

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files
Folder Title: Committee for the Survival of a
Free Congress (1 of 3)
Box: 5

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name BLACKWELL, MORTON: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 6/7/2010

File Folder COMMITTEE FOR THE SURVIVAL OF A FREE
CONGRESS (1)

FOIA

F09-0043/01

Box Number 9076

STRAUSS, C

7

DOC NO	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
-----------	----------	----------------------	----------------	----------	--------------

1	LETTER	BLACKWELL TO PAUL WEYRICH RE CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY WEYRICH	2	10/16/1981	B6
---	--------	---	---	------------	----

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.



Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress

721 SECOND STREET, N.E. • CAPITOL HILL • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 • (202) 546-3000

August 23, 1982

Mr. Hugh C. Newton
Hugh C. Newton & Associates
618 South Lee Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Hugh:

You err in suggesting that I write the "Alice in Wonderland" columns for the Washington Times. I state absolutely and categorically that I do not write them directly or indirectly and do not supply materials for them. Moreover, the identity of who does write the column remains a mystery. If you find out who is responsible, you tell me; and if I find out, I'll tell you.

Best personal regards,

Sincerely,

Paul M. Weyrich
Director

bcc: Dick Thompson
Dick Dingman
Ed Feulner
Phil Trulock
Morton Blackwell
Margo Carlisle
Jade West
Kathy Teague
Bob Walker
Dave Hoppe
Newt Gingrich

Howard Phillips
Ron Godwin
Terry Dolan
Mike Corby
Richard Viguerie
Jim Whelan
Bob McAdam

Remarks Presenting First Amendment Award
of the Free Congress Foundation to
Patrick Buchanan
May 18, 1983
Capitol Hill Quality Inn, Washington, D.C.
by Morton C. Blackwell

Our honoree is:

A conservative commentator who does not insist Americans are under-taxed, who doesn't write books praising the welfare state;

A conservative columnist who does not require his readers to buy an English-Latin dictionary in order to understand him;

A conservative writer who does not intend merely to be a gadfly to pester the opposition;

A conservative television personality who does not mechanically sell out on every third public issue in order to keep his image blurred;

A conservative radio broadcaster who understands and has mastered confrontational politics;

An author who does not aspire to be the liberals' favorite conservative;

A conservative communicator who, in the heat of battle, continues to combine flawless logic with the most persuasive rhetoric;

A strategist whose proper place in life is on the senior staff of a conservative Republican White House.

Willmoore Kendall, challenged on his spelling of a word by someone who quoted a dictionary against him, replied, "I am one of those people to whom dictionary compilers come as their source of what is correct."

Our honoree lacks the hubris ever to make such a claim, but for many of us he sets the standard for political analysis and good sense: Pat Buchanan.



file
CSFE

Thought this would be of interest to you.

Paul M. Weyrich



MEMO TO: George Strake

FROM: Paul Weyrich

DATE: April 11, 1983

In our recent conversations, we discussed the need of Republicans in Texas to attract blue-collar/working class voters. I have assembled some suggestions for you to consider as things the Texas Republican party can do to accomplish this task.

You are confronted with a situation where the average blue-collar worker has a basically conservative philosophy, yet his traditionally Democratic voting patterns present some very tough barriers to overcome. The key is to construct a bridge to allow that voter to cross-over to the Republican side, as well as the motivation to do so. There are at least two general approaches to attracting blue-collar voters to the Republican side which ought to be pursued. One such approach would be to present the Republican party as an attractive alternative where this traditional Democrat would be welcome and comfortable. Another such approach is to provide the bridges through individual candidates, getting them to vote for a particular individual first and drawing them into the party later.

The first approach is one which requires the change of image of the Republican party in Texas. Right now, a survey of blue-collar voters in the state would reveal their image of the GOP as a party of big-money elitists. The big spending campaigns of Clements and the attitudes that accompanied that campaign feed that kind of image. No doubt this same group of voters views the Democrats as the people of the common man. With some concentrated and conscious effort, these images can be changed and possibly reversed.

The Texas GOP should attempt to sell itself to blue-collar voters as the party that understands the needs and feelings of the common individual. This must be done carefully so as to not turn off the "big money" supporters in the process. There are several ingredients in accomplishing this. Current blue-collar Republicans should be identified and moved into a visible and meaningful position within the party hierarchy. If the average voter can relate to somebody in the party leadership, they may be able to relate to the party as a whole. The GOP should take a visible role in sponsoring inexpensive and "fun" events that blue-collar voters can participate in. Holding a \$1,000 a plate dinner to hear an economist talk about returning to the gold standard will not result in giving these voters anything they can relate to. The positions of the Republican party must be put into terms that the average individual can understand. Many Republicans talk about a strong national defense in terms of numbers of launchers, or increased throw-weight. To attract these voters, the issue of strong national defense must be put in terms of protecting ourselves and other free people from the communist threat.

Once the issues are translated and attempts are made to soften the image of the party in the minds of this voting group, the GOP should be aggressive in its attempt to seek out this group and present its case. Republican speakers should spend less time speaking to Republican clubs and organizations around the state and more time seeking out non-traditional forums. Church groups in traditionally blue-collar areas are but one example of this kind of forum where Republican speakers can talk about how Republicans are the ones who are out to protect the family and the opportunity for people to get jobs and advance themselves.

MEMO TO George Strake

Page Two

While talking about the virtues of the Republican Party, it is also important to talk about the evils of the Democratic party. While many of these individuals are traditional Democratic voters, they are not supporters of the National Democratic Party's platform. Tying Texas' state Democratic leaders to the policies of the Democratic National Committee is important. I doubt that these Democratic voters are particularly interested in inviting homosexuals into their party along with increased taxes and more welfare. Undoubtedly they do not perceive Texas Democratic leaders as part of this kind of thing so that perception must be created.

While it is relatively easier to attract blue-collar voters to a particular candidate, it is relatively difficult to transfer that attraction to other candidates within the Republican party. To get blue-collar voters into a pattern of voting for Republican candidates, the GOP should make a concerted effort to recruit candidates for office levels who can attract blue-collar voters or who come from blue-collar constituencies. If this group consistently sees a candidate attractive to them running on the Republican ticket, their image of the party will change. Furthermore when these candidates do emerge, they should be given extra attention and held up as examples. I am reminded of a candidate who ran for the State House in 1982 from the Houston area, Don Venable. Had the GOP paid more attention to Venable's candidacy, which was a blue-collar effort from start to finish, he might have done better than he did and the constituency that was attracted to him might have received a better impression of the GOP.

It is essential that all candidates who are recruited by the GOP, for all offices, be trained in the dynamics of coalition politics. This kind of training will make them sensitive to the issue concerns and behavior of the various constituencies that the GOP must attract to win elections in the future. Whether it is dealing with blue-collar workers, right to lifers, or the Christian community, candidates must understand the issues that are of interest to them and the jargon needed to communicate with them. Trying to appeal to these groups simply as "Republicans" will be unsuccessful.

In addition to communicating with groups on their own terms about issues of concern to them, the GOP must also seek out new issues which will attract the attention of blue-collar voters. One such issue which is of interest to blue-collar voters nationally is that of "production sharing" which is the process of making parts here in the U.S. and having them assembled in Mexico, or other places outside the U.S. This preserves U.S. jobs without heavy government subsidies. Issues which generally relate to expanded opportunities for blue-collar workers, as well as issues which will allow for the protection of their families and future advancement for their children are among those which the GOP must champion in order to make inroads to this block of voters.

Providing the right kind of image of the Republican party and presenting candidates which can relate to blue-collar constituencies are likely to give the Republican party greater opportunities to attract blue-collar voters to their side. Breaking down the "yellow-dog Democrat" barrier is not an easy task, yet we know that it is possible because the Democratic party is out of step and out of touch with that constituency. Advertising that fact to this constituency and providing them with an acceptable alternative will greatly benefit the GOP.

PAUL M. WEYRICH
721 SECOND STREET, N.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002
202-546-3000

file C5 FC

March 30, 1983

Mr. Morton Blackwell
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Morton:

May Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ bless you and keep you during this Holy Season and throughout the year.

As someone who works each day for political victories, I know how easily one can lose a proper perspective. It is true that these victories are important. It is true that the Lord commanded us to occupy until His return.

But is also true that the ultimate victory has already been won. Satan's power, which was unleashed on mankind when our forefather Adam sinned and turned away from God, has been conquered once and for all. Satan's power is now only an illusion in reality, but unfortunately all too often we allow Satan to act as if he had real power.

As St. John Chrysostom said in the fourth century "Let no one grieve over his sins, for pardon has shone from the grave, let no one fear death, for the death of our Saviour has set us free."

Jesus Christ has indeed set us free. We are free to do His will, knowing that victory is ours. By His death, He has conquered death.

So as this glorious Easter season is again but a memory, let us join together to resolve that we will continue to go about our work for the rest of the year in the framework of this Holy time.

Christ, being Risen from the dead, has become our Leader and Reviver. To Him be all glory honor and power now and always and unto the ages of ages.

Christ is Risen! Indeed He is Risen! Happy Easter!

Sincerely,



Paul M. Weyrich

January 5, 1983

Dear Joe:

Nancy and I are very sorry that we can't be with you and Holly as so many of your friends gather to honor your well known work for conservative causes.

After the weather you have been experiencing out in Denver, this warm and special tribute must seem very welcome, indeed.

Because many of our best friends and strongest supporters are there with you, this may be just the right time to reveal some of our strategy for 1984. Of course not everything is firmed up yet, but at least one portion of our master plan seems to be falling into place: George McGovern is thinking about running for President again.

Seriously, though, Joe, I do want to express my heartfelt appreciation for the long and sometimes lonely battle you have fought in the cause of freedom for so many years. Who could ever forget the dark days when hardly any politician would admit to being a conservative? Now, with your help, we have turned that situation around. Today, hardly anyone will admit to being a liberal!

Our past successes and our progress in the future must be credited in large part to you and to the people who pay tribute to you. Thank you for your faith, your dedication, and your hard work.

Sincerely,

Mr. Joseph Coors
President
Adolph Coors Company
Golden, Colorado 80401

CALL CAROLYN SUNDSETH 2657 for delivery

RR:Livingston:-
cc: K.Osborne/M. Blackwell/J.Wells/CF

August 10, 1981
MEMORANDUM

file CSFC

We have recently learned through the press that the Justice Department intends to reincarnate the Kennedy/Carter bill to recodify the federal criminal code. That bill is being managed by a Carter holdover, Deputy Assistant Attorney General Ron Gainer, without any of the key Reagan appointees having read the bill and without consultation with any of the New Right groups which had in the past expressed concern over this legislation.

We wish to alert you that, if the bill looks anything like Kennedy's S. 1722, there is enough hidden in that legislation to alienate virtually every pro-family, pro-life, and pro-business constituency.

S. 1722 would have: (1) virtually repealed federal pornography statutes; (2) overturned the Barlow decision; (3) decriminalized marijuana; (4) substantially reduced penalties for a wide range of drug offenses; (5) created a new abortion funding program; (6) enacted into federal law the homicide statute under which Ford was prosecuted in the Pinto case; (7) enhanced federal gun control statutes; (8) increased monetary penalties for most business offenses by 99,999%; (9) created a new rule of federal criminal liability for unintentional conduct; (10) held businessmen liable for agents acting within their apparent authority, even though expressly forbidden from engaging in the unlawful conduct; (11) removed spousal immunity for rape; (12) loosened statutory rape provisions; (12) recognized common law marriage for the purpose of forcible sexual acts; (13) codified the union exemption from federal extortion statutes; (14) made it a federal crime to make any misstatement to a bureaucrat; (15) reduced penalties for manufacturing child pornography; (16) created broad new remedies for seizing business property; (17) codified provisions requiring businesses to notify customers to sue them; (18) removed any reference to the death penalty from federal criminal law; (19) created a new right of agencies to issue self-enforcing subpoenas; (20) repealed the Smith Act; (21) massively expanded the civil rights statutes to include "sex" as a "suspect classification"; (22) substantially extended employer liability for currently legal interference with unlawful strikes; (23) expanded federal criminal jurisdiction on a wide variety of business-related fronts; and (24) repealed the Logan Act, to name but a few.

At the end of last year, Gainer had refused to reach a satisfactory compromise on most of these provisions. Furthermore, despite the explicit instructions of Senators Thurmond and McClure, Justice Department lawyers have refused to even meet with the Senate staff attorney who last year negotiated over pro-family concerns.

Given the hundreds of deficiencies in the recodification bill, it is our assessment that the President's anti-crime package would do better if it could be considered independently of the political and substantive problems which the recodification bill would raise.

JES copy

Bill Billings, National Christian Action Coalition
Paul Brown, Life Amendment PAC
Judie Brown, American Life Lobby
Jack Clayton, American Association of Christian Schools
Kathleen Teague, American Legislative Exchange Council
Paul Fisher, The Wanderer
Louise Ropog, Family America, Inc.
Mary Jane Wright, Concerned Women for America
Howard Phillips, The Conservative Caucus
Peter Gemma, National Pro-Life PAC
John Metcalfe, Family Protection Lobby
Ed Rowe, Roundtable Issues & Answers Inc.
Gary Jarmin, Christian Voice
Phyllis Schafly, Eagle Forum
Onalee McGraw, National Coalition for Children
Kirk Kidwell, Christian Inquirer
Neil Blair, Free the Eagle
Paul Dietrich, The Fund for a Conservative Majority
Dr. Ron Godwin, Moral Majority
Gary Potter, Catholics for Christian Political Action

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 1, 1981

Mr. Paul Weyrich
CFFC
721 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

Dear Paul:

I'm pleased that you were able to switch your program on October 27 so that I can be the luncheon speaker rather than the breakfast speaker.

I'm sorry for the trouble this has caused you, and I'll be there - - barring any unforeseen emergency.

Best regards,



Lyn Nofziger

Maiselle
FBI
File
Si

MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Weyrich
FROM: Tom Farr
RE: National Labor Relations Board

May 5, 1981

The National Labor Relations Board presently is a captured agency for organized labor. The three Board Members and the General Counsel are left-wing ideologues committed to government intervention and the supremacy of collective rights over individual rights.

There currently are two openings on the Board. The need to fill these two positions with conservative management attorneys is crucial. Even if two conservatives are named, they still will be outnumbered three to two. If a conservative majority ever is to be established, it is essential that the first steps be taken now.

There are five candidates to fill the two positions. The three good candidates are Milo Price, Bob Hunter, and Bill Brown. Price is a Regional Director for the NLRB and appears to be the leading candidate. The Teamsters have attempted to cash a chip on Bill Brown, who philosophically is an exceptional candidate. Secretary Donovan appears to be pushing Brown, who is a partner in a Texas labor law firm. Bob Hunter is Chief Counsel to the Labor Committee and also is very good. Hunter was the team leader for the Heritage Foundation's report on the Department of Labor and the NLRB. All of the Republican Senators on the Committee have recommended to the President that Hunter serve as Chairman of the NLRB.

Susan Robfogle, a Republican attorney from Rochester, also has emerged as a candidate. Robfogle almost was named to the NLRB by President Carter last year. Her husband is a major fund-raiser for the Democratic Party in Rochester. A reliable source through Right-to-Work claims Robfogle and her husband are "opportunistic attorneys who play both sides of the aisle." A local conservative leader in Rochester claims that after 15 years in local politics, he never once has seen Robfogle at a conservative function. On April 29, Robfogle was endorsed by the Communications Workers of America. CWA is extremely active politically and extremely left-wing. They are deadly enemies of Ronald Reagan and every pos-

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 6, 1981

TO: Elizabeth H. Dole
FROM: Morton C. Blackwell

Here are two items in which Paul Weyrich outlines his information regarding the meeting of the Child Welfare League of America last week.

First is an internal memo to his Free Congress Foundation leadership.

Second is the rough draft of the text of his next Weyrich Report newsletter. This second is unedited, but you had asked for the information as soon as possible.

st
pr

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Foundation

FROM: Paul Weyrich

DATE: May 1, 1981

At the Child Welfare League of America meeting in Minneapolis we were treated to a number of presentations by members of the Welfare Establishment who articulated their posture with regard to the President's economic program. As a matter of fact, I would say that as a tax exempt organization, the Child Welfare League was engaged in a good deal of lobbying as well as legislative information at their conference which was attended by upwards of 1500 people from several midwestern states. The interesting thing about the conference is that it received no press attention, even though that many were gathered at the Lemington Hotel in Minneapolis. Neither the Minneapolis paper nor the St. Paul paper covered it. None of the television stations covered the conference, although there were a number of widely known and nationally prominent speakers there with excellent credentials in the welfare field.

One of these was Jack Calhoun, the director of the Center for Government Affairs of the Child Welfare League of America in Washington. Calhoun was an official of Carter's Department of Health and Human Services and left that position to take this new position as essentially the Legislative Director of the Child Welfare League's operation. He is an impressive individual, very bright and extremely articulate. He was able to present to the delegates a very concise picture of where the Welfare Establishment stood with regard to the President's economic program and where they should fight. It was quite clear to Calhoun that in all probability the President would prevail in the fight over the budget in the House of Representatives. He presumed of course that the President would prevail in the Republican controlled Senate but he indicated that indeed a major fight was ahead in the House of Representatives, and that the Welfare Establishment was backing the Jones alternative budget. He said that he and various liberals had prevailed upon Representative David Obey of Wisconsin to introduce another alternative budget which he said the Black Caucus may or may not support. He indicated they might have yet another alternative budget of their own. In any case he said that the liberals wanted the alternative budget in order to make the Jones budget the moderate budget. Of course he argued that it was in fact the moderate budget. He said that the Obey budget was what the Welfare Establishment really wanted but that they were pragmatic enough to understand that they couldn't get that kind of budget in this sort of atmosphere and so they were ready and willing to take the Jones budget. The Jones budget, he said, kept figures on social welfare spending a little higher than President Reagan's budget but most important it kept the various institutions alive because it did not include the provision which President Reagan is fighting for on the folding of various categorical programs into block grants. Indeed most of the discussion by Calhoun centered around block grants. As other speakers indicated, the Welfare Establishment intends to make its real fight over block grants but intends to do as well as it can on the President's budget fight because the absence of a strong contest in the budget fight would make the fight over block grants, which they considered to be the essential fight, more difficult. He said that there was great optimism with regard to the block grant proposal. He said that as far as the Child Welfare League of America (and the Coalition which had been established with other welfare organizations) their major efforts would be to preserve Title XX. He said that because of the efforts of various welfare organizations

the mail was changing, that it had been overwhelmingly in support of the President Reagan's program but that it had now changed to about 50/50 to most members of Congress which they had monitored and indeed had even tipped over 60/40 in their favor to Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia which has given Senator Nunn a good deal of pause because he had supported the President's program thus far and is now taking another look at the situation.

He said that the Welfare Establishment should not be discouraged because the pattern of Ronald Reagan was to begin his administration with a great flourish and then settle down to the pragmatics of practical politics later on. For example, he said when Reagan came into office in California he went after two hundred programs but in the end he was able to only curtail 40 of them because of the grassroots sentiment which was stirred up in California. So he said if the Child Welfare League supporters as well as other welfare groups do their job, many of the block grant proposals which Reagan has advanced will in fact be defeated. He indicated that while the President was probably prepared to veto some legislation, if there was a strong enough vote, the White House would probably go along in order to save other programs. He then went into various members of Congress who he said had indicated support for the Child Welfare League in one way or another. He was particularly praiseworthy of Congressman John Rousselot of California who he said was a premiere conservative long-time hard-liner now on the Ways and Means Committee, and who served as an official of various conservative organizations. Rousselot, he said, has committed to the Child Welfare League to support some of their efforts to keep categorical programs and he quoted Rousselot as saying that he is for budget cuts but not on the backs of children. He also had some praise for Senator Orrin Hatch and said that it just proves that nothing is black and white in this world--that if someone like Orrin Hatch could make compromises with the Child Welfare League, that no member of Congress be counted out in lobbying efforts. He also indicated that for reasons best known to the Senator, Jerry Denton wanted to keep the adolescent pregnancy program as a categorical program rather than a block grant. He said that of course the Child Welfare League should support that effort as well as any other efforts which are indicated to peel off the block grants and retain them as categorical programs. For example, he indicated that there would be a major effort on CETA, although he did not name the particular Senator involved. He said that he had testified before Senator Bob Dole and that Dole wasn't paying much attention to his testimony until he particularized the testimony and related it to Kansas. At that point Dole perked up, later had a private conversation with him, got an aide, the aide has since met with Calhoun and now Dole is very interested in some of the Welfare League proposals to keep various programs alive.

He said that the people who are arguing against the President's program should go out of their way not to argue against fighting inflation. He said that everyone supports President Reagan's goals of fighting inflation and that if the Welfare Establishment gets itself on the wrong side of that question, they will not be effective. What these various advocates should do, Calhoun said, was to learn to put their arguments in terms which are agreeable and acceptable to conservatives. For example, he indicated that in his view if certain welfare programs are curtailed now, it will end up costing the federal government more later in unemployment benefits or in various other kinds of welfare programs which are more expensive than the so-called preventive welfare programs which he feels the Child Welfare League supports. So he said that what the various social workers should do is to frame their advocacy of continuation of these programs in conservative terms to indicate to the members

of Congress that they too are for saving money, that they too are for cutting programs but the way to do it is not on the backs of children but rather to take the longer view and to try to save money later.

He said that the battle over the Legal Services program has already been won, that the American Bar Association has done such an excellent job that it is quite clear now that a majority of members of both the House and Senate will vote to preserve the Legal Services Corporation and to keep it intact. He said that it is true that the funding for the Legal Services Corporations will be cut, that the Legal Services program will come out bruised but not broken. He said that was very important because when the atmosphere changes and things get a bit better, that the numbers can be raised but the important question in all of this continuing fight was keeping the welfare institutions alive. He said if the Reagan block grant proposals were to pass that the delivery systems would be destroyed and once the delivery systems were destroyed, it would take years to duplicate them and perhaps the institutions would never, in fact, be reestablished, even under a more liberal administration. Whereas he indicated, if the institutions are kept alive (even though certain cuts are absorbed at this time) when the political situation changes to a certain degree, the numbers can be reinstated. He felt the real question is whether or not the President's block grant program is supported because he said if that goes through, then indeed a political revolution will have taken place. He started his speech, as a matter of fact, by saying that it is no hyperbole to suggest that the fight which is taking place in Washington is the most significant and politically revolutionary since the 1930s.

So the message that Jack Calhoun delivered to the delegates was very clear and that was ~~an~~ all-out fight should be waged on the block grant program, that this is where the action is. He indicated that there are literally dozens of members of Congress, although he did not name them, who are going to support the President's budget numbers but who have agreed privately and have made commitments to the Welfare Establishment to support the Welfare Establishment on individual block grant proposals, that is to say on individual categorical programs and against the President's block grant proposal. He got very specific in answering questions as to how the people should be lobbied, where the lobbying should take place, what forms the lobbying should take, how the members should be approached, and what is the most effective way to reach a member of Congress. It was all of the standard affair that is dished up at both liberal and conservative gatherings when discussions of reaching legislators are concerned. His advice is the same advice in that regard as I have heard conservatives give to audiences of a different philosophical make-up with regard to reaching legislators. I thought that his presentation was perhaps the most effective of the entire conference in that he was very reasonable, he was very positive, and he gave the delegates there a clear signal that the fight could be won and he rallied the troops. But he did so by offering them the hope that if they work hard enough, that they can win the victory. On the other hand, some of the other speakers spoke in such draconian terms and were so pessimistic that in my judgment they may have turned off some of their supporters because they may have painted a picture that was so bleak that it would be beyond the ability of the average social worker to tackle. Calhoun, on the other hand, presented a picture which was not nearly as bleak and one which, with the aid of the troops, the day could be carried. So I was very grateful that we were able to monitor this presentation because I think it gave a very clear picture of what the Welfare Establishment has in mind regarding the upcoming fights in Washington.

WELFARE ESTABLISHMENT LEADERS SEEK TO POLITICIZE SOCIAL WORKERS

Describing "the horror of what is going on in Washington," leaders of the social welfare ("human services") profession sought to increase the political awareness of those attending the Midwest Regional Training Conference of the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) in Minnesota late last month. Although the ostensible theme of the conference was "Children: Tomorrow's Hope, Today's Challenge", the focus of keynote speakers during the four day conference was on politics. Numerous suggestions emerged as to how professionals employed in federally-funded social welfare programs could make their cases to the U.S. Congress as it debates not only the 1982 budget resolution, but also the specific appropriation and authorization battles yet to come. The training conference was held at the Minneapolis Leamington Hotel from April 26-29.

"America's First Radical Judge" Attacks Capitalism

on the morning of April 27

While introducing the first keynote speaker of the conference, chairman Allan J. Kohls charged that the Reagan Administration's investment in human potential is "less than marginal." He then introduced Judge Justin C. Ravitz of the Recorder's Court of the city of Detroit, whom the New York Times has described as "America's first radical judge."

Ravitz began his address to the delegates by saying, "My position is capitalism doesn't work for most of the people who inhabit this country." Focusing on private property, Ravitz added, "Someone once said, 'the earth is the common property of all the people.' I agree with that, the problem is it's not true. . . . We have socialism for the rich, but what do the poor have?" Ravitz continued, "There is a class struggle between the rich and the rest of us, including the middle class." Near the end of his speech Ravitz focused on what he called, "racism and sexism," saying, "When capitalism doesn't work, they blame the victims. . . . So long as they (capitalists) keep us divided, they win." Ravitz charged that the American free enterprise system helps develop attitudes which favor competition, materialism, and contribute to the spread of drugs and crime. He exhorted the audience, "We have to invite the capitalists down to fight."

Ravitz also praised the Cuban revolution under the direction of Fidel Castro, maintaining that the Cuban dictator "knew what he was doing" in forcing the boat people out of that Caribbean island last year. Ravitz contended, "Even after twenty years of the revolution, there are still some people who can't adapt." Ravitz called Cuba "a society that cares about its people," and cited as evidence that there are 800,000 adults in Cuba involved in some way with education.

A founding member of the Detroit Alliance for Rational Economy (DARE), Ravitz also discussed situations in which he has engaged in dialogues with school children. Ravitz said he seeks to stimulate class discussions in which children seek to design new systems which "protect the interests of human beings." Ravitz added candidly that he directs the discussion toward examination of the advantages of centralized production of goods. Ravitz contends in these discussions that the purpose of capitalism is to keep the labor pool large, keep wages down, and keep profits up. Ravitz, who was introduced as "the poor people's judge", made some observations on the American media ~~XXXXXX~~ similar to the contentions of pro-family activists, blaming television as a source of materialism and violence in our culture.

Humphreys urges activism to welfare workers

The keynote address for Tuesday, April 28 was delivered by Dr. Nancy A. Humphreys, president of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), and ~~anxxxxxxx~~ assistant professor at Rutgers University in New Jersey. Calling the current political climate in the nation's capital "the most serious threat to social programs ever mounted in this country," Humphreys told her audience she hoped to "catalog for you the horror of what is going on in Washington."

Humphreys proceeded to lay out for her audience what she described as a good strategy for the human services profession to follow in battling the Reagan Administration programs. She focused much of her attention on the ongoing ~~XXXXXX~~ effort to "fold" most ~~xxxxxxx~~ federally-funded social welfare programs into block grants to the states. Currently, such funds come under "categorical" grants to the states, which specify not only the amount of money to be spent at the state level, but in cases specify how social welfare services are to be administered and delivered. If the Reagan block grant approach prevails, the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ separate state legislatures will decide for themselves how the money is to be spent.

Humphreys told the audience that if the block grants go through "we would face the task of putting back together what this administration has dismantled." She feared that if the block grants go through it would unleash "an unholy competitive battle in the state legislatures around the country" as various social work/human services groups compete for limited funds. Humphreys argued the need for continued categorical funding of social welfare programs.

Saying, "We can't afford the luxury of meetings like this just to enrich ourselves professionally," Humphreys urged her listeners to write their Congressmen and Senators the next morning. She specifically asked the audience to support either the Black Caucus or Democratic Alternative (Jones) Budget, ~~xxxxxxx~~ and urged opposition to the Gramm-Latta Bipartisan (Reagan) Budget. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Both budgets supported by Humphreys, while making some cuts to the original 1982 Carter budget, retain categorical grants in ~~xxxxxxx~~ for social spending.

involved in "human services"

Humphreys told the audience that "since January" leading organizations ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~EsXXXXXX~~ have been meeting to form a common agenda. The organizations involved in these meetings, according to Humphreys, are: Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), Family Service Association (FSA), National Association of Social Workers (NASW), American Public Welfare Association (APWA), National Conference on Social Welfare (NCSW), U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) and Child Welfare League of America (CWLA). Humphreys said the group took a longtime to find a chairman that CSWE, NCSW, and NASW leaders could all agree upon.

human service

Calling on ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ professionals to "be the conscience of our community," Humphreys contended that the forces arrayed ~~xxxxxxx~~ in favor of the Reagan program are "malleable." She refuted the idea of a mandate for Reagan, pointing to lowered voter turnout and other factors. She contended that medicare patients, CETA workers, and others potentially effected by budget cuts can be brought into a coalition with human service professionals.

political

At one point in her address, Humphreys offered words of self-criticism, saying, "We have consistently failed to include the family as a constituent group." Humphreys went on to say the professionals must find ways to reconcile "kids and their families" in order to build a cohesive constituency. Humphreys noted, somewhat unhappily, that "no one had paid much attention" to the family until last summer when ~~xxxxxxx~~ the White House Conference on Children (in context she probably meant to say the White House Conference on Families) brought about the emergence of the pro-family coalition. At the conclusion of her speech, FPR's reporter asked Humphrey if her appeal to the family ~~xxxxxxx~~ corresponded to what conservative/pro-family activists have said. Humphreys replied, "The same appeal, but we do not mean what they mean by it. We would have a very different agenda."

Former Carter Administration Official Offers Hope to Welfare Activists

Although not originally scheduled to deliver a major keynote address to the training conference, Jack Calhoun, a former official in the Carter Administration's Department of Health and Human Services and now director of CWLA's Center for Government Affairs, delivered a special presentation on the afternoon of April 28 (is this right CRGM?)

Calhoun gave the audience specific guidelines on how to lobby members of the Congress, where the lobbying should take place, what forms the lobbying should take, how the members should be approached, and the most effective ways to reach a Congressman. Calhoun contended that lobbying efforts by human service professionals had already borne some fruit. He pointed in particular to the mail being received by Senator Sam Nunn (D-GA), claiming Nunn was reexamining his support of the Reagan budget ~~XXXX~~ because his recent constituent mail has not been as favorable to the Reagan proposals. Calhoun also ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ indicated CWLA had gained some commitments for continuation of categorical funding for certain welfare programs. He pointed in particular to Congressman John Rousselot (R-CA) and Senators Jeremiah Denton (R-AL) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT).

Calhoun contended the best way for supporters of welfare spending to argue their case was the frame the issue in "conservative" terms. As an example, Calhoun stressed the need to argue in support of President Reagan's goal of fighting inflation, but to also argue that if certain welfare programs are curtailed now, the long range result will be higher costs to the federal government in unemployment benefits and other "preventive" welfare programs. Near the conclusion of his remarks, Calhoun maintained that the battle over ~~Legis~~ the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) has already been won by its supporters. He said that while it is true that funding for LSC will be cut, the program itself will be reauthorized with some changes.

The majority of the workshops at the Minneapolis conference dealt with technical "how to" training for social workers. However, in several sessions monitored by FPR the focus was primarily political. Elizabeth Keller, a social worker with the Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota, served as "convenor" of a workshop entitled "Cross-Cultural ~~XXXXX~~ Perspectives in Adoption Issues." The workshop was designed to examine "The issues unique to cross-cultural adoption which can prohibit or facilitate a positive adoption experience for the racially/culturally different child." However, Keller opened the session with an assault on the Moral Majority and the New Right, maintaining that the emergence of such groups held grave ramifications for minorities. In fact, Keller maintained that the ~~xxx~~ power of Moral Majority groups indicates that country has entered a "new era of racism." As supporting evidence, Keller pointed to citizen objections in some school districts to what Keller called "multi-ethnic" textbooks. What she did not point out is that the source of objection to such textbooks is not that they are "multi-ethnic", but that they include value free humanism, profanity, and other ~~xxxxxx~~ materials objectionable to traditionalists. In her presentation, Keller maintained, "Ideally, social activism should be a prerequisite for becoming a cross cultural family," although she admitted this was not likely to happen.

The cross-cultural adoption workshop revealed some deep divisions among the human services professionals attending. While Keller maintained cross-cultural adoption could be a positive experience, others expressed strong disagreement. One black social worker cited with anger the case of a black child who

(paragraph continued:)

The reluctance of minority social workers to place minority children with white parents struck one pro-family observer, who said, "This is significant because of the right-to-life question. Minority babies are the hardest to place, yet here you have minority ~~px~~ social workers reluctant to allow these children to be adopted." (CRCM--this is you, ok language?)

Focus on Teen Prostitution ~~MM~~, "Conflict Awareness", and the "Uncooperative Client"

A workshop on "Little Ladies of the Night: Teen-age Prostitutes" was convened by Debra Stone, a journalist with the St. Paul Pioneer Press. Stone ~~XXXXXX~~ last year wrote a multi-part series on teenage prostitution. The most controversial question raised at this session was whether or not young ~~girls~~ teenage girls who become prostitutes could be considered victims or not. Although he was not present at the session, Minnesota psychologist Dr. Roger Killinan was cited by ~~some~~ some participants. Killinan argues the young girls are ~~vixxix~~ indeed victims, coming from troubled "dysfunctional" families. Killinan argues that street "pimps" are "excellent pop psychologists" who can spot young girls radiating a low sense of self-esteem and lure them into prostitution. However, Stone pointed out that representatives of the St. Paul police department's vice squad related to her that young prostitutes rarely consider themselves victims.

During a workshop on the "Role of Conflict in Social Work Practice" one social worker described the social worker in general as "a facilitator of conflict awareness and resolution." A lengthy conference "institute" on "Working with the Uncooperative Client" focused on tactics and strategies for social workers to use when ~~XXXXXX~~ dealing with what the conference organizers described as the "dilemma of how to render effective service to involuntary, reluctant, or resistant clients."

"Gay and Lesbian Feelings" focus of one workshop

Meeting the counseling needs of homosexuals was the focus of the workshop on "Support for People with Gay and Lesbian Feelings." Convenors of the workshop were ~~two~~ a self-professed "gay" and "lesbian": John Grace, coordinator of the Program on Affectinal Preference and the Family for the Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis; and Judith Scott, acting director of Gay Community Services for Minneapolis. Both Grace and Scott spoke of their experiences counseling with other "gay" and lesbian individuals. They described the importance of counseling for recognizing, acknowledging, and becoming self-respecting in the homosexual experience. Both agreed they were operating from the assumption that sexual identity is fixed before the age of 5, and both agreed homosexuality was not abnormal.

Grace pointed to what ~~he (oops, sorry)~~ he called the "ambivalence and bargaining" stage of overcompensation by those who will not admit thier homosexuality. Grace describthis, "If I'm a good student, I can't be gay; If I'm a Moral Majority zealot, I can't be gay, etc." He suggested that much of the opposition to homosexuality comes from "closet homosexuals" who have not yet recognized and come to deal with themselves. Grace then added, in all seriousness, that a bill was not pending in Congress to register "gays" so that when the Moral Majority comes to power, it can put "gays" in camps.

Scott pointed to she said was a great need for lesbians: Lesbians do not have places for women to gather similar to the places where "gays" can gather for explicit sexual contact. In this vein, she referred to the five B's "beaches, bushes, bookstores, bars, and baths." Scott attributed this problem to the fact that in our society, women are not permitted to acknowledge themselves as sexual beings. She added, "Sex is delightful in relationships, but it is also delightful without a relationship."

Scott went on to describe an incident involving her nine-year-old daughter and a friend. Scott said she saw her daughter and her friend sitting on the front porch. Her daughter was gently stroking the forehead of her friend. When Scott saw that, her reaction was alarm. She told the audience she thought, "Oh my goodness, my daughter's going to be a lesbian." Scott then said she shortly "got hold of myself" and realized that if her daughter were indeed a lesbian she would be better able to give her support. Scott concluded rather angrily, "While I'm a lesbian, I was programmed to be a mother."

Grace and Scott concluded their remarks with the observative that the "consciousness level" of ~~XXXXXX~~ human services professionals in general needs to be raised. They urged social workers to break what they described as a "no talk rule" in social work offices on matters of "same sex feelings." Judith Scott added that there is a language problem for ~~XXXXXX~~ "gay and lesbian" people attempted to name their sense of difference. She said, "To use marriage terminology is to alienate anyone seeking to understand a same sex relationship."

The ~~XXXXXX~~ four day CWLA training conference attracted some 1500 individuals from all over the United States, including social workers, probation officers, administrators, bureaucrats, students, nurses, educators, and counselors. The states and provinces making up the midwest region of CWLA include Canada, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wisconsin. In all, more than 75 ~~XXXXXX~~ workshops, institutes

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*File
C/S AC*

October 7, 1981

TO: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

FROM: Morton Blackwell *MB*

Attached is an outline and selected chapters of a book being published by Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, Inc.

Paul asked me to ask you if you would consider endorsing the book with a comment which would be printed on the back cover of the book.

I asked Paul to suggest an appropriate comment, and he provided the attached draft. He needs your answer by FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9.

The different chapters are written by a diverse collection of authors, who are each writing independently. Favorable comment about the book need not imply endorsement of everything in it. For instance, I don't think the chapter on the Federal Election Commission is nearly tough enough.



Free Congress Research and Education Foundation

OFFICERS AND BOARD

Kathleen Teague
Chairman

Dr. Charles Moser
Secretary-Treasurer

Dr. Robert Billings

Dr. Onalee McGraw

The Hon. Bill Armstrong

Paul M. Weyrich
President

Connaught Marshner
Director, Family Policy Division
Editor, Family Protection Report

Stuart Rothenberg
Director, Political Division
Editor, The Political Report

Eric Licht
Vice President

Patrick McGuigan
Editor, The Initiative & Referendum Report

October 7, 1981

Mr. Morton Blackwell
Old Executive Office Building
Room 191
17th and Pennsylvania Avenues
Washington, D.C.

Dear Morton,

I understand our earlier letter got lost in the shuffle somewhere. Sorry about that. Jim told me of his meeting with you yesterday. I would appreciate any comments you might have to offer on the book.

Enclosed you will find what we wrote for Elizabeth Dole's consideration. Any help you can give us on this will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Patrick B. McGuigan

pm/cak



Free Congress Research and Education Foundation

OFFICERS AND BOARD

Kathleen Teague
Chairman

Dr. Charles Moser
Secretary-Treasurer

Dr. Robert Billings

Dr. Onalee McGraw

The Hon. Bill Armstrong

Paul M. Weyrich
President

Connaught Marshner
*Director, Family Policy Division
Editor, Family Protection Report*

Stuart Rothenberg
*Director, Political Division
Editor, The Political Report*

Eric Licht
Vice President
Patrick McGuigan
*Editor, The Initiative &
Referendum Report*

October 5, 1981

Kathy Christianson
Old Executive Office Building
17th and Pennsylvania Avenues
Washington, D.C.

Dear Kathy:

Per our telephone conversation of Friday, I am enclosing an outline and several representative chapters from our forthcoming book on judicial reform.

It is our hope that after Morton Blackwell reviews them, we could get some comments from Mrs. Dole which could be used on the cover of the book.

The book will reflect a number of viewpoints, so we do not expect an endorsement, but rather a comment on the importance of such a study.

The publisher has placed a deadline on us of October 9th. We would greatly appreciate receiving Mrs. Dole's response by that date if at all possible. If a comment cannot be made by that time, we would still appreciate receiving it for use in a possible future press release.

If there are any questions, please call.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jim Denniston

James Denniston - Asst. Dir. Judicial Reform Project

jd/cak

Morton
Kathy - We realize this is a big request in such a short time frame, but Paul and I really need your help.
- Pat McGuigan

A Non-Profit, Tax-Exempt Educational Organization

Summary: A Blueprint for Judicial Reform

Edited by Patrick B. McGuigan and Randall R. Rader

- I. Preface by Patrick B. McGuigan and Randall R. Rader
- II. A Forum: The need for Judicial Reform
 - *A. Introduction by George Giller
 - B. Judicial Verbiicide: An Affront to the Constitution by Sam J. Ervin, Jr.
Ervin examines the tendency of modern judges to substitute their own beliefs for the clear intent of the framers of our Constitution and its Amendments. The former Senator in essence concludes that the solution is the appointment of genuine "strict constructionists." He further asks Americans to pray that activist justices will "become horn-again supporters of the most precious instrument of government the world has ever known."
 - C. Judicial Supremacy and the Balance of Powers by Charles E. Rice
Rice examines and refutes the contentions of those who explain away judicial activism. An accurate, forceful, scholarly treatment.
- III. The Role of the Congress in Judicial Reform
 - A. The Case for Withdrawal of Jurisdiction by Senator John East
The chairman of the Senate subcommittee on separation of powers writes a definitive defense of Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, which empowers the Congress to regulate and limit the jurisdiction of federal courts.
 - B. Governing the Judiciary by William Stanneyer
Expanding on a legislative proposal first made by Robert K. Dornan, Stanneyer calls for a constitutional amendment providing that "any decision by the Supreme Court which declares unconstitutional any federal or state law may be rendered null and void by a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress; and . . . that any lower federal or state court decision which declares unconstitutional any federal or state law may be rendered null and void by simple majority vote in both Houses of Congress."
 - *C. Affirmative Action by Senator Orrin Hatch
 - *D. Defunding the Left by Congressman Marvin Leath
- IV. Reining in the "Fourth Branch" of Government
 - A. Administrative Agencies: Impediments to Decision-Making by Thomas Sowell
Sowell's article represents a fusion of conservative economic and legal thinking. He presents a scathing attack on Administrative and Regulatory Agencies, calling them a quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative fourth branch of government. His chapter introduces three chapters which deal with specific agencies or aspects of Administrative Law.
 - *B. Reform of Administrative Procedures by Ray Monboisse
 - C. Government by Bureaucracy: The Role of the Federal Election Commission by Stuart Rothenberg
Rothenberg advocates elimination of the FEC's quasi-legislative and judicial powers. He supports elimination of contribution limits and the ending of the issuance of "advisory opinions." Primarily for political reasons, Rothenberg supports the continuance of disclosure requirements. Although not supporting outright elimination of the FEC, Rothenberg deals fairly with Senator Armstrong's proposal to eliminate the FEC.
 - D. Intervenor Funding and the FTC by Senator Alan K. Simpson
Simpson makes a forceful, well-documented argument for outright elimination of the FTC's intervenor funding program, demonstrating that the majority of such funding over the last six years has gone to left-of-center groups. Short of outright abolition of the program, Simpson recommends seven specific reforms in the current program, including establishment of a "means test" for

intervening organizations and strict limitations on the total amount of money any one group or coalition of groups may receive to participate in rulemaking proceedings.

V. The States, the Private Sector and the People

A. The Resurrection of the Tenth Amendment: Restoring Balance to the Federal System by John T. Doolittle

Doolittle examines the 1976 National League of Cities v. Usery decision and several pending cases which might give heart to supporters of state sovereignty.

B. A Proposal for Reform of the Federal Judiciary and Federal Regulatory Agencies by William F. Harvey. Dr. Harvey suggests that in the future all federal regulatory agencies must a) justify each and every rule and regulation on bases which include cost/benefit analyses and b) that such justification must be made in a state court or a state administrative reviewing agency which is located where the principal regulatory impact is to occur.

*C. Alternatives to Forced Busing by John C. Ashcroft

D. A Proposal to Amend Article III: Putting a Check on Antidemocratic Courts by Jules Gerard.

Gerard supports a constitutional amendment which would require that all federal judges, once they are confirmed by the Senate, would be subject to periodic retention votes of the people, as often as every six years. The proposed amendment would also give Congress the power of recall, subject to a two-thirds vote of both Houses. Gerard also points to the possibility of a permanent committee of the Congress to oversee judicial review.

E. Economic Efficiency and the Regulation of Business: The Role of Conservative Legal Foundations by Ellen R. Jordan and Raul H. Rubin.

Another brilliant fusion of economic/legal arguments from a conservative/libertarian perspective. These authors demonstrate how regulatory agencies have undermined efficient development of economic case law. They point to the useful role business-oriented legal foundations have played in recent cases, and make suggestions for increasing the impact of these foundations.

F. The Role of Legal Education in Judicial Reform by Charles E. Rice

Rice recommends rejection of case law oriented teaching of Constitutional Law courses. He urges expansion of a tendency toward two semester instead of one semester "con law" courses. He advocates specific redirection of the treatment commonly received by the Federalist Papers. Finally, he calls on church-related schools to lead in the struggle for sound interpretations of the Constitution and other founding documents of our country.

*G. Reforming the American Bar Association by Grover Rees III

VI. Religious Freedom in the 1980s

A. Religious Liberty: A Historical Perspective by Jim McClellan. McClellan examines the historical context of the First Amendment, and recent abridgements of free expression.

B. Religious Liberty: New Issues and Past Decisions by William Bentley Ball. Ball examines five major issues of religious freedom which he expects to reach the nation's highest court during the next ten years. For each issue he describes the constitutional and case law basis for sound decisions maximizing religious liberty within an ordered structure.

VII. Conclusion by Patrick B. McGuigan and Randall R. Rader

A. Popular Perceptions of the American Legal System. An analysis of the Heritage/Sindlinger poll of summer, 1981 which demonstrates widespread disenchantment with the federal judiciary. Portions of the Connecticut Mutual Life Survey may also be cited.

B. A Blueprint for Judicial Reform: A summary of the reforms recommended in this book.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1981

TO: Paul Weyrich
FROM: Morton Blackwell
RE: Draft Chapter on F.E.C.

I read through the proposed chapter on the F.E.C. and was quite disappointed. The end of the chapter concluded with the evaluation that the continuation of the F.E.C., albeit amended, is justified.

I think it is rather clear, and I hope you will agree with me, that the abolition of the F.E.C. is what is truly needed to encourage voluntary participation in the political process. We only just beat back a wave of left wing activism which attempted to put even more burdensome restrictions on the political process in the last Congress.

Now is the time, when public and congressional sentiment against the F.E.C. is the strongest. We should strike while the iron is hot. You will recall that the President expressed to you in his letter general agreement with the process of election law deregulation.

No one will fly higher on this issue than you are willing to fly. I think it would be devastating to the cause we support for your organization to not take the position which you yourself have on this issue. I hope you will reconsider this matter before the printing presses put you on record.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

BLACKWELL, MORTON: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 6/7/2010

File Folder

COMMITTEE FOR THE SURVIVAL OF A FREE CONGRESS (1)

FOIA

F09-0043/01
STRAUSS, C

Box Number

9076

7

DOC Document Type

No of Doc Date Restriction

NO Document Description

pages

tions

1 LETTER

2 10/16/1981 B6

BLACKWELL TO PAUL WEYRICH RE
CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY WEYRICH

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

OCT 7 1981

OK - per draft statement
ED

October 7, 1981

TO: ELIZABETH H. DOLE *ED*
FROM: Morton Blackwell *ED*

Attached is an outline and selected chapters of a book being published by Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, Inc.

Paul asked me to ask you if you would consider endorsing the book with a comment which would be printed on the back cover of the book.

I asked Paul to suggest an appropriate comment, and he provided the attached draft. He needs your answer by FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9.

The different chapters are written by a diverse collection of authors, who are each writing independently. Favorable comment about the book need not imply endorsement of everything in it. For instance, I don't think the chapter on the Federal Election Commission is nearly tough enough.

Comments from Elizabeth Dole:

Concerned readers will gain an added awareness of the crucial need for reform of the American judicial system as a result of this important book.

I appreciate the interesting and diverse proposals and analyses offered by

A Blueprint for Judicial Reform.



Coalitions For America

Officers

Dr. George Hajjar
Chairman

Addah Jane Hurst
Secretary

Dr. Charles Moser
Treasurer

Paul M. Weyrich
President

Connaught Marshner
Chairman, Library Court

Richard B. Dingman
Chairman, Kingston Group

Pedraic Buckley
Director of Operation

Barbara Coleman
Secretary

Elia Dal Bello
Receptionist

November 25, 1981

Mr. Edward Meese
Counsellor to the President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Ed:

Many thanks for your willingness to meet with us yesterday. I trust that if we are able to hold such a dialogue on a somewhat regular basis it will be productive for all of us.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to our views that the issue of budget cutting needs to be re-framed. The President can motivate the troops, shift the focus and put the liberals on the defensive if he will point to the massive conflict of interest on the part of hundreds of these groups which are his most vocal opponents and which receive federal funds. I am, as I suggested, perfectly happy to have this organization and others on the right singled out as other groups which should not receive federal funds so that the approach is balanced. Such a speech should be given major billing so that it is given major coverage. If something along these lines is not done, I hate to tell you what I think the losses will be in 1982, even if the economy picks up somewhat in the later part of the year. Many of those who are unemployed now were your supporters and it will take a strong case to make them forget their present troubles.

I also hope you will consider tough bargaining on continuing resolutions to get programs like legal services out of the resolution, even to the point of vetoing the bill if such programs are kept in. You seemed surprised when I suggested that such a veto could be sustained. I believe it could be, and if you are getting contrary advice, I would like to be able to personally discuss the situation with whoever is making that assertion.

Again, thank you for your time. We share many goals and objectives and we aim to be helpful. I hope you will give us the tools with which to turn on your hardest and most faithful workers.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Weyrich
President