To nobody's surprise and everybody's dismay, Earry Goldwater walked off with the Republican nomination in San Fransisco; in the process of doing so, he moved the Republican party several degrees to the rights and sent liberals scurrying off in all directions wailing about atomic war and incipient fascism. Many eastern Republicans announced that they would not support their national ticket in November, some coming out openly for Johnson. In the wake of the successful passage of the civil rights bill, and hypoed by the the transparate victory, the Texan looked down upon by the liberals four years ago as a sellout on civil rights has now risen to a position just below saviourhood. According to many who have been shaken by Goldwater's shoot-from-the-hip style, Lyndon Johnson is all that stands between this nation and utter disaster. Which, unfortunately, is untrue.

It would be so nice if we could solve all of our problems by rejecting this man and elevating that one, or following this policy and ignoring that there. Yet there is nothing in our bipartisan recent history which leads one to believe that a President Johnson would be any better than a President Goldwater. This is a complex and dangerous age, yet the responses to the challenges of our times have been distressingly similar no matter who ruled. We fear nuclear war with a Goldwater election, yet it was the liberal Truman who first used the A-bomb and the liberal Kennedy who maneuvered this nation into a "one-minute-to midnight" position over Cuba, and the presumably liberal Johnson who is continuing the Kennedy position on Viet-nam, a position which seems likely to lead to what is delicately ealled a "confrontation" with China. MORE

As a matter of fact, one is finally left with the feeling that Goldwater is more to be admired for his very frankness about toying with nuclear war than Johnson for has posture of "reasonableness" which hides a multitude of sins.

Civil rights, then, must be the second great area in which a clearly defined difference can be detected. for isn't Goldwater drawing his support from the newly-discovered "white backlash," and isn't Johnson the hero of the Civil Rights act of 1964? The difference is clear here. yet becoming less so as the Democratic Party is forced to the right by the Goldwater acession. Lyndon Johnson is nothing if not a politicaan, and he certainly realizes that, come what may, he has the liberal and Negro vote in his back pocket. There still remains am nebulous area of dism moderate Republicanism disordented by the tracks party s choice, and they are the swing voters in this eletion. Johnson and the Democratic Party must, therefore, tailor their platform to these moderate Republicans, most of whome have been disenchanted by the Goldwater foreign policy line, but who are quite comfortable with the Arizonan on domestic issues. This means a rightward shift for the Democratic Party, and socifically, a rightward shift on civil rights. Not that the Democratic Administration has ever gone out on a limb for the black man's cause; the most stringent recent federal action in the South was the indictment of nine civil rights leaders in Albany Gerogia, and the widely-heralded Civil Rights bill Act gives the President little more power than he already has under, say, 333 U.S. Code, title 10, while the public accomodations section does not meet the problem of the Negro who is too deprived to travel. So we see the Democrats moving rightward from a mediocre record on civil rights while the pressure cookers of the black ghettos are exploding

The Civil Rights Act and the Democrat's record on civil rights were irrelevant in Harlem and Rochester, a situation unlikely to change no matter who gets elected; in fact, one could with justice argue that and therefore more jobsy a Goldwater victory, with stepped-up defense spending would benefit the Negro more than a Johnson victory.

None of this is meant to argue for a vote for Goldwater. It is meant as a verbal dash pf cold water on those who celebrate the fact that, in this election, we now find a significant difference between the parties. It would be nice, but it isn't so, or rather, where it is so, it is on questions of shadow and style rather than on substance. The Goldwater nomination has moved American politics to the right, which is a shame because the left is better able to face up to the problems that face us all; but the Goldwater nomination has not changed workings of impartical politics, nor has it provided the real alternative which this nation so desperately needs if it is to solve the twin problems of poverty and discrimination or the deadly problem of war. Which is a pity.

#