incumbent Mayor John Lindsay, the darling of the liberals. So little known was Marchi that 65 Republican Congressmen and 24 Senators were con ned into endorsing Lindsay because they did not know he had a *Republican* opponent in the primary. Meanwhile, in the Democratic primary, the law-and-order candidate Mario Proccaccino won the nomination by defeating the liberal candidates.

Other elections revealed the same trend. On the same day that Yorty was elected, conservatives in Los Angeles scored a smashing victory over two incumbent liberal members of the Board of Education. Also in the same election, the voters elected a strong 5-to-2 conservative majority for the first Board of Trustees for Los Angeles' eight junior colleges.

On the same day that Lindsay was defeated, a Polish-American housewife, Alfreda W. Slominski, running for mayor of Buffalo as a champion of law and order and neighborhood schools, won a 2-to-1 victory in the Republican primary over a Lindsay-like opponent.

Also on the same day, Jersey City Mayor Thomas J. Whelan, running on a law-and-order plank, was reelected. Jersey City has all the racial and poverty problems that big cities face today, but Mayor Whelan, an ex-fighter pilot, was reelected because of the leadership he has displayed in handling them. He gave Jersey City police this order: "Meet force with superior force, from the outset. . . . No mercy on the lawless." As a result of his policy of supporting his local police, Jersey City's crime rate has been only 25% of what it is in New York City, and only a fraction of what it is in nearby Newark.

These elections are already having a salutary effect in other areas. Liberal Mayor Jerome Cavanagh of Detroit suddenly announced that he would not seek another term. *The New York Times* reported: "Generally speaking, Mayors attending the United States Conference of Mayors' annual meeting in Pittsburgh saw Mayor Lindsay's primary defeat as the continuation of a national trend toward law-and-order candidates."

Also, on the same day as the New York City election, the voters in Cali-



**President Nixon illustrating at his press conference how the American people "are fed up to here" with crime and violence.**

fornia, in a special election to fill a vacancy in the California Legislature, elected Republican Robert G. Wood. Wood polled more votes than the combined total of his four opponents in the 34th Assembly District and thereby assured Republicans continued control of both houses of the Legislature.

This was the third straight victory for Republicans in special elections in California this year. Governor Ronald Reagan, who campaigned actively for the victorious Wood, made this assessment of Wood's victory: "It was a contest fought on the important issues of the day, such as fiscal responsibility in government, support and respect for the law, not only as it pertains to campus disturbances, but also crime." A Sacramento newspaper concluded that this election was "another indication of the conservative political trend in California."

## Liberals Well-Financed

In nearly all these recent elections, the liberal candidates have had overwhelming advantages of lavish financial backing, strong support of the press, and the psychological head start of favorable predictions by the polltakers. Most politicians consider that the psychology of impending victory adds significantly to a candidate's vote total, perhaps as much as 10%. In all the big-city elections, the

conservative candidate had an uphill fight from the start.

In the Los Angeles election, all the polls showed Yorty so far behind that one wonders how he was able to raise any money at all or keep any campaign workers active to the end. The last week before the election, the poll sponsored by the *Los Angeles Times* showed Bradley 53% and Yorty only 36%, a seemingly insurmountable lead for the liberal. This was confirmed by the Field poll which showed Bradley 43% and Yorty only 38%. After the election, the *Los Angeles Times* conceded that Yorty's victory was "doubly sweet [to conservatives] because both major public opinion polls prior to Tuesday's election had indicated that Yorty was going down to defeat."

*The New York Times* showed its surprise at the results of the New York election by reporting: "Political leaders in both parties were surprised by the defeat of Mr. Lindsay in the Republican primary and former Mayor Wagner in the Democratic primary. Many repeated the words of Mr. Low, a defeated candidate for City Council President, who said: 'I need a couple of days before I can make a rational decision.'"

The Evans and Novak syndicated column gave some details on how the money rolled into liberal Tom Bradley's campaign chest. In just one dinner party in Beverly Hills, \$160,000 was raised from 20 California tycoons, an establishment group which included key contributors to both the Republican and the Democratic parties. Evans and Novak reported that the dinner guests "pledged \$3,000 each to Bradley's campaign even before they sat down to dinner." By the end of the dinner, each had also promised to "sign a \$5,000 note for the Bradley campaign, repayable if Bradley won but to be forgotten if Yorty were re-elected." This was "a fund-raising feat of presidential proportions, probably unprecedented on the municipal level."

In New York, John Lindsay is reported to have outspent his conservative opponent by 4-to-1. *The New York Times* reported that Governor Nelson Rockefeller contributed \$50,000 to Lindsay's campaign. But that was only the beginning. In the final

(Continued on Page 3)

## Shift To The Right

(Continued from Page 2)

weeks, Lindsay's friends in the Nixon Cabinet, Romney and Finch, came across with \$70 million in Federal grants. To anyone who knows the realities of politics, it is difficult to see how any candidate could have defeated an incumbent with that kind of financial backing.

The overwhelming advantage of publicity and Federal help that Lindsay enjoyed over Marchi was well described by *The New York Times* the day before the election when Lindsay was photographed at the White House with Vice President Agnew announcing New York's acquisition of a major part of the Brooklyn Army Terminal. In the preceding weeks, Lindsay had "met with every Cabinet officer, obtained Federal funds for Breezy Point Park, job training and industrial development, was host to four Cabinet officers who visited the city, and was photographed alongside President Nixon during a recent visit of big-city Mayors."

Republicans in New York City must have concluded that money and publicity aren't everything. After four years of Lindsay, there are approximately 300 more murders annually than when he went into office, 50,000 more robberies, and 50,000 more burglaries. Lindsay has demoralized the city police. Under his administration, the welfare rolls in New York City climbed from 400,000 to one million. The respected publication *Barron's Weekly* concluded that the Lindsay regime was "a civic disaster, on the scale, say, of the San Francisco earthquake or the Chicago fire." Good-looking John Lindsay was the Golden Boy of the liberal eastern Republican establishment, but Republican voters obviously concluded that "there is less to him than meets the eye."

There was no particular reason for Republicans to vote for Lindsay anyway. As a Congressman, Lindsay consistently voted against his party's national policies. When he ran for Mayor, he refused to identify himself as a Republican. In 1964, he refused to support Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater. In 1968, he and other liberal New York Republicans prevented Nixon from carrying New York State by refusing to let the Conservative Party (which polled

500,000 votes) put Nixon and Agnew on its ballot.

After his defeat in the Republican primary, Lindsay showed bad grace, poor sportsmanship, and uncontrolled antagonism toward the Republican Party by making one of the bitterest statements ever made by a loser about the winner. Lindsay accused Marchi of hanging "onto the coattails of fear and reaction and the backlash," of standing for "negativism" and "the ultra-right," and of appealing to the "forces of hatred and divisiveness." Lindsay still has a chance to be elected Mayor of New York City in the general election — but not as the candidate of the Republican Party.

The only other time on national record when a Republican was so viciously attacked in the primary by other Republicans was the 1952 smear against Senator Robert Taft. One of the principal hatchetmen who devised that smear was Tom Dewey's campaign manager, New York attorney Herbert Brownell. It is quite a coincidence that John Lindsay told *The New York Times*: "Herb Brownell is the closest adviser I've got. . . . Herb Brownell has total wisdom."

### We Knew It All Along

The only people who weren't surprised by these conservative victories were those who have been saying for some time that the American people are basically conservative and ripe to reject the liberal policies which have led us into debt, defeat, disorder, and dishonor.

On October 8, 1968, Congressman John Ashbrook released a study made by the American Conservative Union entitled "How Conservative Are Americans?" This report had the whole story nine months ago. The ACU examined the findings of the major polltakers, including Gallup and Harris, on issues, as opposed to candidates. This study concluded: "The conservative Republican position was the most popular. . . . Clearly, conservatism is the philosophy of the American people."

Here are the major areas where Americans support the conservative position, according to the ACU study: (1) the belief that the Federal Government has too much power and that big government is more of a threat

## ABM Resolution

*The following Resolution was passed in a state meeting by the Illinois Federation of Republican Women on May 15, and also by the Missouri Federation of Republican Women in a state meeting on June 6:*

Whereas, on April 18, 1969 President Richard Nixon said: "I'm going to fight as hard as I can for the anti-ballistic missile system because I believe it is absolutely necessary to the security of the country," and

Whereas, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird provided ample evidence for this decision, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in March 1969,

Resolved, that the Illinois (Missouri) Federation of Republican Women declare its full support of President Nixon's proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system and urge the Congress and the Defense Department to proceed with the rapid deployment of ABM defenses to protect our nation from any Soviet or Red Chinese nuclear attack. ■

than big business and big labor combined; (2) opposition to Federal aid to education and to busing for integration; (3) support of public prayer in public schools; (4) opposition to trade with Communist countries; (5) the belief that foreign aid should be decreased; (6) the belief that taxes are too high; (7) the belief that a person should not be forced to join a union.

On December 2, 1968, the Harris poll confirmed these earlier findings by reporting: "America is in a politically conservative mood. . . . Seventy percent of the people classify themselves as either 'conservative' or 'middle of the road' in their politics.

. . . Clearly, a vast majority of Americans in 1968 see themselves removed from the 'liberal' side of politics." If the polltakers would stick to issues — and not try to pick our candidates for us — they would improve their professional reputation.

The American people have grown more conservative in philosophy during the past few years. Candidates who want to win should support conservative principles. The 1969 elections have shown the way. ■

