

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

of a revival.

Their survey of 40 Republican and 30 Democratic state party chairmen suggests that the GOP is faring better. [Nevertheless, the Democrats hold 34 governorships, the Republicans only 16.] More than half the Republican state party organizations report annual budgets above \$500,000; the majority of their Democratic counterparts spend less than \$250,000. All but a few of the chairmen say that their organizations retain full-time staff members, an unheard-of luxury 20 years ago. GOP staffs average twice the size of their Democratic counterparts.

Reacting to the threat that the "new politics" of TV and political action committees (PACs) would make them irrelevant, most state parties now offer party candidates an array of modern campaign services—public opinion polls, seminars on campaign techniques, media consulting. The GOP generally offers more support: Three-quarters of the Republican state parties and 46 percent of the Democratic ones hired media consultants.

Such strategies appear to be paying off. The state party chairmen estimate that governors, state legislators, congressmen, and local officials are about as active in party affairs as they were in 1960.

Once the backbone of the two-party system, the state parties owe part of their revival to aid from the Democratic and Republican National Committees—data processing services, voter registration efforts, and managerial help, as well as money. Again, the GOP has the edge: State Republicans received \$7.4 million from Washington during the 1984 elections; Democrats \$5.2 million.

Ironically, say the authors, well-intentioned state reform laws, not TV or PACs, now most threaten the resurgence of state parties. Open primaries, ballots that provide no opportunity to vote a straight ticket, and strict regulation of internal party governance all hamper Democrats and Republicans and dampen partisan loyalties among voters.

Politics and Dollars

"Congress's Appetite for Controversial Campaign Finance Reforms Diminishing" by Maxwell Glen, in *National Journal* (Mar. 16, 1985), 1730 M St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

On Capitol Hill, anxiety over the influence of big money and political action committees (PACs) on elections for federal office is widespread. Nevertheless, reports Glen, a *National Journal* contributing editor, campaign finance reform proposals have what one congressman calls "a snowball's chance in you know where of passing."

The reasons are not hard to find. Start with partisan politics. Neither Democratic nor Republican incumbents wish to surrender fund-raising advantages they enjoy under current law. Furthermore, notes Glen, "campaign finance is an issue to which every Member of Congress brings personal experience." Attitudes toward reform frequently cut across party lines.

The campaign finance laws on the books today are the result of four

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

bills passed during the 1970s. Individuals can contribute up to \$1,000 to each congressional candidate, PACs up to \$5,000. (In 1976, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional any limits on spending by the candidates and on "independent expenditures" by noncampaign organizations.) A 1979 amendment permitted unlimited spending on grass roots activities by political parties. The result, unforeseen at the time, was a vast advantage for the Republicans, thanks to their fundraising prowess. Ever since, Glen writes, both parties have been on guard against "hidden agendas" in reform proposals.

There is no shortage of reform ideas. But one that seems logical to some outside observers is moribund: Public financing of congressional campaigns could not win approval on Capitol Hill even during the 1970s, when Democratic supporters of the plan were strongest. Many of them, notably Senator William Proxmire (D.-Wis.), now favor granting tax credits to campaign contributors if the candidate agrees to limits on his donations from PACs and on his total campaign outlays. Like public financing, however, that plan could cost taxpayers (indirectly) a sizable dollar amount.

Senator David L. Boren (D.-Okla.) advocates a \$100,000 ceiling on the amount House candidates could receive from PACs. But many of his fellow Democrats are unenthusiastic. PAC money often benefits Democrats more than Republicans: Incumbent House Democrats raised 45 percent of their 1984 campaign funds from PACs; Democratic challengers 30 percent. The comparable figures for GOP candidates were 37 and 17 percent.

Without another Watergate to inflame public opinion, Glen concludes, campaign finance reform is dead in the water. About the only thing Congress is likely to agree on this year is the creation of a bipartisan panel to study the issue.

FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE

Arms Control

"Pie in the Sky" by Theodore Draper, in *The New York Review of Books* (Feb. 14, 1985), P.O. Box 940, Farmingdale, N.Y. 11737.

As a new round of Soviet-American arms control talks commences in Geneva, the Reagan administration's negotiating position is still experiencing "bureaucratic birth pangs." Draper, a historian, detects its rough outlines in articles published by administration officials.

He does not like what he sees.

In *Foreign Affairs* (Winter 1984-85), U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency director Kenneth Adelman and Paul H. Nitze, special U.S. State Department adviser on arms control, present what Draper describes as "studies in ambivalence."