

THE 1978 WISCONSIN GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGN:
A BURKEIAN INTERPRETATION OF REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE LEE SHERMAN DREYFUS' DEBATE RHETORIC

By

Matthew L. Kyler

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

COMMUNICATION

at

University of Wisconsin
Stevens Point, Wisconsin
May 1984



Report on Oral Defense of Thesis

TITLE: THE 1978 WISCONSIN GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGN:
A BURKEIAN INTERPRETATION OF REPUBLICAN
CANDIDATE LEE SHERMAN DREYFUS' DEBATE RHETORIC

AUTHOR: MATTHEW L. KYLER

Having heard an oral defense of the above thesis, the Advisory Committee:

A) Finds the defense of the thesis to be satisfactory and accepts the thesis as submitted, subject to the following recommendation(s), if any:

B) Finds the defense of the thesis to be unsatisfactory and recommends that the defense of the thesis be rescheduled contingent upon:

Date: MAY 31, 1984

Committee:

William C. Davidson, Advisor

James M. Honey

Richard J. Ulbrich

For My Mother: A Vicarious Master's

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis could not have been researched or written without the help and guidance of a number of people.

In particular, a special indebtedness is owed my wife, Karan, for proofing, endnotes and bibliographical consultation, and general encouragement. Your unselfishness with my time is appreciated.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge Bill Davidson for turning me on to Burke and for academic inspiration; Jean Grandkoski whose flawless word processing allowed me to graduate on schedule; Lee Dreyfus for an invaluable interview and overview; Robert Williams for insight; and Michael Dry and Jack Butler of Sentry Insurance for their cooperation and funding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... iv

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

 Problem & Purpose..... 3

 The Critical Research Tool: Kenneth Burke's
 Identification Principle..... 6

 Research Groundings..... 9

 Limitations..... 14

 A Look Ahead..... 15

 Recommendations For Further Study..... 20

 Endnotes..... 23

II. THE RHETORIC OF COURTSHIP..... 27

 Identifying With The People's Interests..... 28

 Citings Of Courtship Rhetoric..... 30

 A Maverick Woos Wisconsin..... 38

 Endnotes..... 40

III. ROBBER BARON RHETORIC: THE PURGING AGENT..... 43

 The Surplus Issue: Good Vs. Evil..... 45

 The Evil Acting Governor..... 48

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Bureaucratic Denial: Maintaining The Up- State Image..... | 52 |
| A Maverick Sacrifices The Robber Baron..... | 56 |
| Endnotes..... | 59 |
| IV. CONTRIBUTING FACTORS: THE RHETORIC OF AUTHORITY AND OTHER PATTERNS OF IDENTIFICATION..... | 62 |
| A Professor Teaches The Student..... | 62 |
| An Example Of Inborn Dignity..... | 69 |
| Contributory Devices: Background And Fashion.. | 70 |
| Endnotes..... | 74 |
| V. CONCLUSION..... | 77 |
| A Summary Of Dreyfus' Identification Patterns.. | 78 |
| Implications..... | 82 |
| Endnotes..... | 84 |
| APPENDIX A - Transcript of Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate #1... | 86 |
| APPENDIX B - Transcript of Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate #2.. | 106 |
| APPENDIX C - Transcript of Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate #3.. | 132 |
| APPENDIX D - Transcript of Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate #4.. | 154 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 174 |

THE 1978 WISCONSIN GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGN: A BURKEIAN
INTERPRETATION OF REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE LEE SHERMAN DREYFUS'
DEBATE RHETORIC

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

There is little doubt that Lee Sherman Dreyfus' meteoric rise from University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Chancellor to Governor of Wisconsin in 1978, was an amazing political phenomenon. It is especially noteworthy when one considers that Dreyfus was not even the endorsed candidate at the Wisconsin Republican Convention. From political nowhere¹, the relatively unknown Dreyfus upset the GOP's endorsed candidate, Robert Kasten, in the primary, and later defeated Martin Schreiber, the incumbent candidate, handily (55%-45%) to become Wisconsin governor.*

How did Dreyfus do it? What caused the state press to label his candidacy the "campaign that shocked Wisconsin political professionals?"² How could an upstate, university chancellor -- who only joined the Republican party a year earlier -- realize such a victory?

*Note: In 1977, Wisconsin Governor Patrick J. Lucey resigned his office to become U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. Replacing him was Martin J. Schreiber, Lucey's Lieutenant Governor, who was then designated "Acting Governor."

Many interpretations have been advanced as partial explanation for Dreyfus' success. Some said Dreyfus was elected due to "dumb expletive luck and no major glitches."³ Others argued that, because Dreyfus positioned himself as a maverick in a state seemingly enamored with maverick candidates, he generated wide appeal.⁴ Some credited his success with media novelty,⁵ and others claimed Dreyfus was a fresh face in a state of tired politics:

Perhaps even more important, he is a political newcomer in a time in which the voters are indicating they are tired of business as usual... To the disenchanted Republican and independent voters, Dreyfus was a refreshing choice compared to the professional and sometimes overly packaged candidacies of the others.⁶

Finally, many posited that Dreyfus' use of non-verbal symbols (to capture media attention and increase candidate awareness) -- particularly his ubiquitous red vest he'd worn since 1967 for easy identification with students -- endeared voters to pull the Dreyfus lever:

Those of us who had known Lee for years thought 'red vest' was a synonym for 'Lee Dreyfus.' Who would have suspected that in 18 short weeks hundreds of thousands of Wisconsinites would be making the same mental connection.⁷

While such accounts constitute partial reasons for Lee Dreyfus' campaign success, one cannot overlook a most important contribution to his rise to power: his campaign rhetoric. Prior to his 1967 chancellorship, Dreyfus was a communications professor at the University of Wisconsin - Madison. His doctoral dissertation, coincidentally, was on political rhetoric, "Persuasion Techniques in Modern⁸ Congressional Debate." In short, Dreyfus' strategic use of

rhetoric was a primary tool for his quick ascendancy to the governorship. With no previous experience in political office or party association, Dreyfus had to rely heavily upon skillful rhetoric to first establish credibility, and, ultimately, votes. Kenneth Burke writes in a Rhetoric of Motives:

...when you turn to political exhortation, you are involved in decisions that necessarily lie beyond the strictly scientific vocabularies of description. And since the effective politician is a 'spellbinder,' it seems to follow by elimination that the hortatory use of speech for political ends can be called 'magic,' in the discredited sense of that term... To be sure, the rhetorician has the tricks of his trade. But they are not mere 'bad science,' they are 'art.'

Did Dreyfus really have that rhetorical "magic"? His background in communications was, no doubt, an asset. Yet one must ask how skillful he was in employing campaign rhetoric to meet his political goals. What strategies were used? What rhetorical challenges were presented by the campaign? How did Dreyfus ultimately use campaign rhetoric to generate such a decisive (55%-45%) victory in the November election?

PROBLEM & PURPOSE

One way to answer these questions is to isolate Dreyfus' rhetoric in a controlled situation: a series of one-on-one debates with his Democratic challenger, Martin Schreiber. These debates serve as isolated and controlled situations - microcosms of the campaign - where Dreyfus' rhetoric can be examined to help us better understand why he was elected.

For rhetoric as such is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic,

and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols.¹⁰

Dreyfus and Schreiber participated in four one-on-one debates. Each was examined closely to help solve the major research question: what rhetorical strategies did Lee Dreyfus utilize to help him enhance his standing with voters? These debates were the October 19 League of Women Voters debate in Milwaukee; an October 23 WHA-sponsored Wisconsin Public Television debate; a League-sponsored debate, October 24 in Madison; and a final League-sponsored debate, November 2 in Stevens Point. Three debates were broadcast live, in entirety, to a statewide audience, with the October 24 debate telecast in Madison.

A valuable purpose was also served by examination of these debates: it provides accurately edited transcripts of the candidate's rhetoric.*

To date, critical research into this topic has not been conducted. Re-examination of Dreyfus' debate rhetoric sheds light on the candidate and shows how he identified his personal attitudes and political platform with his audiences.

The speaker's language will reveal the substance out of which he expects to identify with his listeners. Consciously or unconsciously his words will reveal his attitudes or stylized answers to the obvious divisions. The concept of identification will help the critic structure his insight into a speaker's sense of unity by grouping strategies into 'clusters' until relationships indicate the speakers concept or hierarchy and reflect the

*Every utterance has been recorded verbatim. Transcripts are found in the appendices of this thesis.

process of guilt, purification and redemption. Identification...is the critic's key to the speaker's attitudes and the dramatistic process.¹¹

By critically reviewing Dreyfus' rhetoric under debate auspices, we can not only determine which clusters or strategies of identification he employed, but we can also make assumptions as to how persuasive his discourse was to his audience.

Ernest G. Bormann, in his book, Communication Theory, reasons:

The critic's viewpoint might include some assumptions about the artistic nature of communication, about the ethical canons to be used in evaluating discourse, and about the importance of discovering how discourse functions persuasively, how it functions to create a sense of community, or how it functions to deal with historical change.¹²

The critic can also play a vital role in his analysis by determining which rhetorical strategies were used to promote policy acceptance. Those strategies reveal signs indicating a candidate's strengths and weaknesses on certain political positions.¹³

Access to campaign articles, books, newspapers, the candidates and the debates allowed the critic an important investigational tool for this study. This was paramount; only then could a master dictionary of given "facts" be compiled.¹⁴

Getting back to this study's focal point -- which rhetorical strategies did Dreyfus utilize to help him enhance his standing with voters? -- the critic must carefully correlate any findings to the historical environment in which they took place. That is, how did the political environment of that particular period, shape Lee Dreyfus' campaign rhetoric?

In a 1952 Quarterly Journal of Speech article, Leland M.

Griffin observes:

The student's task is to isolate the rhetorical movement within the matrix of the historical movement; the rhetorical movement is the focus of his study. It is to be isolated, analyzed, evaluated, and described, so that he can say for the particular historical movement which he investigates: this was the pattern of public discussion, the configuration of discourse, the physiognomy of persuasion, peculiar to the movement.¹⁵

This study of the 1978 gubernatorial election was limited to the two month period of activity between the primary and general election. While this is a narrow time focus, it allowed the "rhetorical isolation" Griffin calls for. It follows that said limited historical movement allowed in-depth investigation encompassing scholarly accuracy and completeness.¹⁶

THE CRITICAL RESEARCH TOOL: KENNETH BURKE'S
IDENTIFICATION PRINCIPLE

To explain the effectiveness of Lee Dreyfus' debate rhetoric, Kenneth Burke's principle of identification was implemented. This principle seeks to "mark off the areas of rhetoric, by showing how a rhetorical motive is often present where it is not usually recognized, or thought to belong."¹⁷

Burke contends that it is through identification that people unify and cooperate. He refers to this unity and cooperation as "consubstantiality":

A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so... In being identified with B, A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself.

Yet at the same time he remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another.¹⁸

Why do people seek to identify with each other? Burke writes that man identifies because "identification is compensatory to division." Hence if those addressed were not apart from each other, a rhetorician, or, in this case, a candidate, would not need to "proclaim their unity."¹⁹

A political candidate is the perfect example of someone seeking identification: potential voters. Whether it's debates, slogans, baby-kissing or speech-making, the candidate seeks to attain consubstantiality. In short, identification becomes "the essence of the interaction process in man's symbolistic relations with other men."²⁰

Burke calls man's identification, when successful, a type of transcendence -- an overcoming of man's inherent separateness:

Identification in itself is a kind of transcendence. For instance, since the individual is to some extent distinct from his group, an identifying of him with the group is by the same token a transcending of his distinctness.²¹

Hugh Dalziel Duncan echoes the notion of transcendence:

Identification is essentially an integrating device, a way of overcoming the divisiveness [my emphasis] intrinsic in every relationship.²²

It should be noted that Burke developed his identification principle not as a replacement for traditional theory of persuasive discourse but as an "accessory."²³

As for the relation between 'identification' and 'persuasion': we might as well keep it in mind that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications; his act of persuasion may be for the

purpose of causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker's interests; between himself and his audience.²⁴

Virginia Holland, writing in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, frames the persuasion/identification relationship as "old" and "new" complements. She quotes Burke:

If I had to sum up in one word the difference between the 'old' and the 'new' rhetoric...I would reduce it to this: The key term for the old rhetoric was persuasion and its stress upon deliberate design. The key term for the new rhetoric would be identification which can include a partially unconscious factor in appeal.²⁵

By focusing upon the speaker-audience relationship, Burke's identification principle served as grounding for the rhetorical findings of this study. Perhaps no other rhetorical tool was so well suited for re-examining political discourse.

Burkeian scholar Bernard Brock writes that use of Burke's rhetorical principles matches well with political study:

This writer feels that the application of Burkeian rhetorical principles to contemporary political speaking does provide a new perspective which will allow critics to gain fresh insights into political speaking and to serve as a check upon the power of the politician.²⁶

Identification should also be acknowledged as something more than a process; indeed, it serves as a tool for ordering the rhetorical process at hand.

John Kirk notes in the Quarterly Journal of Speech:

The key to Burke's concept of identification is...(that) it functions not only as a process whereby separate entities are brought together, but also as a structure - a hierarchial structure in which the entire process of rhetorical conflict is organized. Identification is then not only a process which operates in rhetoric; it is also the structure which gives it order.²⁷

Finally, if it is true that people are, by nature, divided,²⁸ and thus every statement they make partial, what better place than an inherently partisan environment to apply Burke's identification principle?

How well did Lee Dreyfus align his views with his audiences? What rhetorical strategies did he employ? This critical analysis of Dreyfus' use of the identification principle sheds new light on why he was successful in achieving his goal: Wisconsin's governorship.

For Burke, identification is an essential function of language which manifests itself in the quest for cooperation among beings who by nature respond to symbols. Burke's ultimate concern remains sociological, yet as has been demonstrated, his concern begins with the individual in his quest for identity.²⁹

In this study, that individual is Lee Dreyfus.

RESEARCH FOUNDINGS

As stated, there is no existing study which examines Lee Dreyfus' debate rhetoric, or campaign rhetoric. Principle sources of research, in addition to the debate transcripts and videotapes mentioned, obviously included the key works of Kenneth Burke. Six works in particular, guided this project.

A Rhetoric of Motives clearly delineated the identification principle and such rhetorical analogues as courtship, cunning and the "secularized replica of the Divine Scapegoat"³⁰(the projection device). A Rhetoric of Motives explored the resources of unconscious identification where

rhetorical motives identify the speaker without his really
31
knowing it.

Supplementing this was Burke's A Grammar of Motives which helped explain the uniqueness of human motivation.

Language As Symbolic Action talked about dramatic catharsis and how an audience was purified by a "symbolic sacrifice." This was helpful in examining how Lee Dreyfus was able to use Martin Schreiber as the scapegoat of the campaign.

In The Philosophy of Literary Form Burke wrote about "clusters" or equations (what equals what, rhetorically) which lined up "within the conditions of drama," and examined the "international devil" (scapegoat) as a unification device to enhance identification. This study reviewed those clusters which appeared in Lee Dreyfus' debate rhetoric.

And, finally, Counter-Statement briefly touched upon the importance of slogans, i.e. their appropriateness in a widespread situation.

That Kenneth Burke's writings have made an impact (both positive and negative) upon his peers is understatement; William H. Rueckert's Critical Responses To Kenneth Burke represented an insightful compendium of essays, courtesy of 56 communication scholars. Many of them centered on Burke's identification principle and its applicability. Works like "A Review of A Rhetoric of Motives," by Hugh Dalziel Duncan; "Kenneth Burke and Identification," by John Kirk; "Political Speaking: A Burkeian Approach," by Bernard Brock; "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," by Leland M. Griffin; and "Tragedy as the Representative Anecdote," by

William H. Rueckert, all provided helpful Burkeian definitions and criticisms.

Rueckert's book also included an expansive bibliography of works about Kenneth Burke.

Fortunately, relevant Burkeian studies on identification in a political environment existed. Of assistance was "Kenneth Burke's Concept of Identification as Applied to Selected Speeches of Edmund Sixtus Muskie" by Linda J.C. Giggleman. In this Master's thesis, Ms. Giggleman determined ways Senator Muskie employed identification in five 1971 speeches while seeking the 1972 Democratic nomination for President.

Other helpful studies included "Identification: The Rhetorical Motive" by Marcus L. Ambrester, Jr., and "Sam Houston and the Indians: A Rhetorical Study Of The Man And The Myth" by William C. Davidson. Each of these studies delineated Burke's principle of identification, its applicability, as well as the aforementioned analogues: the rhetoric of courtship, cunning and victimage (the scapegoat).

Access to Lee Dreyfus was a special asset to this project. An interview on debate strategy was helpful, but more importantly, he was able to explain his thoughts behind what he actually said in the debates. Dreyfus was also insightful in imparting knowledge of his stands on the issues of the 1978 gubernatorial race.

In the same vein, William Kraus and Robert Williams offered knowledge on the campaign from an organizational

standpoint. A personal interview with Williams, the Dreyfus Campaign Communications Director, revealed a behind-the-scenes look at the man and ultimately the issues (both real and contrived) that shaped his candidate's rhetoric. As chief proponent of the theory claiming Lee Dreyfus was elected by "dumb expletive luck and no major glitches,"³² Williams also served as a media manipulator which further explained certain Dreyfus mannerisms and speaking strategies.

Kraus, the campaign manager, chronicled the entire campaign in his book, Let The People Decide. Of particular help here is how Dreyfus used the media to perpetuate the "equation" that then Acting-Governor Schreiber equaled the big money special interest groups. Kraus parlayed this equation into a well-planned strategy where Dreyfus, totally non-aligned to special interests, could galvanize the people to vote against these money machines.

We'll beat the Dem machine, the special interest leaders and their money in November. Let the people decide, not the money, [a strong identification] not the desperate special interest leaders. Just the people. The November 7 election is a referendum on whether the big money, the one-issue special interest forces own the state or not.³³

Newspaper articles served as a chronological backdrop to the 1978 gubernatorial campaign. The Milwaukee Journal, The Milwaukee Sentinel, The Stevens Point Journal and Madison's Capital Times, gave varying perspectives on the campaign. The Milwaukee papers covered Acting Governor Schreiber's hometown; the Stevens Point paper was from the town Dreyfus lived in; the Madison paper from the city they aspired to hold a four-year term in.

Newspapers, while by definition "papers of news," also determine how much publicity -- favorable or unfavorable -- a candidate receives. A political reporter or editor can sway many voters by the slant or opinion of his/her copy. Kenneth Burke never liked this:

The editor was late. The paper was ready for the printer, all but the columns reserved for him. Yet he knocked off his opinions on the state of the world in time to beat the deadline... This is 'the norm.' By it all else is tested. It has its place. And unquestionably, the opinions of a trained opinionator, situated at a strategic point with relation to the channels of information and advice, may even thus haphazardly make better comment than could a man deprived of his advantages. The question is: have they done anything? Can they, in this form, possibly do anything? I submit that they cannot.³⁴

Still, as noted by people from William Kraus to Marshall McLuhan, one cannot ignore the powers of the media; Lee Dreyfus recognized this and used them to his advantage whenever possible.

Hugh Dalziel Duncan, as mentioned, was a valuable source for this study. Two of his books, Symbols in Society and Communication And Social Order, offered additional insights to Kenneth Burke and his identification principle.

Symbols in Society examined two important rhetorical strategies of identification: courtship and use of the scapegoat.

Communication And Social Order explored similar strategies, specifically focusing on the use of scapegoat rhetoric to enhance identification. Duncan tells us that a "mass meeting [like a debate situation], to be effective with the masses, must be staged as a drama of struggle between good

[Dreyfus, in this case] and evil [Schreiber]."³⁵

One additional source was Bernard L. Brock's and Robert L. Scott's book, Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective. Both authors are well-versed in Burkeian theory and point out vital concerns for critics making rhetorical analyses. For example, they understand the importance of examining attitudinal relationships in rhetorical situations, and how identification shapes those relationships.

...the relationship of the attitudes of each participant to those of others in the situation will influence their interaction together...Or to put the question in a slightly different way: to what extent can people identify with the attitudes of one another?³⁶

Application of Kenneth Burke's identification theory to Lee Dreyfus' debate rhetoric is, to date, non-existent. Through a wide variety of sources -- both primary and secondary -- this project does provide fresh insight by explaining how Lee Dreyfus used rhetorical identification techniques to help become governor of Wisconsin.

LIMITATIONS

While this study sought to make generalizations appropriate to the discourse of the 1978 Wisconsin gubernatorial campaign, there were certain limitations. Study of four debates could, in no way, represent the entire campaign; yet for purposes of manageability, the four debates cited were deemed a reasonable reflection of the issues. As each debate centered upon varying campaign topics, a wide range of issues was covered.

Another limitation was the lack of previous research existing on this subject. With no other studies on Dreyfus' rhetoric registered to date, it was impossible to cite others' work or make comparisons to their findings. Fortunately, there were similar research projects which offered guidance and valuable information.

Examination of only Lee Dreyfus' rhetoric was also a limitation. Obviously his opponent made remarks that helped Dreyfus to win the election. For the sake of manageability, and to develop a meaningful cluster analysis, focus was solely on Dreyfus' rhetoric.

Finally, interpreting the three gubernatorial debates in a Burkeian context -- identification -- was also a limitation. Burke, however, was best suited as a research foundation for this study. His voluminous writings on how people identify with each other has been consistently and effectively used as a standard of measurement in similar studies.

A LOOK AHEAD

This study was largely focused upon three dominant identification devices used by Lee Dreyfus in three debates with his Democratic opponent: the use of courtship, scapegoat and authority rhetoric.

Chapter II looks at how Dreyfus used soothing and endearing rhetoric to woo his audiences. By the use of courtship, Burke means the "use of suasive devices for the transcending of social estrangement."³⁷

Dreyfus related one example of how he clearly used courtship rhetoric in a definitely estranged situation:

There were things I didn't like (to make sudden political statements on). For example, agriculture. When agricultural groups asked, I'd say I didn't know a lot about it, but I'd say I was a pretty good eater...the ag people appreciated it.³⁸

Dreyfus often relied upon courtship rhetoric to allure voters. He was adept at using this form of cunning, as Chapter II shows, to shift politically uncomfortable rhetorical situations to his benefit. This often meant putting the rhetorical onus back upon Martin Schreiber.

Through identification via courtship, Chapter II also focuses upon how Dreyfus, new to political campaigning, used soothing and reassuring discourse to play down his political inexperience.

Burke writes that "one must speak grandly when there is something to be done and 'minds are to be swayed.'³⁹"

References to Dreyfus' use of 'grand speaking' to court his audience are shown in debate context in Chapter II. Numerous citations found Dreyfus actively seeking to woo voters.

Flattery is nothing new in politics. Yet, as Burke tells us, it does serve a special purpose as an identification device. Chapter II clearly depicts how Lee Dreyfus used the rhetoric of courtship to identify with his audience in attendance, and ultimately, those watching at home.

Persuasion by flattery is but a special case of persuasion in general. But flattery can safely serve as our paradigm if we systematically widen its meaning, to see behind it the conditions of identification or consubstantiality in general.⁴⁰

Chapter III explores how successfully Lee Dreyfus used

"scapegoat rhetoric" to unite his audience against the "evils" of his opponent. Burke calls this a projection device -- the "curative process that comes with the ability to hand over one's ills to a scapegoat, thereby getting purification by dissociation."⁴¹

By choosing rhetoric to equate Schreiber as "the vessel of certain unwanted evils, the sacrificial animal upon whose back the burden of these evils is loaded,"⁴² Dreyfus was able to use Martin Schreiber's record and campaign experience against him. By sacrificing this victim -- this scapegoat -- Dreyfus could simultaneously establish himself as the "good" candidate.

Chapter III clearly delineates numerous Dreyfus debate references where Schreiber was associated with something unfavorable. Of primary interest is Dreyfus' rhetoric regarding a large state surplus, funded by Wisconsin taxpayers, which had peaked at \$500 million under Acting Governor Schreiber. Dreyfus effectively blamed Schreiber for stealing the people's money, using colorful language to identify with "the people".

The proper thing to do with the money once it has been collected is to return it to the people from whom it was collected because that is what is done when stolen property is recovered.⁴³

This surplus issue was unquestionably one of the major focal points of the Wisconsin gubernatorial campaign in 1978. Dreyfus cleverly used rhetoric equating his opponent with this evil (an excessive surplus) -- a Burkeian projection device -- to his advantage. Chapter III notes, in the debate environment, repeated use of this technique to identify the scapegoat (Schreiber) and the cathartic alternative (Dreyfus).

Burke writes in The Philosophy Of Literary Form:

In tragic catharsis, the principle of transformation comes to a focus in victimage. The tragic pleasure requires a symbolic sacrifice.⁴⁴

While political rhetoric is often accusatory, pointed toward the discrediting of the adversary, Lee Dreyfus not only suggested that Martin Schreiber equaled something undesirable, he made those associations believable. In doing so, Dreyfus made himself the attractive alternative and purging agent.

Marcus Ambrester argues in his doctoral dissertation that by sacrificing a scapegoat, the speaker creates a "loving relationship" with his audience.

The speaker, therefore, utilizes the process of alienation to effect identification, and in the process of symbolic action he creates a 'loving' relationship with his audience. Thus, they seek a removal of the barriers to complete the 'equal' and/or 'spiritual' communion and accept a sacrificial 'goat' that would complete the process and allow them the purgative redemptive union desired. In such a relationship between speaker and audience, other 'proof' quite naturally becomes automatic since the audience has come to rely upon speaker as 'lover' and scapegoat as 'cause' of estrangement.⁴⁵

Specific use of the projection device -- scapegoat rhetoric -- was an important piece of Dreyfus' debate rhetoric. Chapter III highlights this identification tool.

Chapter IV examines another major identification strategy in Dreyfus' rhetoric which, along with his use of courtship and scapegoat language, did contribute to the consubstantiality he sought with his audience.

This additional identification pattern was Dreyfus' rhetoric of authority which attempted to position Dreyfus, the new politician, as more knowledgeable of state government

than his career-politican opponent.

Burke tells us that "imitation is an essentially dramatic concept. It makes for consubstantiality by community of ways ('identification') since men can either crudely imitate one another's actions as revealed on the surface, or subtly imitate the underlying principles of such actions."⁴⁶ By employing authority rhetoric, Dreyfus was able to turn his political inexperience from a liability to an asset, and thus be able to "imitate" the governor.

Chapter IV also provides a rudimentary background on Lee Dreyfus' previous experience as a public speaker, and briefly explains the significance of his non-verbal identification device -- the red vest. This information explains why Dreyfus was no stranger to the public podium, and enhances his claim as the "people's candidate." This background data also helps explain why Dreyfus was able to maintain his maverick image.

Chapter V summarizes the use of courtship, scapegoat and authority rhetoric, and shows how they, along with the less dominant identifications, played important roles in Lee Dreyfus' political success. Of critical importance, however, was the measuring of how the clusters lined up within this dramatic (one-on-one debate) environment.⁴⁷ How evil did Dreyfus rhetorically portray Schreiber? How well did Dreyfus' rhetoric establish the notion Lee Dreyfus equaled a good governor? Within those general equations, how well did Dreyfus get his audience to identify with the smaller clusters

-- the individual issues? Was Schreiber, for example, a "thief" because the state surplus had bloated under his administration?

Chapter V puts these answers into perspective thus answering the primary research question: which rhetorical strategies did Dreyfus utilize to enhance his standing with voters?

The study, then, provides new grounds in helping explain why Lee Dreyfus' rhetoric was successful in one-on-one debates with his opponent. By examining the identification devices in his campaign and debate rhetoric, we are able to determine how well this political newcomer was able to proclaim unity.

Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division. If men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity.⁴⁸

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

To date, no research had been undertaken on the rhetoric of the 1978 Wisconsin gubernatorial campaign. While this study involved Lee Dreyfus' rhetorical identification strategies in a debate context, there remain numerous topics available for further study.

One such topic would involve charting Lee Dreyfus' campaign rhetoric strategies prior to his surprising primary win over Congressman Robert Kasten. At the time of the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates, Dreyfus enjoyed good name recognition. He did not, however, enjoy visibility and name recognition some six months earlier. Further study could help explain Dreyfus'

transformation from the unendorsed GOP candidate to its standard bearer in such a short period of time.

Another area worth exploring: the role of the press in this election. In essence, how was the candidates' rhetoric shaped for the newspaper, radio and television media? What prompted Dreyfus, for example, to eschew the normal 30-second advertisement in favor of half-hour shows? How could Martin Schreiber have better conveyed his political experience to the press and ultimately the voters of Wisconsin? Why did Schreiber's staff fail to maintain an inventory of Dreyfus' various political stands from the time Dreyfus first announced his candidacy, so as to later exploit any perceived vulnerability? In an era of electronic media, how was their campaigning positioned to take advantage of publicity and media reporting?

Lastly, it could be argued that Lee Dreyfus ran an innovative yet unorthodox campaign. Additional research might examine this candidate's organization, its strategies and techniques to promote Dreyfus, and the effectiveness of public relations activities to heighten candidate image. Did Dreyfus, the candidate, represent the finest piece of political packaging ever witnessed in Wisconsin? Just what elements were really working when Dreyfus' campaign manager proclaimed "we stayed cosmic"?
49

These are but a few areas of study to be recommended for future research. As one of Wisconsin's most colorful gubernatorial elections, a plethora of interesting and intriguing

topics await scrutiny.

ENDNOTES

- 1 "On, Wisconsin," Wall Street Journal, 4 December 1980, p. 22.
- 2 "How Lee Dreyfus Really Won Wisconsin," The Capital Times (Madison, WI), 11 February 1980, p. 15.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 "Dreyfus Running Maverick Campaign," The Milwaukee Journal, 22 October 1978, p. 12.
- 5 "LaFollette Calls Dreyfus Media Novelty," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 14 October 1978, p. 2.
- 6 "The Gubernatorial Battle," Fort Atkinson - Jefferson County Union, 29 September 1978, p. 8.
- 7 William M. Kraus, Let The People Decide (Aurora, IL: Caroline House Publishers, Inc., 1982) p. 47.
- 8 Lee Sherman Dreyfus, "Persuasion Techniques in Modern Congressional Debate" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1957).
- 9 Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), p. 42.
- 10 Ibid., p. 43.
- 11 Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective (New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 319.
- 12 Ernest G. Bormann, Communication Theory (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980), p. 199.
- 13 Bernard L. Brock, "Political Speaking: A Burkeian Approach," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 445.
- 14 Robert L. Shayon, Open to Criticism (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1971), p. 15.
- 15 Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech 35 (1952): 185.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. xiii.

- 18 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
- 19 Ibid., p. 22.
- 20 Marcus LaRoy Ambrester, Jr., "Identification: The Rhetorical Motive" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, Ohio University, 1972), p. 36.
- 21 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 326.
- 22 Hugh D. Duncan, "A Review of A Rhetoric of Motives," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 258.
- 23 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. xiii.
- 24 Ibid., p. 46.
- 25 L. Virginia Holland, "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech 39 (1955): 354.
- 26 Brock in Rueckert, p. 455.
- 27 John Kirk, "Kenneth Burke and Identification," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 345.
- 28 Leland M. Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 472.
- 29 Ambrester, p. 211.
- 30 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 31.
- 31 Ibid., p. 35.
- 32 The Capital Times, p. 15.
- 33 Kraus, p. 190.
- 34 Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, 3d ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973), pp. 162-163.
- 35 Hugh D. Duncan, Communication And Social Order (New York, NY: The Bedminster Press, 1962), p. 229.
- 36 Scott and Brock, p. 185.
- 37 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 208.

- 38 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Inc., Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 39 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 75.
- 40 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 55.
- 41 Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 202.
- 42 Ibid., pp. 39-40.
- 43 "Dreyfus, Schreiber Ignore Interruptions During Debate," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 25 October 1978, p. 17.
- 44 Kenneth Burke, Language As Symbolic Action (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1966), p. 189.
- 45 Ambrester, pp. 101-102.
- 46 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 131.
- 47 Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 33.
- 48 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 22.
- 49 "Dreyfus Boosters Found That Affection, Respect Got Votes," William M. Kraus, The Milwaukee Journal, 20 September 1982, p. 6.

"The greatest analogue for courtship (in contemporary discussion) is sexual courtship; but the forms of sexual courtship are really derived from historical forms of social courtship."

-- Hugh Dalziel Duncan
Symbols In Society

CHAPTER II
THE RHETORIC OF COURTSHIP

Throughout the 1978 Wisconsin gubernatorial campaign, Lee Dreyfus proclaimed his campaign slogan: "Let The People Decide." This phrase was coined to highlight his decision to remain at arm's length from special interest groups. By separating himself from the bureaucrats and lobbyists of Madison, Dreyfus could elevate his status among voters:

...most people are outside the political process. But I play the up-state guy against Madison because those people down there think they know all about state government and we dummies up-state don't know anything. The minute you start doing that you begin identifying with the guy in the plant and the guy on the farm... the people who aren't locked into that bureaucratic notion. So my campaign was done out of the intent to let people know I was not part of that group, and if I got down there (Madison), I was not going to be part of that group.... It was a matter of identifying Marty's (Schreiber's) group as money. This powerful group of millions of dollars.... That was the old Bob LaFollette theme: Who's going to run this state -- people or money?!

A key objective of the Dreyfus' campaign was to implement this campaign slogan into Dreyfus' rhetoric. "Special interests" and "bureaucrats" became a target of his discourse which consequently identified him with the "interests" of the people.

In this chapter it will be argued that one of the dominant rhetorical patterns to emerge from the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates was Lee Dreyfus' use of courtship discourse. Dreyfus repeatedly employed soothing rhetoric designed to protect the people's interests. These interests included new jobs, new energy sources, better transportation, care for the elderly, the poor, affirmative action, and, ultimately, open and less intrusive

government for the people of Wisconsin. By identifying with such interests, Dreyfus positioned himself as a viable alternative to his opponent, a professional politician whom he sought to connect by contrast with special interest connections. Thus, a courtship device was an ongoing rhetorical strategy Dreyfus used to build a union with his audiences.

Marcus L. Ambrester, Jr. writes that courtship is a weaving together of speaker and audience interests to establish a union or rapport.²

This chapter examines how Lee Dreyfus employed courtship rhetoric in debate to identify with his audience and build that desirable union. This study will argue that this device, along with use of the scapegoat (Chapter III) and authority (Chapter IV) were the major rhetorical strategies employed.

IDENTIFYING WITH THE PEOPLE'S INTERESTS

To better understand Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric, one should understand the philosophy of government he promoted throughout the campaign and particularly in his debates with Martin Schreiber:

In looking at a philosophy of government, what are the principles for governing? As I see them, 'the government that governs least governs best' is one principle. Secondly, to give the individual the greatest possible latitude. Thirdly, that government does what the individual cannot do for society. Fourth, that level of government closest to the people will be that level of government which is most responsive to the people. And fifth, government must be open.³

Dreyfus' "philosophy" of government reiterated his campaign slogan: "Let The People Decide." Phrases like "does what the

individual cannot do," and "gives the individual greatest latitude", and "most responsive to the people," served as parameters for his rhetoric of the peoples' interests.

In the debate sponsored by the League of Women Voters in Stevens Point, November 2, 1978, Dreyfus grounded that philosophy in what he believed was the average person's interests. He also illustrated how current Wisconsin government, as headed by Martin Schreiber, strayed from the people.

Now what's happened to our government? People not only feel excluded, but they feel alienated. Career politicians and career bureaucratic leaders have taken over, and they have taken over with the help of special interest groups. In fact, elected representatives can't get through to the bureaucrats who are creating the rules and regulations because they create them with the help and consultation of technicians and the special interests. People are screaming and no one listens. I tell you we are heading in the wrong direction; we are heading away from the people and they are getting mad.⁴

Dreyfus sought to align himself with those who felt alienated; he claimed to share their frustration. He would listen to their interests and not to the big-money interests. By so "positioning" himself he sought to only endear his candidacy with the voters.

In Counter-Statement, Kenneth Burke notes:

A politician seeks to ally himself, actually or apparently, with issues which to his mind the people consciously advocate.⁵

Dreyfus recognized this necessity and actively pursued such an alliance. Witness his response to the debate question regarding how closely his own views paralleled those of the GOP platform:

I have had a conflict within my party on the platform formation relative to the status of civil service and

civil service reform. It is the only area of general conflict that I've had because I believe we have got to take people who make policy out of civil service status.

I understand my party's concern with a move that may appear to look like patronage and a move in that direction; but I also believe there is a fundamental principle that says that those who make policy, should not be insulated from the voters. We now have people who are insulated from the voter.⁶

By only differing with his party on an issue where he sought to make State employees more accountable to the people who voted, Dreyfus had the best of both worlds. He could be a party man, yet deviate to perpetuate his pro-people philosophy.

CITINGS OF COURTSHIP RHETORIC

Dreyfus consistently implemented courtship rhetoric to woo his audience in the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates examined. His message was consistent and clear: he had the people's interests at heart. By "looking out for the little people," Dreyfus identified with the grass roots, something an astute politician must do.⁷

The interests of this grass roots movement were common ones. What's essential is how Dreyfus made those interests paramount to the people. This use of courtship served as the thread connecting speaker and audience.

The issues of energy and jobs, for example, were hotly-debated in Wisconsin in 1978. A review of the first gubernatorial debate -- October 19, 1978, at Marquette University in Milwaukee -- revealed how Dreyfus was able to shift a potentially negative identification into a positive campaign statement with courtship rhetoric. Dreyfus recalled the

situation:

Marty was trying to position me as a big candidate for nuclear energy. No way do I want to get locked in as 'Mr. Nuke.' So the answer there was that I shift the issue. I wasn't just talking energy, I was talking about jobs for the minorities...for the young coming out of school...for people in the laboring fields. So I argued, why would you, Marty, a Democrat, not be in support of the energy we need to support the jobs so people can go to work?...instead of arguing nuclear energy my intent was to put Marty in a position of trying to defend why he's against jobs.⁸

In that debate, Dreyfus' use of courtship rhetoric was multi-purposeful: it was tailored to the state's biggest city; it played live before the people who needed energy and jobs the most, and, it played in Martin Schreiber's former hometown. By shifting the focus from the potential perils of nuclear energy to economic opportunity for the future, Dreyfus was able to build audience rapport and denigrate his opponent at the same time.

We've got to quit talking about acceptable levels of unemployment, especially when we see 40% of the inner city of Milwaukee and its young between age 16 and 25, unemployed. When there's over 8% unemployment in Kenosha, and then we get a glowing picture of how well things are going in Wisconsin.

I tell you there's got to be a new criteria for growth in expansion of business and industry in the United States in the '80s and '90s.

So let's wait and wipe out one more generation of people? I tell you the poor must have at least equal weight in this state, in this nation's debate on energy and growth.⁹

Dreyfus did his homework. Later in that debate he explained that his pro-nuclear energy stance was backed by two important and influential minority groups: the NAACP and the Urban League.¹⁰ Clearly, his courtship rhetoric was well-suited to his Milwaukee audience.

This approach was reinforced in the second debate --
"Governor's Forum," October 23, 1978, on the Wisconsin Public
Television network:

The point is that I want to get rid of the 117,000 unemployed or as many as possible. I want to do something about all the underemployed in this society...Employment will come from expansion of business and industry.

But sometimes you choose one evil in order to avoid a greater one. And I think the greater evil in the future is limitation of energy for expansion that could, in fact, provide the bottom line jobs.11

Through such an approach Dreyfus endeared himself with people who wanted to see the unemployed back to work. No doubt many were at least inclined to give nuclear energy expansion a chance if it meant a better economic climate.

Dreyfus also used his philosophy of open government to further promote his attack on unemployment. By promising, if elected, to make everybody eligible for government appointment, he made himself, symbolically, a potential employer -- a means to directly assist the unemployed.

How do I plan to open that government up and return it to the people? That's a very hard thing to do. But, if the people decide next Tuesday that I am to form a new administration by electing me governor, then immediately I do now afford every single citizen an opportunity to recommend and nominate people for appointment.

And I will ask the press immediately following that election to release job categories so that you know what the needs are -- so that you can send the name and information about that person directly to: People's Government, Box 1979, Stevens Point. We will start volunteer screening committees going over all of those names; they will all be looked at and in no sense will we begin taking in administrative leadership from a few segments within the society. All 4.6 million citizens will be eligible.12

This wooing was a tremendous example of Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric. The people could vote for a candidate who, in return, would let them help choose his co-workers. Another triumph: the symbolic opening of both government and government jobs to the people. It also marked a well-planned strategy to promote citizen/government cooperation upon one clever contingency -- people had to vote for Dreyfus to make it happen.

Dreyfus made good on his promise to review citizen job applications by repeating his "Peoples' Government" screening committee offer the day after the election.¹³

This notion was an extremely flattering one. Burke writes of flattery:

[It's] a special case of persuasion in general. But flattery can safely serve as our paradigm if we systematically widen its meaning, to see behind it to the conditions of identification or consubstantiality in general. And you give the 'signs' of such consubstantiality by deference to an audience's 'opinions.'¹⁴

Encouraging audiences to guide his decision-making process as their governor was, in itself, a paradigm of Dreyfus' deference to the people.

In his book, Symbols in Society, Hugh Dalziel Duncan writes:

Address among superiors, inferiors, and equals is a form of courtship, and courtship is a form of persuasion, a presentation of the self before others who give us our place in society.¹⁵

Lee Dreyfus knew well that the voters would ultimately determine his place in society. Hence, his courtship rhetoric was directed to many other points of contention in the 1978 campaign. One such point involved the cost of needed energy per

megawatt to satisfy state needs.

In the first debate in Milwaukee, Dreyfus took his opponent, Martin Schreiber, and the listening and viewing audiences through a fairly convoluted mathematical exercise to determine this annual fixed energy rate:

Now, if 90 megawatts is the one percent over and if the current costs are estimated at \$1000 per kilowatt or a million dollars per megawatt, it comes to \$90,000,000. And with a 20% fixed annual rate to pay for that indebtedness, that comes to \$18 million. And even if I were to, say, go to \$2 million per megawatt because of future construction growth, I really am concerned that we come out with a figure that simply says \$175 million per percent.¹⁶

Schreiber responded to this exercise by claiming "nobody
¹⁷
in their living rooms understood" what Dreyfus meant. To this, Dreyfus responded:

First of all I think you underestimate the intelligence of the audience out there and I think they do understand me. Nine thousand megawatts is the peak load, 1% is 90. That's very easy to figure. (laughter) ...I think everybody in the audience understands it perfectly, Governor, and I wish you'd take a look at it and look at it carefully.¹⁸

This exchange, while seemingly minor, was a good example of how Dreyfus used courtship rhetoric to court and identify with the Wisconsin electorate. By again shifting a potentially sticky labeling from a negative to a positive, Dreyfus endeared himself further to voters. Whether you understood his math or not became irrelevant; he believed you were intelligent enough to understand. It exemplified Dreyfus' ability to court under adverse conditions.

A similar incident occurred in the second debate where both candidates were answering questions on prison facilities.

Schreiber said he believed there was a relationship between the number of people working and the rate of crime, to which Dreyfus reacted strongly:

The correlation is not between the rate of people working and crime but the rate of people not working and crime.¹⁹

The simple twist of words made an important point in Dreyfus' favor. The more people unemployed in Wisconsin, the greater the potential for acts of crime. That brought the jobs issue back to the forefront. It also allowed Dreyfus to stand up for both the people who needed jobs, and, for the people who had jobs but wanted to see unemployed, potential trouble-makers back at work. Again, this rhetoric of interests was in action, shaped for purposes of appeal.

In its essence communication involves the use of verbal symbols for purposes of appeal. Thus, it splits formally into the three elements of speaker, speech, and spoken-to, with the speaker so shaping his speech as to 'commune with' the spoken to.²⁰

Dreyfus continually "communed" with the audience because, he appealed to their interests. When asked about depletion of fossil fuels, he focuses that danger not upon loss of transportation, but on loss of individual freedom. This positioning was something close to every person who owned a driver's license.

But it seems to me we're gonna' have to put in the research to make sure that (depletion of fossil fuels) doesn't happen. Because the automobile is an extension of people's freedom. It has what has provided us the kind of individual mobility, and the elimination of fossil fuels for automotive would bring that result (loss of individual freedom). Let me say this: I think we still have to find a substitute for fossil fuels, for personal automobile capability, because we need those fossil fuels for other things than transportation.²¹

By equating loss of energy to loss of freedom, Dreyfus raised questions about Schreiber's energy policies -- i.e. was he looking out for us? -- while positioning himself as the one who would provide ample energy to keep our cars on the road.

He was also able to defend his potentially controversial position that road construction (certainly not everybody's top priority) was his top priority with courtship rhetoric. He accomplished this by extending the emphasis of individual freedoms to community assets:

As to the first priority being roads... You'd be surprised how that's going to help the people. That is the fundamental life blood of this society. We've got eight hundred and some communities that are only served by roads and have no railroad input at all. They live by truck in a very real sense.²²

Republicans, traditionally have been associated with the country-club set, the party of the rich. When taxes are a campaign issue, Democrats often claim that Republican tax programs favor the upper-class income groups. In 1978, Wisconsin proved no exception as Dreyfus was charged by Democrats with backing an inequitable progressive income tax platform. The Dreyfus/Schreiber debates show how Dreyfus consistently used courtship rhetoric to counter this claim.

In the third debate in Stevens Point, for example, Dreyfus countered charges that he was against levying property taxes based on people's ability to pay by claiming Schreiber's proposed tax plan would certainly favor the rich.

Now, what principle maintains that I don't want to relate the property tax to ability to pay? It's because of all the loopholes I see in the tax system that allows those who made a lot of money to wind up paying very little, and their adjusted gross

or adjusted income in many cases is almost zero. And you could have people who wind up with a giant income, a giant piece of property -- under your plan -- and they would pay almost nothing...

And, to get this tied to a tax system that is already loopholed to death -- I don't want to tie the property tax. At least on the property tax I can go and look at the taxroll and see what your tax is and what my tax is.²³

In the debate in Milwaukee, he talked about how increased gasoline taxes were unfair to the elderly and poor.

I've already proposed publically that all automotive vehicle sales tax be allocated to meet the needs of transportation, and that there be no increase whatsoever in the gasoline tax of seven cents per gallon.

Why the automotive sales tax? Because at least it will retain, if possible, the user fee relationship. Why no tax on gas? Because increasing fuel costs, in fact, makes the sales tax hardest on the elderly and hardest on the poor.²⁴

Also, in the debate in Stevens Point, Dreyfus identified with the "over-taxed" middle class:

But, maintain the strength of the middle-income working people. They are the people who work...they must remain strong and not have their strength sapped from them by over-taxation or the whole business comes down.²⁵

These references point out the universality of Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric. He supported the user-fee relationships to help lower class and elderly groups. He appreciated the tax burdens extant on the middle class. That his overall concern with over-taxation would be welcomed by traditionally more affluent Republicans was a given. In short, everybody got something.

Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric was evident on the issue of state-hiring practices, too, especially for those with affirmative action jobs. By opposing a freeze on state hiring,

Dreyfus identified with women and minorities.

First of all, I think the freeze (on state hiring as proposed by Schreiber) will have a chilling effect on affirmative action...the last ones hired in are going to be the first ones taken out. And since affirmative action is relatively new in our state hiring procedures, I tell you the people that are going to come out will be disproportionately minorities and females.²⁶

Finally, an examination of Dreyfus' views on the importance of promoting education with state dollars were valuable. This stand marked yet another example of how he transcended traditional Republican views, taking a largely Democratic stance on improving the skills of the underprivileged.

The other factor, though, has to do with educational skills because I tell you people without skills are people without hope. And unless the cornerstone of that is education and provides the basic skills of literacy, the basic skills of arithmetic skills, and basic skills of mechanical related to vocational, technical operation, all of the opportunities provided in the world aren't going to help that young person.²⁷

This excerpt was consistent with Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric. Few people of any political inclination would find fault with humanitarian discourse to aid future generations.

A MAVERICK WOOS WISCONSIN

It can be argued that politicians are all things to all people. Many times campaign promises are craftily designed and worded to offend the least amount of voters. Dreyfus' courtship rhetoric was a device which successfully helped him identify in debate situations with his audience of Wisconsin voters, despite attempts by his opponent to label much of that rhetoric as nothing more than election-year fluff.²⁸

Courtship rhetoric made Dreyfus a different brand of Republican

-- a maverick in a state that likes mavericks.

Why was this rhetoric successful? Campaign promises aside, Dreyfus understood the importance of a loving relationship with his audience, and designed his philosophy of government and platform accordingly. Marcus L. Ambrester, Jr. relates:

Identification is rooted in the language function as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation. Hence, the speaker relies upon the vested meaning of the symbols, thereby creating a 'courtship ritual' through which he woos his audience into a 'loving' relationship.³⁰

Dreyfus did identify with voters because his rhetoric of best interests was a valuable tool which mirrored his campaign slogan, "Let The People Decide." Through this rhetorical strategy, he was able to position himself as a desirable leader of people, a trustworthy candidate whom the majority of Wisconsin voters felt had their best interests at heart. Thus, Dreyfus was identified as a candidate of the people, not of special interest groups or even the Republicans. This identification broadened his voter appeal tremendously, and, as Burke tells us, helped "transcend social estrangement."²⁹

Dreyfus' use of courtship rhetoric was logical because as a political newcomer, there was much social estrangement to overcome. Throughout the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates, that style of rhetoric consistently recurred. This in turn allowed the loving relationship to grow until audience and speaker consummated the romance on election day.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Inc., Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 2 Marcus LaRoy Ambrester, Jr., "Identification: The Rhetorical Motive" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, Ohio University, 1972), p. 96.
- 3 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 2 November 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 3 - Stevens Point, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. C-135.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968), pp. 71-72.
- 6 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-144.
- 7 Burke, Counter-Statement, p. 71.
- 8 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus.
- 9 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 19 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 1 - Milwaukee, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. A-89.
- 10 Ibid, p. A-102.
- 11 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 23 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 2 - Madison, WI," John Powell, narrator, pp. B-122-123.
- 12 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-136.
- 13 "Dreyfus Plans Bureaucracy Shakeup," The Milwaukee Sentinel, 9 November 1978, p. 11.
- 14 Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), p. 55.
- 15 Hugh Dalziel Duncan, Symbols In Society (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 127.
- 16 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-91.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid, p. A-92.

- 19 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-118.
- 20 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 271.
- 21 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-98.
- 22 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-137.
- 23 Ibid, pp. C-138-139.
- 24 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-93.
- 25 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-136.
- 26 Ibid, pp. C-147-148.
- 27 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-99.
- 28 Ibid. (See pp. A-88 & A-105)
- 29 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus.
- 30 Ambrester, p. 97.
- 31 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 208.

"Or otherwise put: the imagery of slaying is a special case of transformation, and transformation involves the ideas and imagery of identification. That is: the killing of something is the changing of it, and the statement of the thing's nature before and after the change is an identifying of it."

-- Kenneth Burke
A Rhetoric of Motives

CHAPTER III

ROBBER BARON RHETORIC: THE PURGING AGENT

The political rally is staged as a great community drama, a struggle between good and evil, for the soul of America. At best the orator's opponent is misled or simply unable to carry out the great responsibilities of public office. At worst he is in league with evil powers, who are using him for malign purposes of their own or direct him in black conspiracy.¹

Attempts by politicians to associate their opponents with charges of mismanagement, corruption or other "evils" is nothing new. If candidates simply exchanged pleasantries, voters would not be able to perceive the differences between the candidates so easily. In Wisconsin's 1978 gubernatorial campaign, both candidates sought to discredit each other on numerous occasions. An inspection of the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates found many references where the candidates used pointed rhetoric to pin negative associations on each other.

Kenneth Burke calls this type of discourse the projective device of the scapegoat:

The 'curative' process that comes with the ability to hand over one's will to a scapegoat, thereby getting purification by dissociation... Hence, if one can hand over his infirmities to a vessel, or 'cause,' outside the self, one can battle an external enemy instead of battling an enemy within.²

Burke adds:

The poetics of tragedy explicitly deals with transformation by victimage. The audience is edified by sympathetically witnessing the imitation of a 'good' character being sacrificed.³

Lee Dreyfus' designated scapegoat, naturally, was his opponent, Martin Schreiber. With no political record of his own to run on, Dreyfus sought purification by dissociating

himself from Schreiber's administration. Throughout the debates examined, Dreyfus portrayed Schreiber as evil and not a man of the people's interests, thereby elevating his own status. In short, Dreyfus wished to identify with his audience by becoming the cathartic agent who would sacrifice the scapegoat for their benefit.

Thus the principle of drama is implicit in the idea of action, and the principle of victimage is implicit in the nature of drama. The negative helps radically to define the elements to be victimized. And inasmuch as substitution is a prime source of symbol systems, the conditions are set for catharsis by scapegoat (including the 'natural' invitation to 'project' upon the enemy any troublesome traits of our own that we would negate.)⁴

As stated, the Dreyfus campaign slogan was "Let The People Decide." That quip was predicated upon Dreyfus' belief (as stated in Chapter II) that government in Wisconsin had strayed away from the people, that people were over-taxed, and that big lobbying powers -- the special interests -- were buying the election with all their financial support for Schreiber.

Robert Williams, Dreyfus' Communications Director, recalled the special interests issue:

The special interest groups issue was very contrived. Whatever you don't have, meaning money here, make a plus for it. The money we didn't have was a terrible minus for us so we turned it around and made the other guy the villain for having all the money.⁵

Making Martin Schreiber the "villain" was an important priority in Dreyfus' campaign, and it showed in his rhetoric. Its task was to identify Schreiber's group as money, a powerful group with millions of dollars. In the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates studied, Dreyfus repeatedly made

this association, attempting to portray Schreiber as a robber baron. The issue which particularly made this possible was the state treasury, which had accrued a surplus of \$500 million.

The surplus topic was hotly debated; was it a plus for the taxpayers of Wisconsin or was it a case of overtaxation by the state? Dreyfus believed the latter and proposed to give it back, claiming the state had stolen that money to begin with.

Any tax system that steals \$500 million from the people beyond what it was designed to take in, needs reform. The proper thing to do with the money once it has been collected is to return it to the people from whom it was collected, because that is what is done when stolen property is recovered.⁷

This style of robber baron rhetoric was indicative of Dreyfus' debate performances. By equating Martin Schreiber as the villain, Dreyfus could be purified by dissociation.

THE SURPLUS ISSUE: GOOD VS. EVIL

One reason Dreyfus was able to successfully use robber baron rhetoric in debates was because he was an outsider to government. With no previous strings attached to the bureaucracy in Madison, and with no prior voting record on such issues as state taxation or jobs, it was easy for him to dissociate, to distance himself as far as possible from his opponent. In essence, he positioned himself as a governmentally-detached professor challenging a long-time bureaucrat.

Dreyfus made it clear his detachment from government was an asset; Schreiber, he claimed, was too blinded by his political experience to see the light:

You'll find in the debates he doesn't know how much of our [my emphasis] money he has. And he unfortunately had been in government so long -- and that happens to you -- that he's talking about the state's money, 'our' money, 'our' meaning state. I was using 'our' to mean the people who were paying it. Once the state's got it -- 'our' money -- it's easy to slip into saying it's the state's money.⁸

Thus Dreyfus' strategy was to "hang the surplus around Marty's neck"⁹ by blaming him for stealing "our" money. In the debate in Stevens Point, Dreyfus said:

I do blame you for the surplus -- not for its creation, that's double digit inflation. I blame you for sixteen months of inaction (Schreiber's stint to date as Acting Governor). We didn't need a tax plan out of you five weeks before election. We needed it out of you some time over a year ago. You could have done something about preventing that surplus, and the fundamental principle with me has been and still remains: no state has the right to take money from the people it doesn't need to provide services to the people. That's fundamental.¹⁰

This rhetoric was critical of the state, and Schreiber was its chief executive. That made him directly responsible for the surplus bloat. It also gave Dreyfus the opportunity to generate publicity with colorful imagery depicting the surplus as "stolen goods,"¹¹ an "albatross" around the necks of Democrats,¹² and a "blob": "Stop taxing the people and the blob will die!"¹³ Dreyfus had even told the State Republican Party Executive Committee before the primary:

Why don't we just stop withholding income taxes now and quit pouring money into the surplus? The state has enough money. Dave Carley (Schreiber's Democratic opponent in the primary) said in the last debate that the state has almost \$500 million in the bank. That will get the state through the rest of the year quite nicely. It's the people who need money. So why not have the rich state quit taking money they don't need from the poor people. Let's quit playing Robin Hood in reverse!¹⁴

In the second debate in Madison, Dreyfus' imagery was more subdued, but his point clear:

I am convinced there is a surplus there to do what we wanted essentially. I'm not talking about giving it back -- I am talking about...not taking it in the first place.¹⁵

While Schreiber did not believe the surplus issue was this serious initially (on September 25 he said, "People want to take that surplus and drape it around my neck like a rubber chicken...I don't think the voters of the state are going to accept that."¹⁶), and was content to address tax relief after the election, the robber baron rhetoric helped provoke a new tax program five weeks before the election. Dreyfus took note of this in the Stevens Point debate:

In terms of looking at changes, I'm really surprised that you would mention flip-flopping and changing about. It's like speaking of a rope in the house of a hanged man. I find that first you came out and said: 'I know what I'm gonna' do with the surplus -- I'm gonna' give everybody a \$20 rebate.' And when that didn't fly, you said: 'We'll have a tax commission (Schreiber's Blue Ribbon Tax Commission); we'll really study it and we've gotta' be thoughtful so there won't be anything out until after the election.' Then came in step three which was -- five weeks before the election -- zap: 'Here's a plan.' I can't imagine any more radical changes than that. And, I am surprised that you are concerned about change.¹⁷

Schreiber never was able to escape the surplus issue, mainly because Dreyfus' robber baron rhetoric wouldn't let him. Dreyfus continually kept the rhetorical onus on Schreiber, never letting up. Schreiber ultimately realized this cost him his job. Three days after the election he blamed his loss on the surplus:

The surplus was a positive thing. But I was never able to get my point across.¹⁸

As Burke writes in Language As Symbolic Action:

The overall purpose involved in tragedy is 'catharsis,' while various other resources serve in one way or another to make the sense of purgation most effective.¹⁹

THE EVIL ACTING GOVERNOR

In addition to using robber baron rhetoric to equate Acting Governor Schreiber with an evil -- the surplus -- Dreyfus also successfully employed it to equate Schreiber with other perceived abuses of Wisconsin state government. He made it clear that since the Democrats took over the governor's office in 1970, the people of Wisconsin had been subjected to the abuses of one-party government. And even though Schreiber had been governor for only 16 months, Dreyfus was able to associate him with blame for certain acts that happened in state government since 1970, when he was elected lieutenant governor.

I would also say we've got to reduce. In reducing the intrusion of government, the best way to do it is to build a two-party system, because in the contest between parties, it is in that clash of balance that you can't get the kind of arrogance that begins to corrode good government. It is when you have one-party control, as we've been able to observe in Madison over these past years, that one is able to say I will take top legislative leadership and literally seduce them out of the legislature by offering top bureaucratic jobs. And I watch that honed to a fine degree.

That imbalance between executive and legislative, I tell you, is a very real problem.²⁰

With this statement, Dreyfus prepared Martin Schreiber for the sacrifice. By pairing him with the evils of political imbalance, he had further identified Schreiber as evil, and he, Dreyfus, as the answer to this problem.

Schreiber was further castigated by robber baron rhetoric

as Dreyfus went in for the kill, blatantly charging Schreiber with personally taking advantage of the one-party, Democratic hold on the legislature:

But when you have one-party control, then you can avoid the wishes of the people -- you don't need them at all. And that will allow you to just simply decide, as my opponent did, that while not moving to reform taxes he could reform the governor's salary, from somewhere in the area of \$45,000 up to \$65,000, with one signature of the pen, making it the fifth highest paid governorship in the U.S.²¹

This marked a very important moment for Dreyfus: he had not only criticized Schreiber's party for one-party abuses, but he depicted the governor of Wisconsin as a greedy executive who would pad his salary while, as Dreyfus had pointed out, stealing the taxpayers' money and building an excessive surplus. Whether Governor Schreiber deserved that pay raise or not became irrelevant; Dreyfus identified Schreiber as a robber baron, collecting the people's pennies for himself.

Hanging the robber baron identification on Schreiber made Dreyfus the amelioration candidate - the man to wipe out the excesses of government by removing its evil leader. In his essay, "The Rhetoric Of Hitler's Battle," Burke points out that this style of rhetoric is not in the tradition of parliamentary criticism where a policymaker seeks to upgrade his adversary's policies; rather, it is a technique to clearly distinguish one person at the expense of another.

Add, now, the step into criticism. Not criticism in the 'parliamentary' sense of doubt, of hearkening to the opposition and attempting to mature a policy in the light of counter-policies; but the 'unified' kind of criticism that simply seeks for conscious ways of making ones position more 'efficient,' more thoroughly itself. This is the kind of criticism at which Hitler was an adept.

As a result, he could spontaneously turn to a scapegoat mechanism, and he could, by conscious planning, perfect the symmetry of the solution.²²

Most of Dreyfus' criticism of Schreiber was indeed "unified." Witness this exchange in the second debate as Dreyfus continued to associate (relatively new Governor) Schreiber with eight years of mediocrity:

Dreyfus: I do sense, as I travel around the state, people are looking for a new direction. Can we get a change? Where are we going to head out? And what are we going to do about something in terms of problems of unemployment? What are we going to do about the problems in the schools and the fact that we are turning out people who don't read and write, and aren't able to add? And what are we going to do about -

Schreiber: Lee Dreyfus, you're telling everyone here and want to have (guest reporters) Ed (Hinshaw) and Neil Shively believe that I am responsible for all the things that you say are going wrong in the state of Wisconsin?

Dreyfus: Well, I think the last eight years of the administration has to accept the responsibility for that, and I think the fact we've seen a reduction of local government and a more pre-emption of state government over it. I'm getting from them -- we've got to get that turned around. So, in a sense, you're talking about eight years you were number two, if not number one. In the last 15-16 months you've been number one.²³

Dreyfus also got Schreiber to admit mistake in the sale of the Adams prison, an act actually performed by former Governor Patrick Lucey when Schreiber was his Lieutenant Governor. As Wisconsin faced an over-crowding in its penitentiaries, Schreiber was forced to accept blame.

Dreyfus: I think we should not have sold the prison in the center of the state. Maybe there were good reasons for it then, but it sure doesn't look like it now.

But should we have sold that prison, or did we just make a mistake? And I can understand mistakes;

did we make a mistake? Because I understand now it would cost a heck of a lot more to buy it back from the federal government.²⁴

When pressed for an answer, Schreiber finally gave in and said:

"Yes, I think it was a mistake."²⁵

Again, Dreyfus was successful in equating Schreiber with the misdeeds of his boss and the evils of one-party domination. Even though Schreiber later says "Governor Lucey decided to sell the prison,"²⁶ he could not dissociate himself from a perceived mistake. Dreyfus identified Schreiber as an inept administrator because due to the 1978 prison facility shortage, it became apparent Schreiber (whether true or not) somehow had a hand in the mismanagement of a state taxpayer-supported institution.

Dreyfus did this one more time in more subtle fashion when he blamed Schreiber indirectly for promoting acceptable levels of unemployment.

Dreyfus: When people talk about acceptable levels of unemployment -- acceptable to whom? Not to the people who are in them. Plus you've got a pile of people who are absolutely underemployed.

Schreiber: No one mentioned any acceptable level of employment. When did I ever say that?

Dreyfus: No, I am not saying that...

Schreiber: Alright, then don't mention it anymore.

Dreyfus: Oh no. The Humphrey-Hawkins bill talks about an acceptable, in fact they use the term 'full employment with four percent underemployment.' That is just a silly kind of approach for a society like ours to take.

Schreiber: But don't raise that in the context of giving anyone the impression that that's my position.

Dreyfus: But that's a position of where we are now in this society, and it's a position of this state. Now we've gone from -

Schreiber: It's not a position of this state. I just told you that.

Dreyfus: It may not be one that you are holding to, but you are not going to produce the energy to expand, and right after 1987 (when Dreyfus believed the state would be unable to meet energy demands), you are out.²⁷

With this exchange, Dreyfus conveyed two key points to his audience. First, even though Schreiber denied it was his position, Dreyfus identified him with the terms of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill -- that certain levels of unemployment were OK. Dreyfus did this by a simple association: he said that "acceptable unemployment" was a position of the state, of which Martin Schreiber coincidentally was its chief executive officer.

Second, Dreyfus reinforced his own pro-nuclear energy expansion, pro-jobs position at Schreiber's expense. Once again the same rhetorical strategy was at work: make the man sitting on the big taxpayer surplus seem indifferent to the people. This was the "unified criticism" Burke refers to in "The Rhetoric Of Hitler's Battle."

THE BUREAUCRATIC DENIAL: MAINTAINING THE UP-STATE IMAGE

Being new to the political arena can be a liability. Lee Dreyfus had no political record to stand on, no bills that he had passed or vetoed, and no advantages incumbents traditionally enjoy. Despite these seeming handicaps, Dreyfus nevertheless sought to make his political inexperience and subsequent detachment from the Madison scene an asset. In essence, by

dissociating himself from state government and Martin Schreiber, Dreyfus could play devil's advocate and preserve his up-state, maverick image.

That Dreyfus was a shrewd politician, is clear. His ability to dodge potentially harmful bullets is also clear. His pro-nuclear energy stand as stated was controversial yet more palatable because he associated that energy expansion with a positive: new jobs.

A good indication of this shrewdness is when Dreyfus side-stepped an association he deemed harmful. Surprisingly, it involved a claim by Martin Schreiber that Dreyfus, because he worked for the state's university system, was indeed, like Schreiber himself, a bureaucrat. And bureaucracy -- particularly at the upper levels -- was something Dreyfus had publicly derided, especially because of easy access to special interests and vice-versa.

Equating Dreyfus with state government and bureaucracy was a rhetorical strategy Schreiber sought to employ. For if Dreyfus could be identified as one of the state bureaucrats he (Dreyfus) was so critical of, the onus would be at least partially lifted off Schreiber. If both men were considered state servants, Dreyfus could not easily play the up-state, detached candidate who sought to portray Schreiber as the robber baron.

Dreyfus first avoided the bureaucratic label during the second debate in Madison where he and Schreiber were exchanging views on the state's prison system:

Dreyfus: And that in fact, nine locals just today endorsed me, and all out of the corrections system; and I gather what they're honked about is that very

issue (prison personnel policies). And maybe you know more about precisely who they are upset with and what's involved.

Powell(Narrator John Powell): Nine unions of local guards?

Dreyfus: Yes, corrections units.

Schreiber: State employees, bureaucrats?

Dreyfus: Yes, that's true.

Schreiber: OK.

Dreyfus: But bureaucrats at the working level. But not at the top level, you know? There is a very real difference there, and do they know the difference...the people that are doing the work-a-day work in every bureau.²⁸

Here, Dreyfus chose to segment the bureaucracy. This meant an endorsement by "working level" bureaucrats was acceptable, yet easily distinguished from "top level" bureaucracy of which Martin Schreiber was the figurehead.

In the debate at UW-Stevens Point, Schreiber again tried to make Dreyfus admit he, too, was a bureaucrat because he worked for the state's university system. Schreiber:

I have been governor for sixteen months...Mr. Dreyfus has been chancellor here for a period of ten years and I would challenge him to tell us what he did, if anything, about any of the problems that he talked about right now. Because, whether or not you know it, he is a bureaucrat. He is the person that has been entrusted to run this campus for a period of time.²⁹

Dreyfus addressed that labeling:

As far as my being a bureaucrat -- not in the sense of civil service. As a chancellor of this university, I have about thirty seconds' tenure. That's long enough for the president of the board to get to a phone, call me, and tell me I'm fired. That's the way it ought to be; that's the way it is. People who make policy that affects people's lives -- and I did on this campus -- ought not have the protection and insulation from those people by having some kind of permanent tenure or civil service status.³⁰

By again segmenting the bureaucracy, Dreyfus told his

audience he was not a high level bureaucrat of the same ilk as Schreiber. His own job was subject to almost immediate termination because he was not protected and insulated from the people whose lives his policies affected. This was a critical distinction which allowed Dreyfus to continue his good guy vs. evil rhetoric. It was also interesting because further examination found Dreyfus seemingly contradicting his anti-bureaucrat position:

I think they (the people) ought to look at my administrative record in running one of the state's larger businesses, and I'm quite willing to stand on that. I think it's been done well, I think it's been done in the most cost-effective manner, I think it's been done with quality, and I think that it has produced the results I was expected to produce up there as a chief executive officer in that branch of government.³¹

The irony here is apparent. In one debate, Dreyfus plainly claims he is not a top level state employee; in another he brags about his record as a "chief executive officer" of "one of the state's larger businesses."

In Counter-Statement, Kenneth Burke notes that drama, more ³² than any other form, must never lose sight of its audience. Dreyfus, the speech professor, obviously understood this: he positioned his opponent as an evil bureaucrat while positioning his own state service record as a benefit. Again, Dreyfus' use of clever rhetoric protected the important positioning he desired as the people's -- not the bureaucrats' -- candidate. The people could appreciate his job as a top level state servant; to Martin Schreiber, he refused to admit he was a top level state servant. The distinction, outwardly, is fuzzy at best. Yet Dreyfus, with this broad-based rhetoric, was somehow able to keep his detached,

anti-bureaucrat image.

His approach to politics is fresh, his appeal is spread broadly [my emphasis] across the political spectrum, his programs have the ring of innovation; not the dull thud of politics as usual.³³

This ringing endorsement from the state's biggest morning newspaper, The Milwaukee Sentinel, reflected the effectiveness of Dreyfus' use of rhetoric to bolster his maverick, up-state image. Failure to dodge Schreiber's attempts to label him as another bureaucrat could have seriously damaged that image and restricted his robber baron rhetoric.

A MAVERICK SACRIFICES THE ROBBER BARON

It is very disarming to say that we should evaluate measures purely on the basis of their contribution to 'comfort.' But even 'comfort,' in this usage, is a principle, an abstract ideal. In fact, so far as I am concerned, it is much too abstract. Its danger resides in the fact that, because it sounds familiar, one thinks he knows what it means. Don't worry about such matters as the balancing of the budget, says (Thurman W.) Arnold. Yet some men demand it because it would comfort them.³⁴

A summary of Lee Dreyfus' robber baron rhetoric reveals it was most definitely aimed at that "comfort" factor people demand. In this case, Dreyfus shaped his rhetoric to show that the budget was imbalanced because it was too big! The \$500 million surplus was something Dreyfus made a majority of people uncomfortable with. It's particularly ironic that in an age where federal politicians are hyper-critical because the national budget is swimming in red ink, a chancellor from Stevens Point, Wisconsin, could defeat the Acting Governor because there was too much money in the state coffers.

One begins to see how essential the robber baron rhetoric

was to the Dreyfus campaign. Clearly the surplus issue was a catalyst to victory. (Martin Schreiber, as indicated, blamed his loss on the fact that Dreyfus turned the surplus into his (Schreiber's) political liability.)³⁵ By claiming Martin Schreiber had "stolen" the Wisconsin voters' taxes, and by using colorful phrases like "Robin Hood in reverse," Dreyfus hung the robber baron tag on his opponent.

In addition, the fact that Schreiber signed a bill to raise the governor's salary (some 45%), his association with special interests (which Dreyfus' rhetoric also equated with evil), Governor Lucey's errors, and Schreiber's inability to focus upon Dreyfus' limited political experience, all contributed to his sacrifice.

Thus disobedience is 'cured' through some kind of sacrifice, and since, in matters of governance, man is a socio-political being, the kind of community in which he lives and the roles he can play in it will determine the kind of sacrifice he thinks proper. When our opposition becomes an evil power in its own right, we must find some kind of public victim whose suffering and death can be witnessed by the community as a demonstration of the triumph of good over evil.³⁶

Hugh Dalziel Duncan tells us that redemptive sacrifice is a purgation of sin, or a cleansing of the individual and the community in which the sin occurred. Lee Dreyfus' election win³⁷ signaled the community purgation in Wisconsin in 1978. His robber baron rhetoric, along with his endearing discourse -- the courtship device -- formed a powerful combination. Both devices were effectively aimed at the people, and away from Madison and the bureaucrats and special interest groups that operated there with Martin Schreiber.

While scapegoat rhetoric is nothing new in politics, it can

be argued Lee Dreyfus's use of robber baron rhetoric in his debates with Martin Schreiber contributed to his favorable, maverick image. It was a factor in "good" triumphing over "evil," 55%-45%.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Hugh D. Duncan, Communication And Social Order (New York, NY: The Bedminster Press, 1962), p. 293.
- 2 Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, 3d ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973), pp. 202-203.
- 3 Kenneth Burke, Language As Symbolic Action (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1966), p. 299.
- 4 Ibid., p. 18
- 5 Interview with Robert W. Williams, Idea Associates, Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 6 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Inc., Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 7 "Dreyfus, Schreiber Ignore Interruptions During Debates," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 25 October 1978, p. 17.
- 8 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 2 November 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 3 - Stevens Point, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. C-143.
- 11 "Two Candidates Battle To Tie On Tax Issue," The Milwaukee Journal, 25 October 1978, part 2, p. 1.
- 12 "Dreyfus Style Buys Hopes Of Republican Fund Raisers," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 26 September 1978, p. 9.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 William M. Kraus, Let The People Decide (Aurora, IL: Caroline House Publishers, Inc., 1982), p. 47.
- 15 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 23 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 2 - Madison, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. B-113.
- 16 "Money Not There For Dreyfus' Plan - Schreiber," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 25 September 1978, p. 1.
- 17 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-138.

- 18 "Schreiber Assesses His Defeat," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 10 November 1978, p. 2.
- 19 Burke, Language As Symbolic Action, p. 204.
- 20 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-150.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 211.
- 23 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-109.
- 24 Ibid, pp. B-115-116.
- 25 Ibid, p. B-117.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid, p. B-125.
- 28 Ibid, p. B-115.
- 29 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-142.
- 30 Ibid, p. C-143.
- 31 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-130.
- 32 Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968), p. 37.
- 33 "Governor Choice Is Lee Dreyfus," The Milwaukee Sentinel, 25 October 1978, p. 10.
- 34 Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 182.
- 35 "Schreiber Blames Loss On Surplus Issue," The Stevens Point Journal, 10 November 1978, p. 2.
- 36 Hugh D. Duncan, "Communication in Society," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 412.
- 37 Ibid, p. 414.

"From the standpoint of 'identification' what we call
'competition' is better described as men's attempt to out-
imitate one another."

--Kenneth Burke --
A Rhetoric Of Motives

CHAPTER IV

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS: THE RHETORIC OF AUTHORITY AND OTHER PATTERNS OF IDENTIFICATION

As shown, Lee Dreyfus was able to identify with the voters of Wisconsin in the four Dreyfus/Schreiber debates analyzed because of two dominant rhetorical strategies: the rhetoric of courtship and robber baron rhetoric. Chapter IV examines another key strategy Dreyfus utilized to identify with the Wisconsin electorate.

This strategy involved Dreyfus' use of a special rhetoric to position himself as an authority on the Wisconsin governorship -- an ironic ploy considering Dreyfus had never served in that office while his opponent had been Lieutenant Governor for 6 1/2 years and Governor for 1 1/2 years.

A PROFESSOR TEACHES THE STUDENT

In his book, A Grammar Of Motives, Kenneth Burke argues:

For surely there has been at least one other great order of power that has greatly stimulated men's terminologies of motives: the power of authority.¹

Authority was a trait Dreyfus enjoyed in his academic life as a teacher, and as chancellor of UW-Stevens Point. As a professor of communication, and as a frequent public speaker, Dreyfus was no stranger to the lecturer's podium. These characteristics ultimately served him well in 1978 as he debated with Martin Schreiber.

Dreyfus particularly understood the power of authority in the political environment. In his own doctoral dissertation,

his use of authority paralleled Aristotle's notion of ethical proof:

Authority was one of the most used techniques in both Houses... This agrees with Aristotle's notions about the values and extensiveness of this type of argument. As mentioned before, (W.N.) Brigrance has theorized that authority is one of the oldest techniques and one of the most effective.²

In 1978, Dreyfus employed the rhetoric of authority repeatedly in the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates. Usually, this authoritative rhetoric was uttered in a pedantic or professor-to-student fashion -- as though Dreyfus was teaching Acting Governor Schreiber how to be a better governor.

Dreyfus related in his interview with this writer that this rhetoric of authority was not happenstance; rather, it was a strategy to improve his standing with voters.

But Lowell (Dreyfus aide Lowell Jackson) had said, 'Remember now, you are not on the attack. You are always to be the teacher, the professor, the patient one to teach this student who learns slowly. You'll have your chance to parry and thrust.'³

Strategic use of statistical information was one way Dreyfus espoused rhetoric of authority. More importantly, he used figures he received from state government offices -- information Martin Schreiber would have even easier access to.

In Milwaukee, Dreyfus cited statistics from the State Department of Transportation as he lectured to his opponent.

But now when you say you don't understand the figures, and where I'm throwing them out...the five thousand bridges with structural deficiencies come from the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation is part of the executive office. The executive office which is the one which you control. You appointed that secretary. So please understand I use my figures, and I use that appointment from your office, and you, in effect, people under your control.

As far as all the work on railroads in that right-of-way thing -- you appropriated \$7 million -- I just think where we are now...it just isn't doing the trick.

Your own Department of Highway and Transportation says it isn't doing the trick. And you're right, you're absolutely right -- except for your \$1.7 billion figure, I say that what I program is \$1.3 billion. The Wisconsin public expenditure survey, a private group, says there will be \$1.3 billion, and out of that I want \$160 million for roads.⁴

The professor-student parallel was obvious. Dreyfus was literally speaking down to the state's highest ranking official. This strategy helped identify Dreyfus as an even greater authority of some sort. It almost appeared that he was giving Schreiber a lecture in political science, especially the way he took Schreiber through the Governor-Dept. of Transportation relationship ("The DOT is part of the executive, you control the executive, so they're your people, etc.") step by step.

And how could Schreiber hope to challenge Dreyfus' logic if, indeed, Dreyfus was using statistics from Schreiber's own staff?

In another example of authority rhetoric, Dreyfus again used statistics to help Martin Schreiber determine just how big the surplus in Wisconsin really was.

And consequently if that's \$350 million, and that's less than half of the surplus, the surplus would have to be larger than \$700 million, and obviously it isn't. The surplus this year, I gather, was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500 million. Your figures don't jive for me, and every time I get another set of figures I begin to find that because if in fact it's \$350 million beyond the 1970 inflation, and if in fact that is not half, then how can you talk about a surplus being only \$500 million? You know, make it add.⁵

"You know, make it add," was reminiscent of a math teacher

asking a student how he got the answer he got. And whether Dreyfus' math was any better is not important; he was telling you Schreiber's math was wrong.

The math lesson continued:

You see, for example, when you throw in the moratorium of stopping the taxes this year -- that \$314 million according to you -- and you add that to the cost -- you said you wouldn't do that so you can't add it now. The proposal for the form for '79, once I'm governor, what I can do at that point will be \$1.318 billion. Those are our figures. You keep saying \$1.7 but you're adding in \$300 million, that in fact you know is going to be there. As you say, there's still \$280 million sitting there to carry over, and it's going to be there. And as far as I can see, using the last figures of the public expenditure survey -- just came out -- they are saying \$1.35 million and I'm saying another \$280 (million) in surplus left over -- that's got to be something more than \$1.6 billion.6

There was little doubt few people in Wisconsin could follow either Dreyfus' or Schreiber's logic in determining the surplus total. In fact, one got the feeling neither of them really knew the surplus total. Still, the key point was evident: Dreyfus, with his authority rhetoric, sounded like he knew exactly what he was talking about when he spouted those numbers. It was an important distinction which eroded Schreiber's credibility because, as Acting Governor he should have known exactly what his surplus total was.

Dreyfus also gave a math lesson to student Schreiber in determining fixed energy costs.

Your numbers don't add up for me. In fact, while I'm at numbers, let me ask you: You say that for every one percent of energy in excess capacity it will be \$175 million that will be given (passed on) to the consumer. My concern is that it is a function that you are really at the mercy of your staff and the technicians. Please derive that number for me. Let me tell you why I think that number is out of line: We have a 9,000 megawatt peak capacity right now,

and you can figure this out there at your desk,
(laughter) 9,000 megawatts peak capacity right now.⁷

First Dreyfus told Schreiber his numbers didn't add up, then, in true lecturing form, told him to re-figure his math at his desk...not at his own lectern, but at his desk. The pattern of authority rhetoric began to take hold as the challenger continued to speak down to the Governor, while simultaneously positioning himself as a credible person who could manage big money.

Dreyfus even chided Schreiber for omitting a statistic.

Was your \$175 million over ten years? That's a detail you left out. You ought to tell the people that's what it's going to cost for one percent. Ten years into \$175 million is only \$17 and a half million per year, right?⁸

The math lesson concluded in the final debate in Stevens Point with more teaching and chiding by the professor. The math problem this time was to determine just how many state employees there really were. Dreyfus:

Let's get re-sorted out within state government. Just the question, for example, of how many people we have employed in the state is confusing -- very difficult to obtain an answer. I've heard all kinds of answers; I had them fed to me in different forms; and, in fact, during the course of this debate -- up until this point -- the Governor never came out and said: 'Here's the number.' You know, is it 71,300, as I just saw today in a political advertisement?

Ah, we need somehow to find out how many people -- darn it -- are working for the state. In fact, if we can't do that, I think I'm going to call an employee census day in which everybody comes to Camp Randall (football stadium at UW-Madison). We get 'em through one gate and we'll count 'em all by nose. Somewhere we've got to know how many people are working.⁹

This time, Dreyfus made an example out of Schreiber, as a teacher would explain why Marty was a bad boy to the class.

Use of Camp Randall was colorful imagery, too. This debate (11/2/78) naturally coincided with football season and, as most Wisconsin fans knew, Camp Randall was the biggest stadium in Wisconsin -- a perfect place to round up all the state employees.

Related to these references of Dreyfus' use of authority rhetoric were two other debate excerpts where he again scolded Schreiber, but in this case, for unethical behavior. And again, Dreyfus spoke down to Schreiber:

And, also on the quip of defending the shores and delivering the mail -- come on, be serious. You can't really think that I'm talking about a federal government that has those two functions. I'm surprised -- I've mentioned it before -- that you take a quip and move it out to define the whole philosophy; don't do that in the presence of a whole state audience.¹⁰

And when Schreiber claimed Dreyfus was changing his positions as he traveled the state, Dreyfus lectured him on the merits of newspaper reporting.

I'm not talking different things as I travel around the state. You see that doesn't work, you get reported by the press. And you can't talk about what I said; these people down here can read about what I said in Wausau and they can read about what I said in Superior. It simply isn't a fact of life.¹¹

The voice of authority continued to speak down to Schreiber, blaming him, in essence, for unfair play. And what was critical here was that Dreyfus resolved charges by lecturing his opponent. This was directly opposite a similar situation, as noted, where Dreyfus tried to pin the "acceptable levels of employment" charge on Schreiber. Only in that instance, Schreiber was unable to use his own authority to truly refute Dreyfus.

Finally, it should be noted Dreyfus even went so far to give Schreiber a snap quiz on his positions on State taxes.

In the Wisconsin League of Women Voters debate, October 24, 1978 at UW-Madison, Dreyfus took advantage of his academic surroundings (Memorial Union) to surprise Schreiber with a quiz. Dreyfus rattled off Schreiber's stands on taxes in a true-false context and then gave Schreiber a failing grade much to the amusement of the largely student audience:

Now last time you called me 'Professor.' Alright, let me give you a true or false quiz. (laughter)

One: You proposed the \$20 rebate. True or False? True.

Two: I proposed a major income and property tax reform this summer. True or False? True.

Thirdly: Wisconsin's surplus is the largest in the United States. False - it's only the third largest in the United States. (laughter)

Number four: You opposed a bill for property tax relief in February similar to that which you put forth now. True.

Number five: You had 15 months to do something but you did nothing. True.

Number six: Your current plan doesn't provide relief, if passed, until 1980. True.

And, to date, you've proposed nothing to stop another big surplus. True.

Frankly, you just flunked that exam. (laughter) So let me give you a couple of homework questions. What will you do now with this thoughtful study? Will you just dump it when it comes in? Or the last big question for 10 points: Why couldn't you sign tax reform but you could reform the governor's salary and sign that from somewhere around \$45,000 to \$65,000 a year?12

One additional authority device Dreyfus constantly employed was the statement, "I tell you," to signify his

knowledge and experience in authority roles as a teacher, chancellor and speech-maker. Dreyfus used this phrase countless times throughout his debate rhetoric, often aimed at Schreiber:

The point is there aren't jobs for all of those people unless you think all 117,000 unemployed have jobs waiting for them that they cannot take today. I tell you the jobs are not there.¹³

Dreyfus' use of authority rhetoric was a bold yet seemingly successful way to enhance audience identification. He surely played the patient professor teaching the slow-learning student. In short, he did "out-imitate" his adversary, the governor.

Finally, there are a few other identification devices at work in the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates which warrant examination.

AN EXAMPLE OF INBORN DIGNITY

In his essay, "The Rhetoric Of Hitler's Battle," Kenneth Burke talks about Hitler's rhetorical unification device which included the important feature of "inborn dignity."

In both religions and humanistic patterns of thought, a 'natural born' dignity of man is stressed.¹⁴

While Burke refers to inborn dignity as "an attribute of ¹⁵ all men," it could be argued Dreyfus employed this line of thought when he was discussing jobs in the first debate in Milwaukee. Witness his answer on behalf of blacks and minorities to the question of what would happen should Wisconsin's economy not grow:

With no growth? Ho ho... I don't see a way to solve it

with no growth. There isn't any question in my mind what's operating within the racial biases of this society as to who loses a job first. And I think when you've got no growth, the only option left would be public employment in the public sector, and I think that's dumping ground employment with nowhere to go and basic support of people for their lives, and that's not in their own personal best interests.

I agree if we get to no growth, and that's the thing I'm concerned about, then we're concerned about what we're gonna' do on energy expansion. No growth would absolutely be disasterous for the minority people in this society. Absolutely disasterous.¹⁶

Dreyfus' rhetoric here did address the inborn dignity of blacks and minorities. When he spoke of "dumping ground employment," and that it was not in their "personal best interests" he was addressing the "natural born dignity" of this group -- a proud group. This unification device served to identify Dreyfus more closely with an often-ignored group which, by tradition, doesn't usually vote Republican. While this is not to say Dreyfus carried the minority group, it did help to position him as somebody who understood societal prejudices.

CONTRIBUTORY DEVICES: BACKGROUND AND FASHION

In addition to rhetorical devices employed by Lee Dreyfus in the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates examined, readers should know of two peripheral identifications Dreyfus was able to make with his audience. The first involved Dreyfus' speaking experience before large groups.

While Martin Schreiber was the seasoned politician who had made a career out of public address, Lee Dreyfus was no stranger to the podium. His speaking experience dated back to junior high school in Milwaukee where he first participated in

debate. In senior high, he also participated and was an officer of his debate society. At UW-Madison, he judged debate as an undergraduate and graduate student, and later as an instructor there.

His wife, Joyce, once remarked:

I always used to call him 'flannel mouth' in Milwaukee. In high school he was always up on the stage giving talks. It's 32 years later and nothing's changed.¹⁷

Speaking before large audiences was also something Dreyfus was familiar with while chancellor at UW-Stevens Point. According to campaign aide Robert Williams, Dreyfus made 937 speeches in Wisconsin during his 11 years as¹⁸ chancellor. Dreyfus related that he would speak in front of "any audience. I was building enrollment here (UW-Stevens¹⁹ Point). I used the platform to build it." This speaking experience also helped to develop his reputation as an extemporaneous speaker.

I'm not a fat Lincoln who writes speeches on the back of envelopes...but sticking to a prepared text is more fitting in a Communist country where a public figure's every word is measured for orthodoxy than in a democracy.²⁰

With a strong academic record in communications, a doctoral dissertation on political speaking, and a wealth of speaking experience, one can better understand how Dreyfus was able to skillfully perform in a political debate environment. His familiarity with debate was apparent when he told Martin Schreiber,

First of all I wanted to do my opening constructive rather than to respond to your question.²¹

The "constructive" is a technical debate term referring

to the opening or structural statement. It's not a likely word choice unless the speaker is familiar with debate training as Dreyfus, a former speech professor and debater, was.

The background here on Dreyfus' speaking experience is brief; it definitely does serve, however, as useful information to help explain rhetorical style which, as Burke tells us, is an aspect of identification.²²

Style is also transmitted as individuality. Without question, Lee Dreyfus' ever-present red vest was a non-verbal identification device. His bumper stickers, posters, buttons and advertisements all carried graphics depicting the red vest. As indicated, Dreyfus had worn red vests continually since 1967 for easy identification by students. In 1978, the red vest added to Dreyfus' maverick and unorthodox campaign style. This helped position Dreyfus as a candidate of individuality.

The playfulness of fashion, unlike the solemnity of ritual or the rigidity of public and official roles, lightens the weight of tradition and the staleness of custom and restores individuality to our relationships.²³

How much did the red vest help Lee Dreyfus enhance his standing with the debate audience and television viewers? It's hard to measure. But it did distinguish him as an individual which undoubtedly added to his up-state, anti-bureaucrat image. Perhaps this exchange in the second debate is symbolic: (Host) John Powell:

Will we see anything different from either of you (in an upcoming debate)?

Schreiber: Well, I won't be wearing a red vest.
I don't know what the opposition will be doing.

24

Dreyfus: I will be wearing a red vest.

Dreyfus proudly used a fashion device to make a statement for himself. If you didn't know Dreyfus before seeing him in person or on TV, the vest made him easily identifiable and by implication, at least, enhanced his claim that he was an accessible candidate who would open up the governor's office and be responsive to the needs of the people.

In sum, the rhetoric of authority, though seemingly ironic in that a political newcomer was lecturing down to Governor Schreiber, served as both an effective identification strategy and a dominant rhetorical device to augment the patterns of courtship and scapegoat discourse. In positioning himself as a greater authority on the workings and relationships of state government, Dreyfus was able to "out-imitate" his opponent.

The inborn dignity statement, speaking experience and non-verbal identifications were intangible identification factors. Still, they too were contributing factors to Lee Dreyfus' debate performance and image.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), p. 122.
- 2 Lee Sherman Dreyfus, "Persuasion Techniques In Modern Congressional Debate" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI, 1957), p. 246.
- 3 Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Inc., Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 4 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 19 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 1 - Milwaukee, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. A-95.
- 5 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 23 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 2 - Madison, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. B-111.
- 6 Ibid, p. B-113.
- 7 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, pp. A-90-91.
- 8 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-126.
- 9 Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks, "Governor's Forum '78," 2 November 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 3 - Stevens Point, WI," John Powell, narrator, p. C-139.
- 10 Ibid, p. C-137.
- 11 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-96.
- 12 WMTV-TV, Madison, WI, "Governor's Forum '78," 24 October 1978, "Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate - Madison, WI," Mary Grady, moderator, pp. D-156-157.
- 13 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 1, p. A-92.
- 14 Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, 3d ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973), p. 202.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-128.
- 17 "Dreyfus Optimistic As Campaign Closes," The Milwaukee Sentinel, 16 November 1978, p. 5.
- 18 Interview with Robert W. Williams, Idea Associates,

Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.

19

Interview with Lee Sherman Dreyfus.

20

"Dreyfus Reflects On Campaign Disparities," The Stevens Point Daily Journal, 28 October 1978, p. 6.

21

Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 3, p. C-137.

22

Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 309.

23

Hugh D. Duncan, Communication And Social Order (New York, NY: The Bedminster Press, 1962), p. 273.

24

Dreyfus/Schreiber Debate Number 2, p. B-107.

"In being identified with B, A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another.

-- Kenneth Burke
A Rhetoric of Motives

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Persuasion is the process of making use of all the techniques and devices available to the communicator to influence toward the communicator's purpose the attitudes, beliefs, and actions of the listener, reader or viewer.¹

This definition was posited by Lee Dreyfus in his own doctoral dissertation. It could be argued in reviewing Dreyfus' rhetorical strategies of courtship, scapegoat and authority rhetoric, that he indeed "made use of all the techniques and devices available" to him during the Dreyfus/Schreiber debates. Singularly these strategies were effective; collectively, they formed powerful rhetorical momentum for Lee Dreyfus.

Careful cluster analysis of these debates found Dreyfus' rhetoric clearly aligned with these three devices. Surprisingly few strings of his discourse did not clearly track with these dominant identification patterns. This style, in turn, led to a unified rhetorical appeal which was not only strategic, but people-oriented. Thus, Dreyfus never lost sight of his debate audiences.

This specific focus on the "people" also fostered Dreyfus' maverick image at a time when another maverick -- Jimmy Carter -- was holding the nation's highest office. Like Carter, Dreyfus sought a maverick distinction, and the three identification devices he employed all held "the people" as the common denominator.

Dreyfus enjoyed rhetorical success in the debates because he built a stronger people-candidate rapport than his opponent. Equating Schreiber with evil or distrustful forces helped; still, Dreyfus' rhetoric extended beyond this equation to formulate a new one: Dreyfus plus the people equaled fair and open government.

Although the debates examined here were only an aspect of the gubernatorial campaign, it can be reasoned that they reflected the campaign strategies, and provided a useful basis for critical investigation. While the debate formats can be a limitation to open, campaign discourse,² they did allow isolation within the campaign, or, as Griffin says, within the matrix of the historical movement.³

A SUMMARY OF DREYFUS' IDENTIFICATION PATTERNS

Lee Dreyfus' strategic use of the courtship device in the debates proved very successful in wooing his audience. His concern for energy, jobs, over-taxation, individual freedoms and other issues was, politically, nothing original; yet, he managed to relate these concerns in a genuinely soothing manner. In essence, Dreyfus converted such concerns to instill a pro-humanity quality in his rhetoric. This framework was an extremely persuasive tool. As Burke observes:

...humaneness is the soundest implement of persuasion. For it contributes towards the general humanization of policies, even should bad policies prevail.⁴

An orator aims to move his audience by broad appeal to their emotions, but can only accomplish this task by holding their interest.⁵ Dreyfus was able to hold that interest by

building a loving relationship with his audience based on their own best interests. By equating himself as the caring candidate, he was able to identify with courtship rhetoric.

The cluster analysis indicated that the scapegoat represented Dreyfus' most dominant rhetorical pattern in his debates with Schreiber. With no prior experience in political office to promote, it was only natural for Dreyfus to promote himself by shifting the voters' focus to Martin Schreiber's perceived flaws or evils. This shift also facilitated an effective rhetorical strategy called antithesis. In Language As Symbolic Action, Burke argues:

One may find himself hard put to define a policy purely in its own terms, but one can advocate it persuasively by an urgent assurance that it is decidedly against such-and-such other policy with which people may be disgruntled. For this reason also, the use of antithesis helps deflect embarrassing criticism.⁶

Dreyfus' labeling of the Wisconsin tax revenue surplus as an evil exemplified his use of antithesis rhetoric. His tax plan, outwardly, was no innovation; indeed, his position on taxation changed over the course of the campaign just like his opponent's. The difference was that Dreyfus successfully employed his robber baron rhetoric to keep a controversial issue focused not upon his views, but instead upon his foe's. By claiming his tax plan would return the "stolen" surplus to the people who were unfairly taxed, he was largely able to avoid any of the embarrassing criticism Burke alludes to. In sum, Dreyfus' use of antithesis fostered his purification by dissociation from Schreiber.

Burke notes the "systematic attempt to carve out an audience as the commercial rhetorician looks not merely for persuasive

devices in general, but for the topics that will appeal to the particular 'income group' most likely to be interested.⁷

The surplus issue was surely a factor in the debates examined here as Dreyfus hung it "around Martin Schreiber's neck." Again, his success here came more from identifying an evil association (Schreiber and excessive surplus) with scapegoat rhetoric than from promoting a superior tax plan.

While the surplus, as noted in Chapter III, was the critical topic around which to build the robber baron rhetoric, one cannot ignore Dreyfus' successful equating of Martin Schreiber as a robber baron to such other campaign charges like special interests collusion, generous salary increases and overly bureaucratic government which was closed to the people. Dreyfus continually paired Schreiber with these misdeeds to the point that Schreiber had great difficulty shifting the rhetorical onus off of himself and back on Dreyfus. The failure of a seasoned politician to sell the benefits of his experience -- in lieu of the opponent's inexperience -- cost dearly. The debates revealed this point clearly as the purging agent (Dreyfus) prepared the scapegoat (Schreiber) for sacrifice.

Dreyfus' authority rhetoric marked an important contribution to the dominant courtship and scapegoat patterns. As stated, this was an ironic twist -- a role reversal -- where Dreyfus lectured to, even spoke down to Wisconsin's highest ranking official, while simultaneously educating his listeners. Ambrester relates that there exists a strain of identification where the "process of identifying with a ruler without thinking

you are a ruler" shows one has common interests. In the debates, Dreyfus pushed this strain even further, daring to display his understanding of the governor's office and state government in a context that made him seemingly more knowledgeable than the governor himself.

Furthermore, as suggested in Chapter IV, the rhetoric of authority allowed Dreyfus to not only showcase his appreciation of the job he aspired to hold, but also conveyed the feeling that this outsider and avowed anti-bureaucrat had the skills to run the governor's office despite his lack of political experience.

William C. Davidson points out in his doctoral dissertation, "Sam Houston And The Indians: A Rhetorical Study Of The Man And The Myth," that "The equations reveal the speaker's strategy for winning over the audience."⁹

By equating himself as a man well-versed in state government, Dreyfus was perceived, in specific instances, as more of an authority on the Wisconsin governorship than his opponent. This positioning helped Dreyfus win over the debate audience by allaying fears that he was a politically naive professor who was unqualified for the job he sought.

Finally, the candidate's overall profile and appearance also served as contributory identifications to enhance voter appreciation. The red vest, a non-verbal identification device, served as part of the "general body of identifications that owe their convincingness much more to trivial repetition and dull daily reenforcement than to exceptional rhetorical skill."¹⁰ The public speaking experience led to a distinct rhetorical style which, in itself, was a social identification.¹¹

Together, these traits, along with the rhetorical strategies, helped to package a candidate who was very desirable to the debate audiences. In fact, some claimed the entire Dreyfus campaign represented "the finest piece of political packaging the state has ever seen."¹²

IMPLICATIONS

The desire to identify with people and build consubstantiality was something that continually motivated Lee Dreyfus in his one-on-one debates with Martin Schreiber. As cited in Chapter I, many suggested different reasons, as indicated, for his impressive election victory, yet one must not overlook those rhetorical devices he implemented to specifically build rapport and win over his debate audience. For unlike the day-to-day campaign politicking, the debates represented a statewide media event which allowed voters to compare the major candidates and their stands on issues. In a campaign which, as Dreyfus Communications Director Robert Williams claimed, had no major glitches,¹³ the debates did represent opportunities for Dreyfus glitches which could have potentially affected the governor's race. Williams:

Up to the primary, I thought we had nothing to lose. We're not expected to win so any good showing at all is a plus. But then when we found out we were ahead in some polls, we knew we could lose by one mistake. It's a terrible fear.¹⁴

Thus, the debates were extremely important to the Dreyfus camp. An embarrassing misstatement or verbal gaffe was disheartening to consider, let alone politically damaging before a statewide audience. Furthermore, the debates were

"replayed" by the news media. As posited, one strategy Dreyfus employed to keep the (potentially embarrassing) rhetorical onus off himself was to draw attention to his opponent's record and policies. This shifting undoubtedly alleviated worries of misstatement, for had the onus been kept on Dreyfus, there was greater opportunity for slip-up.

Finally, the debates showed the benefits of a cohesive identification ploy: the use of "we." Ambrester tells us that for Burke, an important strain of identification is how a speaker uses "we" because it can mean different things to
15
different people.

Use of "we" by the candidates often denoted something totally different. For Dreyfus, the candidate who claimed to represent the people's interests, "we" meant he and the Wisconsin people. Governor Schreiber sought this same definition; yet Dreyfus' was successful in having the people of Wisconsin believe that Schreiber's use of "we" meant he and the politicians/bureaucrats in the State Capitol. This positioning was an important distinction which greatly augmented Dreyfus' rhetorical patterns of identification and successful isolated him as a more desirable candidate.

As Kenneth Burke writes, "you persuade a man only insofar
16
as you talk his language." By clearly identifying his candidacy with the Wisconsin electorate and their best interests, Dreyfus was able to transcend man's divisiveness and proclaim unity.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Lee Sherman Dreyfus, "Persuasion Techniques In Modern Congressional Debate" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, University of Wisconsin - Madison, WI, 1957), pp. 24-25.
- 2 "Debate Expert Resolves That Debate Format Is Faulty," The Milwaukee Sentinel, 3 November 1978, p. 14.
- 3 Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech 35 (1952): 185.
- 4 Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 313.
- 5 Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), p. 74.
- 6 Kenneth Burke, Language As Symbolic Action (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1966), p. 19.
- 7 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 64.
- 8 Marcus LaRoy Ambrester, Jr., "Identification: The Rhetorical Motive" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, Ohio University, 1972), p. 68.
- 9 William C. Davidson, "Sam Houston And The Indians: A Rhetorical Study Of The Man And The Myth" (Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, University of Kansas, 1971), p. 9.
- 10 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 26.
- 11 Hugh D. Duncan, Communication And Social Order (New York, NY: The Bedminster Press, 1962), pp. 274-275.
- 12 "Letter To The Editor," Scott Schultz - Stevens Point, WI, The Milwaukee Journal, 26 October 1978, p. 18.
- 13 "How Lee Dreyfus really won Wisconsin," The Capital Times (Madison, WI), 11 February 1980, p. 15.
- 14 Interview with Robert W. Williams, Idea Associates, Stevens Point, WI, 23 January 1984.
- 15 Ambrester, p. 69.
- 16 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 55.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPT OF DREYFUS/SCHREIBER
DEBATE #1 -- WISCONSIN LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS "GOVERNOR'S FORUM '78,"
OCTOBER 19, 1978 AT MARQUETTE
UNIVERSITY, MILWAUKEE, WI

Hello, I'm John Powell. Tonight at Marquette University's Varsity Theatre, two candidates for governor, Martin Schreiber and Lee Dreyfus, will come together face-to-face in debate. Two of the topics have already been decided. They concern economic growth, and transportation policy questions. In a departure from previous debate formats, the two candidates will also answer several questions from the audience.

Election day is less than three weeks away. In those weeks, there will be several televised programs including all the candidates for governor. Coverage of this debate and others is provided by public broadcasters throughout the state. Now, from Marquette University in Milwaukee, Debate '78.

ANNOUNCER: The President of the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin...

PRESIDENT OF WOMEN VOTERS: Good evening. Before the debate begins, let me quickly outline the main ground rules. The candidates will engage in two rounds of debate, each round on a specific topic. Then alternating, they will present two rebuttal speeches. At the close of the two rounds of debate, the moderator will pose to the candidates several questions which have been submitted by the audience. The questions will have been selected by a panel on the criteria that they are relevant to the debate topics, represent the major interests of the audience, and are fair.

The debate will conclude with a closing statement by each candidate. Candidates have been asked to keep their remarks germane to the proposition and to the issues implied in it. The moderator will interrupt a speaker, if necessary, in order to keep the debate relevant to the issues.

The candidates' remarks will be timed and they have been informed of the time limits. In the interest of fairness to both candidates, and in the interest of staying on schedule, we have asked the audience in the auditorium to hold applause until the end of the debate. The moderator for this first debate is Barbara Knowlton, Program Vice-President of the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin. Barbara...

MODERATOR: Our first speaker tonight is Democratic candidate for governor, Martin J. Schreiber, who is currently the Acting Governor of Wisconsin. He has served both as Lieutenant Governor and as a State Senator.

Speaking second will be Lee S. Dreyfus, the Republican candidate for Governor; Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin/Stevens Point, currently on leave. Both participants have kindly agreed to be referred as "Mr." throughout the debate in the interests of

time and simplicity. Before reading the first proposition, let me state that these propositions do not necessarily reflect the League's view on the issues. They are presented as a basis for discussion.

The topic for the first round of debates is growth. Specifically, the proposition is, "Resolved: That Wisconsin's growth rate should continue at the current level. Personal income has risen an average of 9% per year since 1970, and employment, by 3% per year, since 1972." I will repeat the proposition, "Resolved: That Wisconsin's growth rate should continue at the current level."

By a flip of the coin, Mr. Schreiber is to present his opening statement first.

SCHREIBER: Thank you. On the outset, I want to express my gratitude to the League of Women Voters and to all of the people that have made these debates possible. As Governor of Wisconsin, I am proud to report to you that our economy is strong, and growing stronger - twice as fast as the rest of the nation. Welfare and Medicaid payments are down by \$36 million, there are 16,000 fewer people on welfare today than what there were 16 months ago. We are number one in the nation in energy conservation. We've worked hard to establish this record over the past number of years because when we came into office, we found the state of Wisconsin to be a mess. Number one in taxation among all of the states in the nation; an economy which was stagnant; we were losing tens of thousands of jobs, and the government payrolls were growing faster than what they were growing in the private sector.

No longer is Wisconsin the number one tax state. We are now adding 56,000 jobs per year in our private sector. We have invested massive amounts of money in local government and also through private business and industry tax advantages. Because of that, we now have a strong economy.

We have cut property taxes. We have invested in our future and we also have a surplus. My program for the past 16 months and for Wisconsin's economic growth is continuous direct property tax cuts. Continuation of business incentives and to insure the return of that surplus in a manner that's fair.

If Professor Dreyfus' campaign promises and election-year gimmicks are any indication of the kind of leadership that he offers, all progress over the past eight years will be reversed. Not only has he constantly changed his mind about the surplus, but he has also come up with an ill-advised temporary withholding plan statement which is unfair and is part of a \$1.7 billion scheme to mortgage the future, to buy the election, and to spend every last cent the state has.

His energy proposals exceed that even of the utilities'. They will be a \$500 million millstone around the necks of Wisconsin

consumers. And it adds \$120 per year on to every utility bill. Tonight, listen to what is said, not how. Look behind the jokes and clever sayings, look at substance and merit; your future depends on it.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your opening statement.

DREYFUS: To the resolve I say "no," that we should not maintain where we are now for three basic reasons. You point out in your resolve 9% personal income per year for the past eight years -- that's clearly been offset by inflation. You point out that it's true that there's 3% employment growth and rise per year since 1972, but I would also point out that unemployment has risen incredibly. In 1970, the unemployment figure was 72,000 people. In 1978, July, the unemployment figure was 117,000 people. The only way to solve that, in my opinion, is jobs.

We've got to quit talking about acceptable levels of unemployment, especially when we see 40% of the inner city of Milwaukee and its young between age 16 and 25, unemployed. When there's over 8% unemployment in Kenosha, and then we get a glowing picture of how well things are going in Wisconsin.

I tell you there's got to be new criteria for growth in expansion of business and industry in the United States in the '80's and '90's. It will no longer be sun, cheap labor and cheap taxes. It will now be those states that can provide guaranteed energy and guaranteed transportation of quality. We need a minimum of 5% more electrical energy available for industry and business per year for the next decade to solve these problems. How? One, obviously by conservation, and I think we're doing well on that. But clearly we can not get it all through conservation.

In fact I think we now have too many eggs in the coal basket. We now look at coal, can we expand it? Coal is a very dangerous fuel; it killed almost 200 Americans in the ground last year just digging the fuel. It put 50 pounds of coal dust per person in the air. And this is not to talk about black lung disease and how many people in Appalachia are dying from that.

We now know that the cost of scrubbers to make those coal plants and coal fire electrical energy plants effective in terms of the environment may raise it as high as \$15,000 per citizen in the United States before 1995. I would also stress that if we go heavily into coal and continue that, we'll put a stress on railroads that frankly do not have the ability. Is hydro the answer? No - overworked rivers now. Is solar the answer? I think yes -- but not before 2025. But with a major breakthrough, maybe by 2000.

So let's wait and wipe out one more generation of people? I tell you the poor must have at least equal weight in this state, in this nation's debate on energy and growth. How odd it is that historically, a Democratic governor is taking a conservative

posture and taking the key data from the utilities, when the utilities' motive is clearly profit; they owe that to their stockholders. And I understand that, but the governor's motive is to govern the growth of double digit inflation, to cover the needs of the unemployed, the under-employed, growing female work force, and those aging who do not wish to retire. All that needs to be included now, and if we make an error in producing energy in the next ten years I would rather err on the side of too much, not too little.

MODERATOR: We now begin the rebuttal speeches: Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: There are a number of dramatic fallacies in the opposition's proposals. Dr. Dreyfus, I would point out to you that the economy in our state has grown twice as fast as the rest of the nation. We have added 56,000 jobs per year since 1971, and you insist on a 5-8% energy growth rate.

I don't believe you really know what the energy growth rate has been in the state of Wisconsin over the past number of years. I don't believe you really understand that it has been .008%. Where you get you're 5-8% growth rate from... Why he seeks to put a \$500 million millstone around the necks of Wisconsin consumers... Why he seeks to expand our energy production above and beyond what is necessary, is something I find quite unbelievable. It would have been my hope that the good Chancellor would have taken it upon himself to evaluate precisely the kind of energy growth that we have experienced in the state of Wisconsin. That he would understand that it costs \$175 million more to Wisconsin consumers every time we have one percentage point of growth of electrical energy that we don't need.

He mentions employment of young people in our inner cities. I have yet to hear from Chancellor Dreyfus one specific program other than constructing nuclear energy plants... constructing an energy growth pattern that is above and beyond what anyone can ever envision. He has yet to point out how creating one nuclear power plant in the state of Wisconsin is going to give one job to any black unemployed person. Chancellor, I'd like to hear from you on that.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your first rebuttal speech.

DREYFUS: My first point is that if we have created 56,000 new jobs for the last eight years, then somewhere we have created an obvious 424,000 new jobs -- and the state has not grown to that extent -- why then do we wind up with the number of unemployed that we have? Your numbers don't add up for me. In fact, while I'm at numbers, let me ask you: You say that for every one percent of energy in excess capacity it will be \$175 million that will be given to the consumer. My concern is that it is a function that you are really at the mercy of your staff and the technicians. Please derive that number for me. Let me tell you why I think that number is out of line: We have a 9,000 megawatt peak capacity right now, and you can figure this out there at your desk,

(laughter) 9,000 megawatts peak capacity right now. If we go in percentage one percent over, that's obviously 90 megawatts.

Now, if 90 megawatts is the one percent over and if the current costs are estimated at \$1000 per kilowatt or a million dollars per megawatt, it comes to \$90,000,000. And with a 20% fixed annual rate to pay for that indebtedness that comes to \$18 million. And even if I were to, say, go to \$2 million per megawatt because of future construction growth, I really am concerned that we come out with a figure that simply says \$175 million per percent. That is so far off the mark that I cannot consider which points you are using in terms at arriving at that figure.

And I worry about that because as chief executive officer you cannot be at the mercy of the staff and you cannot be at the mercy of the technicians, and I sure as heck don't believe you can be at the mercy of the utilities. If you wonder why the utilities have changed their point of view when they used to be so conscious about growth, and if you look at the past 25-year history, you won't find this .008 growth you talk about. The reason is they can't produce cheap fuel anymore in high profits.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your final rebuttal.

SCHREIBER: Professor Dreyfus, there is not a person out there in their living room that understood what you said (applause). I don't care how you might want to work around the figures, you have yet to point out how we are going to employ one black young person in Milwaukee's inner city.

We have been able to add growth in our state employment so now we have 46% of our population working in our work force compared to 40% when the Democrats first took over responsibility for our state government in 1971. I want to continue that economic growth, and I'm going to fight for it, whether it's fighting Washington D.C. and making sure we get our proper allocation of natural gas and oil; whether or not it's developing alternative forms of energy by signing into law the solar energy bill; and whether it's developing the kind of good, tough hard programs that's going to provide for our inner city young people. And Professor, I'm gonna' tell you we're not going to employ our inner city young people by constructing nuclear power plants.

And by the way, I would like you in your two minutes remaining, to tell us what we're going to do with the waste from those nuclear power plants. I'd like you to point out and solve for the entire world what we're going to do about de-commissioning of nuclear power plants. And then I would like you to tell everyone in this studio and everyone in their own home assurances that there will be enough nuclear energy to take care of his capacity. No one in this world can assure us of those three points! What to do with the nuclear wastes; how to de-commission a nuclear power plant; and how much available is that fuel.

MODERATOR: May I remind the audience that we have asked you to

hold your applause 'til the end so we can hear more of the debates. Mr. Dreyfus, your final rebuttal, please.

DREYFUS: First of all I think you underestimate the intelligence of the audience out there and I think they do understand me. Nine thousand megawatts is the peak load, 1% is 90. That's very easy to figure. (laughter) No, wait a minute now, don't do that, please don't. Ninety megawatts cost a million dollars. That's 90 million dollars. If 20% of that is the cost for one year annual fixed rate, that's \$18 million. I am saying there is an \$18 million possible overcharge to the consumer if we were to increase by 1%, and you've been using the figure, 175. I think everybody in the audience understands it perfectly, Governor, and I'd wish you'd take a look at it and look at it carefully.

Secondly, without that energy, we will not expand jobs and industry. I said the relationship is to bring industry into this state. And those states in the 80's and 90's that can guarantee enough energy and guarantee the transportation for that industry, will bring in the expansion. And only through that expansion are there gonna' be jobs for everyone. But it happens to be the inner city who in fact are getting hit the hardest on it. And that tied with transportation - mass transportation - will in fact produce the jobs. If the jobs are there, people will be able to seek them out. The point is there aren't jobs for all of those people unless you think all 117,000 unemployed have jobs waiting for them that they cannot take today. I tell you the jobs are not there.

You also gave me the task of waste, and I gather you gave me about six minutes of work in this two minutes. One percent of the nuclear waste problem in this country is related to these plants. Ninety-nine percent is related to military hardware in the Pentagon. That one percent should never have been tied to anything but the military. I wish the Core of the Engineers of the Navy had had it and the federal government ought to move and move on that rapidly.

But the key issue for me is that there is, I agree, a potential environmental danger in the waste. But I tell you there's an environment at Third and Walnut today that is not potential. It is destroying the lives of children and the future people and if we don't move the jobs, they're going to be in trouble.

MODERATOR: Thank-you. That concludes the first round of this debate. Thank-you, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Dreyfus. We turn now to the subject of transportation. You are asked to speak to the following proposition. "Resolved: That Wisconsin's future transportation policy should have a mixed system of highways, rail, mass transit, airports, and harbors." I'll repeat the proposition, "Resolved: That Wisconsin's future transportation policy should have a mixed system of highways, rail, mass transit, airports, and harbors."

In this round, Mr. Dreyfus is to present the first opening

statement.

DREYFUS: Thank-you. My response to this resolve is clearly "yes." But of course the issue is what mix, what balance, so in effect, what influences how we are going to look at a policy of transportation? For example, some of the facts are 55% of all Wisconsin communities are totally dependent on the truck for their existence. Mass transportation exists in 23 Wisconsin communities. Ninety-eight percent of all fruits and vegetables are moved in this state by truck. Twenty percent of our railroad mileage or trackage now carries 72% of the traffic, and tourism depends almost totally on road. Those kinds of facts are the givens that we have to deal with. So one issue is obviously priorities, and I want you to know what mine are.

My first priority, frankly, is roads. That's the first and foremost, absolute top priority of my administration. The second is mass transit and rail. We need a massive, immediate assault on this problem. And the other issue, of course, then is funding. I've already proposed publically that all automotive vehicle sales tax be allocated to meet the needs of transportation, and that there be no increase whatsoever in the gasoline tax of seven cents per gallon.

Now, I understand from the governor's own office that that will constitute an \$80 million per year figure. Why the automotive sales tax? Because at least it will retain, if possible, the user fee relationship. Why no tax on gas? Because increasing fuel costs, in fact, makes the sales tax hardest on the elderly and hardest on the poor. Why the road priority? It's basic to the economy, it's basic to the needs of almost every citizen in this state. There's been a terrible deterioration.

The Department of Transportation figures indicate that. Five thousand structurally-deficient bridges out of 12,000 bridges; 15,000 major-accident-rate roads that are well over the average rate; 4200 with poor surfacing; 5400 with shoulder shortfalls. DOT estimates a billion dollars to restore the road system. We need then a decade of road restoration from automotive sales tax funds that'll come to \$80 million per year. And each year I want at least three quarters of that into roads. That's my priority.

The remaining one-fourth or \$20 million can be towards mass transit in our own cities and the meeting of railroad problems. Why mass transit? Sixty percent of all urban pollution is related to the automobile. Maybe we can do something about that.

Jobs are fleeing the city. Let's move transit systems so that people in the inner city can get to the jobs. Mobility for the elderly and mobility for the handicapped... But with the railroads we need a basic decision: Do we subsidize low-use branches, purchase rights of way? I think so. Or do we have a constitutional amendment for the state to take over if the private sector can't keep them? But can we allow the Milwaukee Road to go bankrupt? And a decision needs to be made soon. The

future means jobs, including transportation.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your opening statement.

SCHREIBER: I favor an aggressive road-building program for Wisconsin, and already began that effort by appropriating \$22.7 million of that surplus that he wishes to give away. \$22.7 million to build the roads that he just talked about. I've been working on problems with the Department of Transportation realizing that Wisconsin must step up its road-building program and its repair of bridges. Realizing that these constructions of roads and bridges and highways are essential to our continued economic development.

We're going to do more. Current estimates -- and this is where I have failed to understand how my opponent can throw out these figures -- current estimates are that there are between \$35 and \$45 million a year that could appropriately be used and spent by our Department of Transportation for the construction of new bridges and new highways.

But we must go further than that. I believe strongly that we must have a balanced transportation system. That means transportation for the elderly, for the disabled, for the handicapped, for the poor who are unable to get about in their own communities. This also means saving vital railroad lines; the accomplishments of my administration in the past six months have done more to strengthen our ability to keep our railroads than almost any other state in this nation.

In addition to that, we have appropriated money for abandoning -- for purchasing abandoned railroad rights of way. We've a big job ahead of us, but keep in mind that Wisconsin traditionally has always had an outstanding highway network. And those have helped make the economies of our cities and our farms strong and growing.

And as Governor of Wisconsin, I'm committed to spending the money for those roads. My opponent -- and I might point out that his discussion in the city of Milwaukee is quite different than his discussion when he's in the North. But my opponent has opposed -- proposed -- dismantling our unified transportation fund in creating a new fund for highways that would spend according to his figures, \$160 million per biennium. Now I want to tell you that is only part of his \$1.7 billion worth of campaign promises and give-away schemes of spending every single last cent in the treasury.

He is serious about his proposal to transfer \$160 million from the general fund to spend on his promises. I challenge him to explain what part of his tax program he will give up to provide the dollars. As he reminded his Republican debate opponent: "Bobby, ya' can't spend the same dollar twice."

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your first rebuttal speech.

DREYFUS: Well, there are several problems I have. First of all, when I'm talking about the surplus I'm not talking about giving it away, I'm talking about \$900 million of it, not taking it in the first place. And you seem not to be able to distinguish between not taking it and giving it away. I have no problem distinguishing that. (laughter)

Secondly, when you talk about \$22 million of the surplus as opposed to \$160 million, that's what I... there's no question about it, I've been saying that from the beginning. We must allocate this kind of money to do something about these roads. Just traveling and campaigning -- and I travel them heavily as you know, I assume you have -- you must be aware of what's happening in the conditions of the roads.

But now when you say you don't understand the figures, and where I'm throwing them out... the five thousand bridges with structural deficiencies come from the Department of Transportation. The Department of Transportation is part of the executive office. The executive office which is the one which you control. You appointed that secretary. So please understand I use my figures, and I use that appointment from your office, and your, in effect, people under your control.

There's no question in my mind that bridges are in structural deficiency, I'm sure when you say 'up north' -- I think he's referring to the Arrowhead bridge -- you ought to go up and look at that bridge. It's in such incredibly terrible shape that I had concerns about its safety and found out they wouldn't let a school bus go across this thing.

As far as all the work on railroads in that right-of-way thing -- you appropriated \$7 million. I just think where we are now with \$105 million coming out of the revenues for state trunk highways -- out of motor vehicle revenues -- and then when you look at the amount of debt service out of that -- \$55 million for maintenance and snow removal, \$21 million for debt service -- leaving about \$25 million for the repair of these roads -- and with a seven-cent gas tax -- it just isn't doing the trick.

Your own Department of Highway and Transportation says it isn't doing the trick. And you're right, you're absolutely right -- except for your \$1.7 billion figure, I say that what I program is \$1.3 billion. The Wisconsin public expenditure survey, a private group, says there will be \$1.3 billion, and out of that I want \$160 million for roads.

MODERATOR: The next rebuttal speech is to be made by Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: I only wish as I listen to my opponent and review his proposals that he has made over the past number of months when he first began running, I wish that he would be able to count dollars as well as he's able to count bridges. Because if he would be able to do that, he would know that he is proposing the

kind of plan where he must, with all responsibility to the people in this room and to the people in their living rooms, he must precisely describe what programs that he has promised before he will cut in order to spend that \$180 million.

Or he must describe specifically whether or not he is interested in a tax increase. Or he must describe specifically what promises he is going to withdraw from. And I want to stress again, as I follow your remarks around the state, they differ quite vividly.

When you're talking in Wausau, you're talking about the fact that we need to reapportion our state of Wisconsin, contrary to the constitution, on the basis of one house of the legislature on population and the other house on geography -- something that was settled by the United States constitution a number of years ago. And at that point willing, to point out that the state of Wisconsin must be willing to bargain with communities around the state, having them give up some of the things they have coming to them, for example, their vote, in order to receive additional benefits. And highways being one of them.

When you talk up north, Chancellor Dreyfus, you talk a total of \$180 million in the highway fund. When you talk in Milwaukee, you're talking about three-fourths that going into roads with the balance going into mass transportation. Chancellor Dreyfus, where do you really stand?

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus now presents his second rebuttal of this round.

DREYFUS: I'm not sure what to pull out of there, except that when I talked up North, I've used the same figure that I want to take: \$160 million. By the way I got this from your office, too, you just upped me 20 -- \$160 million to go to meet transportation needs. It was in the presence of this group asking for a division as to where it would go, and that was part of his debate question.

And I want to absolutely assure that a minimum of three-fourths of that amount is going to go into roads. I recognize the needs for mass transit, I recognize the needs for railroads, but the railroad one's particularly a little bit nebulous. So in terms of breaking it down, whether I talk about highways, mass transportation, or I talk about transportation including mass, including roads, and including railroads. There were also harbors and airports, and I thought they were immaterial.

I'm not talking different things as I travel around the state. You see that doesn't work, you get reported by the press. And you can't talk about what I said; these people down here can read about what I said in Wausau and they can read about what I said in Superior. It simply isn't a fact of life.

The other factor, though, is this \$1.7 billion figure. I am going on the basis that the \$1.3 billion is surplus according to

the Wisconsin public expenditure survey. They are not part of your administration, they are not part of anybody's. I view them as the only truly neutral group, and the only one now whose figures I'm trying to accept. And in fact I have problems knowing what figures come out of your Department of Revenue because that surplus has gone all over the horn from \$280-\$518 (million), so I just now no longer accept the figures.

But I'm not changing on those things, I said then \$160 million per biennium -- what I really said was all of the automotive sales tax. The 160 comes from his office because I don't have the staff to generate the figures -- so I am assuming that that is an accurate figure unless you are telling me differently tonight. And out of that, when being pressed by the Woman's League of Voters here, that I would guarantee minimum of three quarters of that into roads. No question in my mind that's my top priority. After that, we look at mass transit, after that, we look at railroads.

MODERATOR: The final speech of this round is by Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: I'm for maintaining the balanced transportation system. We put \$22.7 million into that system; I'm committed to making sure we preserve our railroads at every possible turn, I'm also committed to make sure that we purchase our abandoned railroads rights of way, provide mass transportation for elderly, our handicapped and our poor. Important, and up to a point, my opponent and I agree pretty much along the line. Chancellor, I want to tell you that if you did not know the amount of money that comes into our state treasury as a result of 4% sales tax on automobiles, if you didn't know that total dollar amount and just felt that that was a good figure, I don't know. It just seems to me that there's a little bit more responsibility required.

And just to feel that it would be a good idea, and not really know the dollar amount of the figure, not really know that it may be \$160 or \$180 million, not really knowing the impact. I guess also I'd like to point out that as Governor of Wisconsin, I feel our harbors and our airports are pretty important. And I also once again point that you, and your press statements, have been reported as saying that you are in favor of dismantling our unified transportation fund, and creating a new fund for highways, only that you would spend \$160 million per biennium.

Again, what you say here, and what you say up north, are two different things. Also, that \$160 million is again only part of your \$1.7 billion give-away program that you are seeking to play upon. A \$1.7 billion dollar give-away program that uses every single cent up that our state has in its treasury.

MODERATOR: Now we will go to the questions from the audience. The first question is: "What effect will the depletion of fossil fuels have on the use of highways in the future?" Mr. Dreyfus?

DREYFUS: Obviously if we have no substitute for automotive capability and we deplete all of our fossil fuels, we will find ourselves with highways and no automobiles to ride on them. That's the extreme. At the same point, those highways would then become, I assume, the basic roadbed for a mass transit system by whatever system of electricity -- and my guess is that if it were the current state of the art it would undoubtedly have to be expansion through nuclear power. We would then all be consigned to mass transit and no longer have the freedom of the automobile.

But it seems to me that we're gonna' have to put in the research to make sure that doesn't happen. Because the automobile is an extension of people's freedom. It has what has provided us the kind of individual mobility, and the elimination of fossil fuels for automotive would bring that result. Let me say this: I think we still have to find a substitute for fossil fuels for personal automobile capability, because we need those fossil fuels for other things other than transportation.

We have fuels that we can go to -- gasahol -- or we can go to possibly the combination of gasahol and electric car that's being experimented with in Madison at this point. But we cannot, in fact, continue to use up fossil fuels for that because we do need it for, essentially, fertilizer. We need it for the many products that both coal and petroleum can bring to us other than fuel for transportation. But there is no question that if we go to the extreme you talk about, we will find ourselves with roads, a \$300 billion road system, and no automobiles to put on it.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your answer.

SCHREIBER: It is that disappearance of fossil fuels that has been the cornerstone of my energy policy for Wisconsin. My energy policy for Wisconsin consists of conservation efforts. Also protection. Protection of sources of supply, through Mexico, the Alaskan gasline, protection from Washington D.C., and also protection from the major oil companies. The major oil companies are spending more time in Washington D.C. looking for profits than what they are spending looking for oil in the ground. Development is the third plank of my energy platform. Development of alternative fuels, solar energy, for example, ethyl alcohol, methane gas, for example. All of these designed to stimulate the opportunity for the people in the state of Wisconsin to have alternative forms of fuel.

The University of Wisconsin is the top energy research institution in the entire world. It is my hope that through their efforts that they are going to be developing the alternatives to fossil fuels. But until that happens, conservation is the key.

MODERATOR: The second question is: "The jobless rate of minorities in Wisconsin has been reported to be the highest in the nation. What, if anything, do you plan to do about this?" I will repeat the question, and then Mr. Schreiber will answer

first. (question is repeated)

SCHREIBER: I've already begun working and developing a program for our unemployed youth. I grew up on 26th and Center Street in Milwaukee, and I had an opportunity to work in the grocery store down the block. I also had the opportunity to work in a small business as I went to high school. That grocery store is now gone, that small business has now disappeared. Businesses are moving out of our inner cities.

The cornerstone for assisting our young people in our inner cities to obtain jobs is to encourage the location through a tax-incentive program to industries to locate in our inner cities. In addition to that, we have put together a special team, working in Milwaukee's inner city to help our young people develop the understanding and the necessity, of filling out a job application, to help match up a youngster's interest with his or her skills. I will point out to you that in all of the research that I have done -- everything that I have read about helping young people have a hope and a dream and a vision -- no author anyplace indicated that by constructing one nuclear power plant, we'd be able to employ one more black person in our inner city.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your reply.

DREYFUS: First of all, I noticed you say you've begun working and developing a program. I'm wondering if after 15 months you've begun working on this. Seems to me you could have done this a lot earlier, and the administration's been in power for eight years. Essentially, the program which I propose, and propose to the NAACP in this community, is a 25% subsidy by the state for those who have been on unemployment for 6 months, 25% of the hourly wage subsidized by the state if private sector employment will take those people on, an increase of 1% for every additional month they've been on unemployment up to 18 months, which could be as high as 37% state subsidy.

To make that person who is unemployed a very available and marketable worker to any business or industry that is ready to take him on, the argument is: where would you pay for that? Obviously, if people come off of a welfare subsidization and go on to a job that is only 25-37%, there's got to be the money to handle it. That provides the job opportunity and in the private sector, not the public sector.

The other factor, though, has to do with educational skills because I tell you people without skills are people without hope. And unless the cornerstone of that is education and provides the basic skills of literacy, the basic skills of arithmetic skills, and basic skills of mechanical related to vocational, technical operation, all of the opportunities provided in the world aren't going to help that young person. So we'd better make the cornerstone education; that is, the foundation in which it is going to go. Since we're still back to the nuclear, unless you've got the power, you will not expand that business and industry. And without

that you will not have jobs in the private sector.

MODERATOR: Our third question is: "What will your course of action be if state tourism drops drastically?" I will repeat the question and Mr. Dreyfus will answer. (question is repeated)

DREYFUS: I think the first thing is to possibly move up the road program faster than I thought it was. It seems to me that the roads are essential to the state tourism industry because it is ease of getting into the tourist area that makes for the expansion of tourism that is now a \$4.6 billion industry in this state.

I think the second factor would have to be to determine what are we doing as a state to promote this great industry of ours? And we have a very minimal input compared to most other states in reaching out to the rest of the nation to attract people, to let them know the great resource we have in the northern part of the state, particularly. And to say here is a place where you can get above the tension line and spend some time that will improve your quality of life and at the same time provide the basic needs for people up there. But I think the third factor has to do with looking at what's happening in the tourist/housing industry and as a result of increased prices and assessments, and what's happening with the sell-off of resort cottages.

We are finding that there is a tendency to move in those areas and increase the assessments based on what some cottages are being sold for on that lake, when you have an industry that is in fact turning over as a rental basis for motels. That program has been brought and I think it's one that we better look at quickly because they are beginning to sell them off. And in the process you begin to get owners-occupied rather than industry-, tourist industry-occupied. And that could have much to do with any radical drop. But the key issue for me is going to have to be promote the advertising and build that area in the state and secondly, produce the roads that will let them get there.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: Well first of all I do not accept the basic premise which forms the basis for the question. Our winter tourism has been increasing dramatically, our summer tourism has been increasing dramatically, and we are now finding ourselves in Wisconsin to enjoy the luxury of being a four season-tourism state. What is exciting about that is the potential that it offers for the north, and also the opportunity for additional recreational enjoyment for all of us.

Within the next number of years, the north will experience a 50% increase in population. I've called for a governor's conference on growth to begin preparing this state for that influx of population. Not only providing an ability for our communities in the north to adjust to accept expanded manufacturing, but to also

make sure we do everything we can to strengthen the tourism industry. The winter conference on tourism... a piece of legislation that I signed into law that expands our ability to have better snowmobile trails... The fact that we are moving and developing as a people in making sure we keep our environment clean... The clean lakes, and the clean rivers, and the clean streams, and as I stand here, I will not say any more. (laughter)

MODERATOR: The fourth question is: "It has been suggested that the state's environmental programs are retarding economic growth. But haven't we had strong economic growth in recent years even with the environmental programs?" I will repeat the question and Mr. Schreiber will be the first to answer. (question is repeated)

SCHREIBER: The answer to the question is "yes". We have had strong economic growth in the state of Wisconsin even though we have had environmental programs. The Fox River is cleaner today than what it was ten years ago. Why? Because of legislation, because of enforcement, but primarily because of the special character in nature of the people in the state of Wisconsin who are willing to make that effort, that extra effort.

I mentioned before in the opening remarks that our economy is growing twice as fast as the rest of the nation. We were able to do that while at the same time clean our environment. I signed into law a piece of legislation that would establish the Wisconsin fund -- a special program established to help our taxpayers in our cities and our communities construct the sewer treatment lines and build the sewer treatment facilities.

That is a program of \$62 1/2 million that was paid for out of the surplus, the surplus that he is wishing to give back to people in an election-year gimmick. Sixty-two and a half million set aside to help our property tax payers meet their clean water needs. Sixty-two and a half million to keep our lakes, our rivers, and our streams clean. A permanent program. The kind of permanent program that's not only going to keep our environment as one of the finest in the nation, but also the kind of program that's going to strengthen our economic development. Wisconsin is now at a point where it is looked upon much like Oregon where people seek us out as a state which is clean and good. I'm going to make sure that we maintain that.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: I think that the publicity, the media coverage about some of the extremists in the environmental field, has in fact been overdone. I don't believe that business and industry and the economic growth of agriculture has been harmed by actions. Granted, some of the things proposed by a few of these groups may in fact turn giant areas back into wilderness. And we have these extremists. There's nothing that indicates it and I would agree with the same question and say yes. And I'm sure legislation clearly as we've moved on it has been the factor, but I've also

seen business and industry commitments. I've seen it in my own Wisconsin River by the Nekoosa Edwards paper company, and they have, in fact, been every year improving the quality of that river.

And they've done it while at the same time maintaining the jobs for 6,000 employees, and at the same time being able to compete reasonably with the cost of paper. We can, in fact, balance the environment, we can balance it with man in it, and we can balance it with the economic factor in it.

Now we're faced with the farmers with the whole business of non-point pollution, but they too have been our greatest conservationists and they will come through. I understand the Clean Water Act, and I'm glad that you allocated the \$62 1/2 million. I think that was one of the better things you did.

And in terms of the tax moratorium that we've talked about, wouldn't have touched one penny of that. There still is that amount of money there and that comes from a man named Torphy, and the last point I knew, he was a member of your administration, and you had appointed him. So I'm using simply his figures and his data. None of that is gonna' be changed out. Never proposed anything to stop any current program that's already been enacted, so don't be confused by that. But we have been able, I think, to manage both wilderness, environment, and jobs.

MODERATOR: Thank you, Gentlemen. That concludes our question round. We will now proceed to the closing statements and Mr. Dreyfus will speak first.

DREYFUS: How much time for the closing statement?

MODERATOR: You have four minutes.

DREYFUS: Alright, thank you. Essentially when we look at the two topics, and they are interrelated for me because I see the future tied essentially for this state both to energy growth, and to the growth of quality of transportation. A return and restoration of that transportation capability; I'm absolutely convinced that those states in the 80's and 90's that are able to say we have energy available for the business and industry to expand, and we will have the transportation capability for that business, will, in fact, come here and will provide the jobs that are necessary.

I understand that the Governor does not perceive the interrelationship of a plant at Tyrone, and I assume you have approved that plant and it was not in your moratorium, and what happens in the intercore of Milwaukee. But I would simply say ask the Urban League or ask the NAACP; their positions are very clear on this. They understand it very clearly.

This is not the time, in my opinion, to go slow, this is not the time for us to be hunkering down and getting defensive; we need to expand and rebuild by the end of this century. And when we

talk about that kind of energy, you understand that if they move today on Tyrone, we're not talking about one watt before 1987. We're already 13 years from the end of the century. We're talking about the impact on ten-year olds on the street and whether there will be enough expansion of jobs, business and industry, to provide them with the employment they want, and to provide the high-quality service that we want in this state because of revenue and taxation from that employment.

A go-slow policy on energy in fact will not only not solve unemployment, it will not solve poverty, it will not solve underemployment -- and that is in the 150,000 range -- or even the ultimate solution to the energy problem. Because, you see, the relationship there is to produce the dollars for the research that will get us to absolute safe energy and possibly a return to cheap energy. Solar may be the answer when tied to the space program. To solve the energy crisis then, that's what we need. We need to turn all of our research sources in that direction.

To conserve fossil fuels for other things, clearly that's what we've got to do. So conservation must continue to be a hallmark of what we do. But not to the point where it begins to control our lives; to where 45-year old workers must again go back to a second- or third-shift operation in many industries where it is not necessary. That begins to affect how Americans live and could begin to affect the warp and woof of what we do.

It is better to move on aggressively and get the energy and get it in the quantity we need. But what is the cost of non-growth? What is an acceptable level of unemployment? And acceptable to whom? I understand the utilities' reluctance to expand into the expensive energy. But the people need it, the future needs it. And I understand the problems with nuclear waste and its potential problem after 28 years involved in nuclear problems.

But sometimes you accept an evil to avoid an even greater one. That's the choice we have today. And it is the same for transportation. We cannot let our roads continue to deteriorate. And the \$22 million or whatever we're putting in isn't enough. I really think now that the massiveness of this problem is such that it needs a massive assault. And we better have a decade of restoration to return our roads to the quality they were before they continue deteriorating as they are, and that will affect tourism, that will affect business, that will affect industry.

And we cannot let it happen, nor can we let it happen with the railroads. We can't watch a Milwaukee Road go bankrupt. What's the next step now? And we do need mass transit in all of these cities for the elderly, for the handicapped, for the poor and for the inner city people to chase the jobs that have flown. They too affect the economy, but frankly, all of this is all the fact that no longer is there cheap fuel, and it cannot be supportive alone. So understand that what we will do now should be our priority and our vision of the future, and decide now in the 1970's because we are making decisions about the quality of life

in the 1990's. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your closing statement.

SCHREIBER: I want again to express my gratitude to the League of Women Voters, and to the people that made this debate possible. We've made tremendous progress in Wisconsin, in the years beginning in 1971 when the Democratic administration took over the reigns of state government. We are no longer the number one tax-paying state in the nation. We are now number nine, and dropping. We've added 54,000 new jobs each year since 1971 in the private sector.

Tax reforms are in progress. A ten percent property tax cut is on the way... a fair and equitable return of our surplus where a majority of tax payers will receive the majority of benefits -- it's a program also underway. More is going to be said about tax proposals in the debates coming up, but tax programs have a direct bearing on economic development. Inconsistencies of position are relevant to the questions of quality of economic development, are essential to the quality of leadership to continue our economic growth.

Four different positions have been taken by my opponent on the matter of the surplus. Since March of 1978, he has proposed spending all of the money for a vet school, for school aids, and retire the state debt. He then took another position where he proposed spending all of the money for general tax reform. And then he took another position in which he proposed direct property tax relief. Now on September 17, Professor Dreyfus completely reversed himself both on the position of how to return the surplus, and took the position of also favoring an across-the-board income tax cut rather than property tax cuts proposed 16 days before. His energy proposal is excessive; it creates an unnecessary millstone around the peoples' necks.

During the coal strike, as I visited in Washington D.C., I was able to tell the President of the United States of America and twelve other governors that we in the state of Wisconsin had energy that we could share provided they enacted the same conservation methods that we in Wisconsin practiced. There was no great uprising in allowing more people to go to work because we put people to work by programs, by specific programs in helping unemployed, black young people.

His transportation position has changed, and it depends upon if he is in the North or the South. Your choice in this election, affects the economic growth of our state, it affects your jobs, the economy, the amount of your utility bill. In the final analysis, the course that this state follows will depend on the quality of leadership and consistency of leadership.

Let me take a moment to read to you what my opponent said about Congressman Kasten's position on across-the-board income tax cuts. The same position that he took just 16 days after he made

the statement, and I quote: "Green Bay News Chronicle--Dumb position, absolutely dumb because the wealthy person gets the biggest cut, and that's the image the Republicans have been fighting, and they're the party of the fat cats." Sixteen days later: "Wisconsin State Journal--Dreyfus proposes 25% across-the-board income tax cut." Leadership like this, based on shifts of position, election schemes, will destroy all progress made in the last eight years.

MODERATOR: Thank you, Governor Schreiber and Chancellor Dreyfus for the discussion of your differing views on growth and transportation. We'll look forward to hearing you debate taxes on October 24. The second debate will start at the Memorial Union, starting at 7:45 p.m.

(applause)

The League of Women Voters, along with the associated students of Marquette University, have presented this debate tonight in order that voters may make an informed choice. The election is November 7th -- we urge you all to vote. I thank the audience for its courtesy and cooperation, and to conclude this debate tonight, let us now give the candidates a well-deserved round of applause. (applause)

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT OF DREYFUS/SCHREIBER
DEBATE #2 -- "GOVERNOR'S FORUM '78,"
OCTOBER 23, 1978 AT WHA-TV,
MADISON, WI

TV COMMENTATOR: Good Evening, I'm John Powell. Tonight's "Forum '78" is the second of a two-part series featuring the candidates for governor in the November 7th general election. This program is being broadcast live from Madison over the member stations of the Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks. Tonight's Forum participants are two of the six candidates for governor. In our studios are Martin J. Schreiber, the Democratic candidate for governor; and Lee S. Dreyfus, the Republican candidate for governor. And we have invited the candidates to respond to questions posed by our two guest reporters who are Ed Hinshaw, the editorial director for WTMJ-TV in Milwaukee; and Neil Shively, political reporter for the Milwaukee Sentinel.

We'll get into a lot of subject areas I know tonight, but because this is perhaps the most intimate forum the two of you will be on -- we've already been together many times -- let me ask you: We've heard everyone else's opinion, who won the last debate?

DREYFUS: Well, I would argue I did 'cause I covered the subject matter.

SCHREIBER: Well, I've analyzed this whole thing from the very beginning - I've talked with my friends - I've talked with people in the middle of the road; I even talked with some of Professor Dreyfus' friends, and the decision was unanimous: I won. And we're looking forward to Tuesday night.

POWELL: Will we see anything different from either of you?

SCHREIBER: Well, I won't be wearing a red vest. I don't know what the opposition will be doing.

DREYFUS: I will be wearing a red vest.

HINSHAW: Gentlemen, the Center for the Study of Public Policy which is headquartered in Madison, will tomorrow release a poll which says among other things, that the people of the state of Wisconsin feel that the state is going in the right direction, generally. Fifty-nine percent of the population feel that's true; that local government also in Wisconsin's going in the right direction - 69% of the population feels that way. Mr. Dreyfus, I'm wondering how you would respond to that. Does that suggest that you may have some difficulty in this campaign that you may not have anticipated?

DREYFUS: No, I don't think so. I think what you are talking about is how people view the services and where this state is operating and I generally get that run. The real issue to me is what we are doing in terms of taxation and spending, and whether we are leaping ahead and doing it without accountability that

could in fact destroy that.

HINSHAW: But you don't see this then as a, in effect, an endorsement of the Schreiber administration?

DREYFUS: No. I see this as simply an acceptance on the part of people that the services that we are providing, the kinds of things we're trying to move ahead and do, we've been doing well, and where we are deteriorating we will have to catch back up to it. I think most people in terms of quality of life in this state right now, and I am talking essentially about what is going to happen to it in the future, like Wisconsin; I think they like it here, and I think that is true of almost everybody in the state. And in fact 59% -- I suppose it depends upon how it's asked -- I would assume that a larger percentage than that like the state, and the question now is whether we have got that protected in the next decade.

SHIVELY: Almost two-thirds, I think, do agree that it's at least above average, perhaps.

SCHREIBER: Well, people universally agree that Wisconsin is above average and the question really that has been put was whether or not Wisconsin's moving in the right direction. And 59% of the people felt apparently, that we were, and I should point out to Mr. Dreyfus and to everyone that that is an improvement over the past number of months. In fact, prior to the time that I took office as governor, I think there was in the neighborhood of 49% of the people feeling we were heading in the right direction.

Because of my open office hours, because of my clean water program, because of the position that we've taken in reforming our tax structure, we have been moving significantly ahead. Not only have we had the open office hours, but town hall meetings, and I feel very comfortable with the fact that 59% do feel we are moving in the right direction because it represents a number of things to me. An improvement, certainly, over what the status was when I first took office. And then, in addition to that, is sort of to me an indication that the people of this state are comfortable with my leadership as governor.

SHIVELY: You may not be as comfortable with another finding in the same survey, Governor. It showed that 63% felt that new solutions were needed to Wisconsin's problems.

SCHREIBER: Well, they are right and we have been working on those new solutions. I have only been governor for some 16 months and there is no way that I am going to be able to solve every single problem that exists here in the state of Wisconsin. You look at the beginnings that we have made. We've already been able to cut property taxes by 10%. We've already cut income taxes by \$20 million. We've already initiated as I said the clean water program, so we are well on our way, and the matter of developing new solutions to problems... and I'm just very proud

that we have at least made a beginning. The Blue Ribbon Commission is going to come forth with some brand new, hopeful new ideas that are going to stimulate our economy, allow us to have a fair tax structure and we're on our way.

DREYFUS: Well, I would guess that that is what I was coming at in my first answer to you. I think there is a general feeling that we are not getting new solutions, that this is just simply more of the same. We're heading in the same direction. In fact, I'm not sure what you are going to do with the results of the Blue Ribbon Tax Commission since you've already laid out what you are going to do. Are you going to be able to simply scrap that or put it on top of? But in terms of the direction we're going, the question is how to finance them, and in what respect do you deal particularly with the middle income people? And I think that's where the key danger exists right now.

I do sense as I travel around the state people are looking for a new direction. Can we get a change? Where are we going to head out? And what are we going to do about something in terms of problems of unemployment? What are we going to do about the problems in the schools and the fact that we are turning out people who don't read and write, and aren't able to add? And what are we going to do about----

SCHREIBER: Lee Dreyfus, you're telling everyone here and want to have Ed and Neil Shively believe that I am responsible for all of the things that you say are going wrong in the state of Wisconsin?

DREYFUS: Well, I think the last eight years of the administration has to accept the responsibility for that, and I think the fact that we've seen a reduction of local government and a more preemption of State government over it. I think the local officials -- at least that's the feeling I'm getting from them -- we've got to get that turned around. So, in a sense, you're talking about eight years you were number two, if not number one. In the last 15-16 months you've been number one.

POWELL: Are you taking credit for the 49-59% satisfied, though?

SCHREIBER: Well, I was just going to ask if the professor, whether or not, wants to give me credit for the things that happened good. You know, having an economy that's growing twice as fast as the rest of the nation; you know, adding 54,000 new manufacturing jobs each year; you know, since 1971, taking ourselves from the number one state in the union in taxing people in 1970, to a far better position now so...

DREYFUS: Nine out of fifty for 26-size, 25-size states.

SCHREIBER: And do you know how many states have more bureaucracy than the state of Wisconsin? Do you know where we rank?

DREYFUS: I can't believe there are any.

SCHREIBER: Well sure, we are, there are 41 other states.

DREYFUS: Oh well, job revolution in this country.

SCHREIBER: Well, we're on our way.

SHIVELY: Governor, you said you had new solutions for treating the problems and I suppose taxes are always a problem for citizens, especially tax payers. The Democratic administration for the last eight years has been treating the property tax in one way or another and you, I think, had two ventures in the treatment of property taxes for the elderly and for the low income groups. At the same time, however, the income tax take, the yield, has gone up about twice as fast as the property tax has gone up statewide, and I'm wondering when are we gonna' treat the income tax which seems to be the reason for the surplus.

SCHREIBER: Alright. Uh, there are a number of things that you assume in your question that are just not quite correct. First of all, less than half of the surplus was produced because of the income tax. Roughly 25% came from the sales tax and another 25% came from the inheritance tax and corporate income tax. There is another fallacy, I think, that's incorporated into your question as far as discussion of the income surplus is concerned. And that is that there are more people working and more people earning salaries today than at any time in the history of our state. And because of that we have more people paying taxes.

Now granted, roughly about \$40 million comes in each year into our state treasury as a result of the inflation impact on our tax system. That's why we have the Blue Ribbon Commission and that's why I propose that we inflation-proof our tax system, inflation-proof the deductions by tying it to a cost of living index, and also inflation-proofing our brackets. Now that's the beginning, as the Blue Ribbon Commission works, and by the way, if we look at the Blue Ribbon Commission, we realize that it's in the progressive tradition of Wisconsin. Both ends of State Street needing to discuss a way of solving a very serious problem and that is to have a progressive tax system, one that's fair, one that's easy to understand, and also one that stimulates the economic development.

A commission made up not only of experts from the University of Wisconsin, but also both Republican and Democrats alike. Not a quick fix solution, but developing the kind of program through our people that's based on establishing the next general principles of taxes. We have not had a reform of our tax system over the past twenty-two years, and it's because of that I felt the job had to be done right, not thinking up of a plan on an airplane ride from Stevens Point to Madison. But sitting down and using the experts and using both parties and using people representing the people from organized labor and from business...getting a real sense, we're a people, we're a state. We've got to reform that state.

POWELL: Lee, did you think up your plan on the airplane ride?

DREYFUS: No, but..

SCHREIBER: That's what I read in the newspaper.

DREYFUS: Don't believe everything you read in the newspaper, I'll tell ya'. The real issue, if you say that less than half of the surplus comes from the income tax that has been grown... and yet when I said I was going to retroactively index, I didn't use that term, but I said adjust the cost of living from 1970-1978. It was your office and the Department of Revenue that told me that would be \$350 million bucks. Now if that...

SCHREIBER: A year.

DREYFUS: Alright, a year...

SCHREIBER: Seven hundred...

DREYFUS: And consequently if that's \$350 million, and that's less than half of the surplus, the surplus would have to be larger than \$700 million, and obviously it isn't. The surplus this year, I gather, was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500 million. Your figures don't jive for me, and every time I get another set of figures I begin to find that because if in fact it's \$350 million beyond the 1970 inflation, and if in fact that is not half, then how can you talk about a surplus being only \$500 million? You know, make it add.

SCHREIBER: You're getting involved in one of your discussions again where I'm sure the reviewers are just really not following, you know, as good, as is what your explanation should warrant. Uh, you know, you just have... here... let's just back up for one moment. We have a surplus.

DREYFUS: How much?

SCHREIBER: The surplus... \$280 million dollars.

DREYFUS: That's what's left. No no, I mean, how much surplus did we have before you committed it all? What was the total surplus gathered this year?

SCHREIBER: The total surplus gathered -

DREYFUS: This year -- beyond the estimates that were expected and before you moved in the additional plans.

SCHREIBER: We're talking a surplus of \$280 million; I mean the important point where you and I differ is how we return that surplus. Whether you return it in a manner of a quick fix, or whether we return it in a manner that's gonna' stimulate economic development; whether we're gonna' have a tax plan for the next

generation or just for the next election.

DREYFUS: We're gonna' debate that tomorrow, I understand that. I want to get back to this basic question... that the income tax has risen so much faster - the data showed that to me. That's why I thought it was the most unfair and inequitable. You talk about progressivity -- the fact that people have been inflated up and up and up into brackets without any real income increase. They've had an increase but then it's matched by inflation, and yet they get pushed into a higher bracket, has in fact destroyed the progressivity. This tax schedule is not as progressive today as it was in 1970-1971.

SCHREIBER: Welcome to the Schreiber plan: direct property tax cuts. There is no other tax that is causing our people as severe problems than what the property tax is. That inflation is driving up those values. Now what do we say in addition to property tax cuts? We say "inflation proof" our income taxes.

POWELL: From now on?

SCHREIBER: Well sure.

POWELL: Next year?

SCHREIBER: Yes.

DREYFUS: Doesn't that freeze the level of unfairness currently where it is?

SCHREIBER: What we're talking about is the Blue Ribbon Commission. What we are talking about is looking at evaluating the current inequities that are in the system. And in addition to that, getting out the inheritance tax that is now forcing some farm wives, some widows and widowers, forcing them to sell the family farm. What we're talking about is making the kind of adjustment that is going to allow, for example, a person over sixty-two years of age not to pay a capital gains tax.

POWELL: So you are saying if the commission agrees with Chancellor Dreyfus, so will you.

SCHREIBER: What I'm saying is that Chancellor Dreyfus is proposing a total of \$1.7 billion in campaign promises. The proposal he is making to put back our income tax structure to 1970 when we were number one in the nation in income taxes. His proposal is going to cost \$700 million. Plus his withholding proposal is \$317 million; plus his proposal to take money out of the treasury to build highways is another \$160 million; plus his proposal to take the pressure off of the vocational schools is another \$180 million; plus his other proposals are \$1.7 billion. And Chancellor, there is not the money there.

POWELL: I'm sure our reporters want to ask questions on other topics so let's just let the Chancellor answer this one and then

we'll move on.

DREYFUS: You see, for example, when you throw in the moratorium of stopping the taxes this year -- that \$314 million according to you -- and you add that to the cost -- you said you wouldn't do that so you can't add it now. The proposal for the form for '79, once I'm governor, what I can do at that point will be \$1.318 million. Those are our figures. You keep saying \$1.7 but you're adding in three hundred million, that in fact you know is going to be there. As you say, there's still \$280 million sitting there to carry over, and it's going to be there. And as far as I can see, using the last figures of the public expenditure survey -- just came out -- they are saying \$1.35 million and I'm saying another \$280 in surplus left over -- that's got to be something more than \$1.6 billion.

SCHREIBER: You can't spend the same dollar twice.

DREYFUS: It's not!

SCHREIBER: The public expenditure survey included, Professor, included the things you are now talking about giving away. They set their projections for our surplus in July, and they included not only your discussion of withholding of the withholding, but they included the anticipated \$280 million as of July 1, 1979. They included it all, and you can't spend the same money twice. You told that to Bob Kasten ..

DREYFUS: By the way you called "Bobby," and I never called him "Bobby." I was surprised you used that.

POWELL: We'll take one more rebuttal and then we'll go on to another topic. No?

DREYFUS: No. I am convinced there is a surplus there to do what we wanted essentially. I'm not talking about giving it back - I am talking about \$900 million of it, not taking in the first place, by shifting the fundamental tax deduction from \$2,000 to \$3200 for the standard deduction, and reforming the income tax. When you do that, you will have \$820 -- is what it comes to -- million dollars less coming in. The surplus is gonna be that much more...

SHIVELY: Before we get off the subject, on your moratorium on collecting the withholding tax... Are you committed to proposing that if you're elected governor? You proposed this fall...

DREYFUS: If the next fall...

SHIVELY: No, I mean next January...

DREYFUS: No, no because you got too much risk.

SCHREIBER: You're withdrawing from your proposal?

DREYFUS: No, no, no, no.

SCHREIBER: Yes, you are.

DREYFUS: No, the proposal was a last three months proposal and there is no way...

SHIVELY: The same fiscal year....

DREYFUS: If we wind up in the last three years and there was nowhere else to do, I'd do it, except I don't intend to have that surplus. I don't think it will be there to have to give back. But if it were, would I do it in exactly the same way? Yes, but at the end of the year.

HINSHAW: One other question before we get off into other subjects: Mr. Schreiber, with the retrospect of the campaign, do you now wish you'd asked the Blue Ribbon Commission to report before November rather than after November?

SCHREIBER: No, I would do things the very same way, regardless of the outcome of the two-week election. And I would do that very specifically because I know what I did was right. I was advised by political friends to take that surplus and give it all back in some kind of an election year gimmick and I said "no." As Governor of Wisconsin, my responsibility is to attempt to build for the future. And I know what kind of problem it's causing me; I need only look at the news reports and hear the statements made by the opponent. But the fact of the matter is that as Governor of Wisconsin, I have got to take a longer view than just the next election.

I am proud of that decision that I made. We're going to have meaningful tax reform. We're going to get at property tax. We're going to inflation-proof our tax system. We're going to do something about the inheritance tax, help out small business people. So, I would do it the same way.

POWELL: Gentlemen, if we may, I would like to move on to some subjects which at least from a distance seem not to have been widely discussed in the campaign. They may be the smaller issues of prisons, womens' issues and so forth. Let me begin by asking the two of you how you feel about the State's prison system and what you would propose for it. Chancellor, you were talking about that this afternoon...

DREYFUS: That's one of the areas, I have said, thus far in the campaign, that in the area of roads, and in the area of corrections, we're going to have to invest money. I've heard a lot about soft judges, so I talked to some of the so-called soft judges. I find out that they have got a problem of where to put youngsters in terms of what's going to happen to that youngster when the youngster comes out. The argument between institutionalizing versus getting it dispersed, and it's obvious to me it's got to be both. But it's clear to me that the current

correction system is not operating and is not operating well.

Secondly, I think we're going to have to invest in it. I think we should not have sold the prison in the center of the state. Maybe there were good reasons for it then, but it sure doesn't look like it now. And I really question the personnel policies -- and I sense this from the people working within that system -- they are at least reacting. The people are being brought in from the outside. They think people ought to be allowed to move up within and that we've got all the qualified people we need. And that in fact, nine locals just today endorsed me, and all out of the corrections system; and I gather what they're honked about is that very issue. And maybe you know more about precisely who they are upset with and what's involved.

POWELL: Nine unions of local guards?

DREYFUS: Yes, corrections units.

SCHREIBER: State employees, bureaucrats?

DREYFUS: Yes, that's true.

SCHREIBER: OK.

DREYFUS: But bureaucrats at the working level. But not at the top level, you know? There is a very real difference there, and do they know the difference... the people that are doing the work-a-day work in every bureau.

HINSHAW: Mr. Schreiber, how about you?

SCHREIBER: Okay, on prisons. We are in the process of looking for sites right now. When I came into office, one of the problems that I was most concerned about was the overcrowding at the prisons, and one thing we are finding: everyone is in favor of building the prisons, but people don't want that prison in their own area. So we are now involved in the process of site selection and trying to find the place to build a prison to take some of the pressure off.

I also have instituted a very important policy in my office as it relates to executive clemency. What I have done is establish the position of certain punishment. I am testing it out so that we then can be in a position to offer to the legislature legislation that will insure that a person committing a crime of a certain degree will be insured of getting a sentence for a certain length of time. According to the judges that I have talked to, one of the biggest drawbacks there to our present prison system is the fact that a person or two people can commit the very same crime, go before different judges, and get substantially different sentences.

While what that does, of course, we can see, is create an upheaval in the entire criminal process system. During my

administration, we have reformed our judicial system. We have created an intermediate court of appeals, we have at the same time, built a uniform system of trial courts. Now our next step -- my next step for court reform -- is to reform our criminal justice system and in order to do that we not only must have certain punishment, but at the same time the expansion of our prison system.

SHIVELY: Was that crime index study -- I think that was a budget study wasn't it? Was that the same one that drew some flack over whether rape was a serious crime or not? It seems to me there was some opposition to that grading of crimes... the one you are referring to. The Assembly Speaker I think came out enraged at that.

SCHREIBER: I am not discussing that report at all. I'm talking about the --

SHIVELY: I thought that was the report you were referring to.

SCHREIBER: No, I am not.

DREYFUS: But should we have sold that prison, or did we just make a mistake? And I can understand mistakes; did we make a mistake? Because I understand now it would cost a heck of a lot more to buy it back from the federal government.

SCHREIBER: One way or another, what is interesting, is that we spent the earlier part of the show talking about everything that was going to be done by the opposition in the area of taxes. He said that public expenditure survey anticipated a surplus of \$1.3 billion. His tax program: \$1.3 billion. And then all of a sudden, he's committing money to build more prisons, and I guess the question is: you know, where are you going to get the money?

DREYFUS: Where do we always get the money for institutions we build? We go before the Building Commission, we go out and bond it and do it. Is that right? Or, we can take it out of the income tax surplus. I've said from the very beginning, we must spend dollars in roads, and we must spend dollars in correction. But why did we sell that prison, what were the facts? I realize you were not the governor at that time, but I assume you must have been in on the inside.

SCHREIBER: You talk about borrowing money; we took \$10 million of the surplus and paid off our state debt... some of our state debt. For every dollar of our state debt that we pay off, we save a dollar and a half. If you, for example, wanted to go into borrowing money when you have money in the treasury, I suppose that's your prerogative. But as Governor of Wisconsin, I don't feel that it's necessary to pay all of that additional money in interest if you want to continue to make promises and promises and promises in election year.

HINSHAW: The question's been asked twice. Was it a mistake to

sell the Adams prison?

SCHREIBER: Yes, I think it was a mistake.

POWELL: And the question here was, are you going to borrow to build the prisons, or?

DREYFUS: That's usually what the Building Commission does. If there is money in there that is available, you go with the money that's available. If not, you go out and do it the way in which we build buildings. I think we are pretty well through, we put a lot of money into education. I've been a piece of that in higher education, obviously; that building process is pretty well done. It seems to me now, I would assume the expansion here in Madison, for the state government, it seems to me ... pretty well done.

My guess is then that the State's building is going to be relatively confined, I think, to institutions of care - either prison or possibly even mental health if that becomes a limit. But where else do we have building to do of major substance? And my guess would be it's in the corrections area. And the State will meet that building need. They don't have the kind of building needs they've had for the last twenty years. We've been building buildings all over the landscape.

SHIVELY: You have two prisons in the planning stage at the present time, don't we? Did the legislature commit \$1 million or so to planning two prisons?

SCHREIBER: Yes.

SHIVELY: How far away are we on those?

SCHREIBER: Well, we're basically at the position of site selection. As you are aware, they have been looking at some of the various dormitories and so forth in various communities and it has been met with some pretty strong opposition.

SHIVELY: Aren't we going to design a new prison, a new maximum security prison? And we don't have a site?

SCHREIBER: We don't have the site. We are looking for it.

SHIVELY: It will be in the Milwaukee area, will it not?

SCHREIBER: Well, it will be hopefully in southeastern Wisconsin. But one of the decisions, one of the reasons that the Health and Social Services Department and Governor Lucey decided to sell the prison at Adams-Friendship, was precisely because that prison was so very very far away from the population base, and any relatives or friends that would ever want to think about visiting would have to travel many miles.

Also, another thing that is such a challenge... and that is the

attempt to make a valid projection for prison population. A lot depends upon the times. We've got a very strong economy right now. And for those that believe there is some relationship between people working and the rate of crime, well, from that standpoint, then because there are more people working in our state than ever before in our history, from that vantage point, maybe crime should be on the decrease.

Whether or not that is exactly coming forth, we don't know. There is another goal that comes into play here, and that is the attitude of society towards a particular crime or the attitude of society towards protecting society rather than rehabilitating the criminal. So these are very difficult things to try and project, and we are doing our best now to make sure we get those things on line and built so we can take away that basing.

DREYFUS: The correlation is not between the rate of people working and crime but the rate of people not working and crime. Because you can have both rise as is happening in this country for some time. We have a rising employment force because of more females into the work force and so on.

But the question is how many are not working? And there is no question that there is a direct correlation between people being unemployed and our crime. And we're into a situation now where we have had a pretty hefty increase in the last decade of unemployment in this state. And on that basis, that produces a greater rate of crime. You've got people who, in fact, in some cases are driven to needs, like people who are idle. I think that's what breeds crime, that plus the social conditions.

HINSHAW: Mr. Dreyfus, one of the issues I mentioned earlier was the women's issue. You've received some criticism for I guess what has been described to me as a reluctance to be eager with regard to what's been happening with the Equal Rights Amendment. Would you like to clarify that in any way? Where do you stand on that?

DREYFUS: Now, I have supported the Equal Rights Amendment all during the County Debates; that question came up. Now what you're talking about, essentially, is the result of an editorial position taken in a four-chain newspaper. And that publisher has, as of this week, indicated to me that he was wrong. And he understood that when he said that I was opposed to ERA, they confused my position, namely. Plus I had done it publicly up in Rhinelander. I was opposed to the ERA extension, a very different matter. Very different matter. In fact it matched my Democratic Congressman up in my district, David Obey.

SHIVELY: The extension of the ratification?

DREYFUS: Yes, precisely. That basis, that issue of the ERA extension, I think got mixed in with the ERA and in fact, our system on the Point Campus, and developed by three key women administrators up there, is a relatively good model that's being

used within the system of the UW. Marian Swoboda will be glad to check that out. I also think its something that you practice. And it's a matter of going through my record in terms of employment, in terms of how we have been able to look at female promotions, female salaries, and down the line, as compared to what's happening in the rest of the system. So I think that's a pretty good track record.

I'm personally committed; there isn't any question in my mind about that. And I don't think that there is question in those who have been around me about that. And I'm committed within the campaign. My campaign chairman is female; the key pilot for my campaign is female; the person that's doing production of the two half-hour specials that I did is female; it's just not been a problem all of my life.

I came out of a home in which my mother was absolutely a public leader. I watched that and watched it grow as a child, her ability to operate and operate very freely. And if you grow up in that kind of sense where you have got a good marital partnership, and that was the role model I had. And I think that's the model I've had within my own home.

HINSHAW: Mr. Schreiber, do you want to respond to that?

SCHREIBER: His childhood?

HINSHAW: No, you were sitting there with a smile on your face.

SCHREIBER: Well, I was just listening to the explanation on the ERA. If you have a question, I'll respond.

HINSHAW: No, I have another question for him.

SCHREIBER: OK.

HINSHAW: And that is, that some of the labor unions are now describing you as a "right to work" candidate, meaning in their perception a "break the union" candidate.

DREYFUS: Yes...

HINSHAW: Is there any truth to that at all?

DREYFUS: No. No. Flat out. And in fact I was asked, would you support a right to work bill? The answer is flat out, "no." You see, what happened is, I saw a really bad transcript of something asked me as I left the Central Labor Council. It was in front of a labor group asking me "what is your reaction to the right to work concept?" as I am walking out. And I -- this is back this summer -- and my answer then, I couldn't tell it from the transcript, was that I personally would be very offended if I want a job that you offer me and a third person says I can't have the job. I got a problem with that as an American. But, I think we have arrived at the position here between those two extremes

of a completely controlled union operation vs. the completely union busting operation. And the state of Wisconsin has a situation in which you can have a union shop if both the employer and the employees agree.

And that is true in a vast majority of the contracts we have got. I think it works well, I think it has worked well for labor in this state. I don't know of anybody pushing for a right to work bill, and I don't think it would get very far, and I would hope it wouldn't. Because I do think that if you go to that extreme, you will begin to bust unions, and I don't think that's to the benefit of either the labor movement or the whole economy when one looks at the history of what's happened in this society.

The other question has to do with the whole question of fair share. And the fair share concept is part of that. Namely, that if I am not a member of the union, and I am in a place where they could have both union and non-union people, and there is a contract negotiated, I ought to pay my fair share of that if I am going to get the benefits of the contract.

And the third area is public employment. You have a right to work by definition in the public sector because there you cannot close it down. Those are constitutional issues, and as such that just simply has not happened across the country. So adding all of that together, that's where I am at. And I never said I would go for a right to work bill. When people say that I said that, they are absolutely speaking an untruth.

POWELL: Governor, are any changes needed in the labor law?

SCHREIBER: Well, before we go into that, I just have a very difficult time sitting here at ease, and listening to the response to your question, because I had heard reports of that meeting, and either the people that told me about that meeting are absolutely wrong, or something different was said than what you said.

DREYFUS: It was.

SCHREIBER: I had a chance to look at your interview in the Capital Times, and what you said just now does not coincide with what you said during that interview with the Capital Times.

DREYFUS: On right to work?

SCHREIBER: Well, they are talking about the matter of unions and union relationships, and you indicated that you really don't see why any organization has got to get between there, the employer and the employee. And you are discussing about the matter of right to work, and you sort of said, well, you'd like to talk that over with Ray Majerus and you'd like to talk it over with the head of the steel workers. And so, maybe I'm just reading wrong, and maybe the people that are talking to me are saying the wrong things and ...

DREYFUS: Ask for the tape. They have got it in audio somewhere; ask for it and print it. In print it is totally unrecognizable. And, in fact, though I didn't get to Ray, I did get to Burt McNamara. What you are talking about in that Capital Times interview is that I said I asked union leadership at that time: give me input on this question. And I got none. And in effect, instead of giving me input, I suddenly get this characterization like something out of 1920. Now there isn't any question in my mind at all, not the slightest question. You asked me a question on where do I stand on the right to work bill... I think a right to work bill would be a bad news situation for the state. I really think we've got a good situation going, and it has proven to be quite effective and quite workable.

POWELL: Governor, we still didn't get your response, do we need changes in labor law?

SCHREIBER: Right now, I think things are going very well. I don't know what specific changes you are talking about, but as of this moment, we do have a good working relationship between industry, between business and labor; it's a kind of relationship that has Wisconsin sought out not only by other businesses in other states, but also by other businesses in other countries.

I just a very short time ago last week attended the grand opening of a Fiskars plant which is from Finland. They make scissors, and they now picked Wausau, Wisconsin as being the very first location of a new plant site outside of Finland. This is just an indication of the kind of strength that we have because of the strong working men and women giving a fair dollar's worth of work for the dollar spent, and also because of the relationships with union and industry.

POWELL: What about public employee unions? The characterizations of your disagreements with them over the strike last summer... Your basic support is for unions, but what about the Wisconsin State Employees union?

SCHREIBER: Well, as Governor of Wisconsin, I had a responsibility to the people of Wisconsin. And, in that way, then, I settled that strike. Now, would they have liked something different? I suppose they would have. Are they disappointed with me? Yes, they are. So very disappointed with me that they were willing to give the opposition a standing ovation and were willing to take out their anger and animosity against me because they thought that the 7-7 1/2% was not as much as what they should receive.

HINSHAW: Mr. Schreiber, during the primary did your opponent, David Carley, challenge you as I recall, at least once on the issue of the solar energy tax credit, which was approved by the legislature and signed by you, for which rules had not been adopted? Therefore, it was not possible for anyone to take advantage of that tax credit. Has anything happened since that

debate to change that situation?

SCHREIBER: Sure. It was already in the process of happening at the time of the debate itself. The administrative rules were in the process of being drafted and what they have now done is gone to the public for hearing for comment, for input from the people. And those rules now will be drafted up into rule form.

HINSHAW: But is it not true that they will not take effect until January thereby losing one tax year of their impact?

SCHREIBER: That is not true. It will be retroactive from the time of the bill passed.

SHIVELY: Mr. Dreyfus, some of us watching this campaign have kind of come to the conclusion, I guess, that you've dug some holes for yourself without being handed a shovel. I'm thinking of the elderly comment which drew, which created, a controversy; your position on energy; the 5% or greater growth. On that one particularly, why did you take that strong energy growth position when the public mood seems to be for somewhat less than that?

DREYFUS: That's always a question, if one's going to accept leadership, then you have to decide where it ought to go. We don't just find which way the crowd's going and go with it. And I feel strongly in this area, that based on the past 25 years history of what we've done and the amount of growth of electrical energy, that if we are to become a state that will draw industry, draw business and therefore draw jobs, that we are going to have to have an energy growth larger than that set by a public service commission which now is beyond rate regulation. They are determining the quality of life 20 years from now.

SHIVELY: They are talking about 3.9 or 3.8% growth, the utilities themselves are talking?

DREYFUS: Yes.

SHIVELY: When you talk 5% energy growth, doesn't the average person, the taxpayer, see bigger utility bills, higher utility bills?

DREYFUS: Well, you're seeing them right now. That's why I happen to be pro-elective public service commission expansion. The utilities are very opposed on the elected public service commission as is the Governor, as I understand recently. And we've just had a rate increase, I think, for 12% more, so that the current situation is not producing it. I would say any shortage - the minute you get into a demand situation --look out down the line.

SHIVELY: It will be too late, is that what you are saying?

DREYFUS: We won't be able to produce it. The point is that I want to get rid of the 117,000 unemployed or as many as possible.

I want to do something about all the underemployed in this society. The fact that people want to work longer because fixed incomes are really knocking off early retirement. A whole series of things are going to affect the projections of how many people need employment. Employment will come from expansion of business and industry. I think that is directly correlated to the amount of electrical energy. Now where we are actually is that we've got five new plants on line to take care of the 80's, essentially.

SHIVELY: You're counting Tyrone and Haven.

DREYFUS: Tyrone and Haven. And I would gather that the Governor and I do not differ on that - I assume he has no intention of stopping Tyrone and Haven. I get the impression from some groups that he does, but if those and the three new coal-fired will take care of the 80's.

The issue now is I'm talking about the 90's and we'd better be planning about it right now. And to put a moratorium on that I think is quite questionable. To put a moratorium on certain kinds of research as is already been happening I think is questionable. So as you say do you dig a hole with certain groups? You're darn tootin' I do.

SHIVELY: What groups are you talking about?

DREYFUS: Well, I assume you're talking about the environmental groups who are obviously very concerned about waste storage, and I understand their concerns. But sometimes you choose one evil in order to avoid a greater one. And I think the greater evil in the future is limitation of energy for expansion that could, in fact, provide the bottom line jobs.

SHIVELY: From what you know now, do you go beyond Tyrone and Haven on nuclear planning and construction?

DREYFUS: For the 90's?

SHIVELY: Yes.

DREYFUS: Yes. I think we'd better be planning on it right now.

SHIVELY: We ought to have more on line in the planning stage?

DREYFUS: Well, we better be planning on them right now, because Tyrone and Haven -- we're talking about 1987 already before they turn out a watt.

SHIVELY: Let's get the Governor's response on this.

SCHREIBER: Well, Mr. Dreyfus and I had a chance to debate this issue just about a week ago, and I will tell you I am as a person, and also as a father, very disturbed with your position on the matter of energy. If you would be able to convince me or

anyone else that there is any kind of relationship between the construction of any more atomic energy power plants and your growth rate, and providing jobs, I would be so eager to hear about it. I would be eager to hear about it because then I would not feel how very, very wrong you are on this particular issue.

Nuclear energy, something that concerns all of us, it's something that we've got to look at very carefully. That 5-8% growth rate you're talking about... I guess I would like to know quite precisely on what you base it. But then I also ask one question that you never answered at the time of the debate and that is: show me one correlation how the construction of a nuclear power plant is going to employ one more black youngster in Milwaukee's inner city.

DREYFUS: You want that correlation? Without power, whether it's nuclear, coal, or whatever, that's the fundamental issue. We need power to expand business and industry beyond where we are. The current level of projections and what we've been doing has not been good enough, Governor. We've got 8 1/2% unemployed in Kenosha County. What's the figure of the unemployed among black youngsters right now in Milwaukee? How can what we are doing now be meeting the problem? It is obvious to me that it is not. We'd better expand beyond what we're doing now, and we've got 25 years with about a 7% growth for that 25-year period.

SCHREIBER: Back up for about one moment...

DREYFUS: Sure.

SCHREIBER: Understand this: Our overall energy growth rate consumption for Wisconsin for the past five years, even though our economy has grown twice as fast as the rest of the nation's, has been .008%. Last year, you should know that we reduced our consumption rate in Wisconsin by .2 of 1%. If you would understand these figures, if you would know them, I feel very confident that you wouldn't be taking the quantum leap forward that you are taking.

When I was at the White House during the time of the coal strike, I was able to tell the President of the United States of America, twelve other governors from coal-producing states, that we in the state of Wisconsin had enough energy to spare. And we do because we had been very diligent in conserving. Now even though we have enough energy, we have still got to work very hard to make sure we provide the jobs in our inner cities. And one of the ways we can do it is to provide for tax incentives for business and for industry to strengthen our educational ability, to make sure that the special group that I put together can work with minority black youngsters, get them to work, and develop and know how to apply for a job, get a job and stay at that job.

But for you to tell me that we can just expand our energy growth, and all of a sudden it's going to take care of the unemployment rate for our people, is something that I cannot accept.

DREYFUS: Alright, the step in between is you are going to have to have the energy in order to attract the business and industry and expansion.

SCHREIBER: We have the energy.

DREYFUS: Alright. We do not have the energy at this point beyond our current plan and we're not ready for the 90's. And the energy tasks we've had and the current rates we've had have produced results that are unacceptable. When people talk about acceptable levels of unemployment -- acceptable to whom? Not to the people who are in them. Plus you've got a pile of people who are absolutely underemployed.

SCHREIBER: No one mentioned any acceptable level of employment. When did I ever say that?

DREYFUS: No, I am not saying that...

SCHREIBER: Alright, then don't mention it anymore.

DREYFUS: Oh no. The Humphrey-Hawkins bill talks about an acceptable, in fact they use the term "full employment with four percent underemployment." That is just a silly kind of approach for a society like ours to take.

SCHREIBER: But don't raise that in the context of giving anyone the impression that that's my position.

DREYFUS: But that's a position of where we are now in this society, and it's a position of this state. Now we've gone from-

SCHREIBER: It's not a position of this state. I just told you that.

DREYFUS: It may not be one that you are holding to, but you are not going to produce the energy to expand, and right after 1987, you are out. There is nothing in the tables right now. And I just think that if you don't understand the relationship between energy-producing business and industry, and business and industry producing the jobs, and if the jobs are there in quantity, that's the way we're going to reduce unemployment. Take the NAACP position, why do you think that they are willing to take the risk environmentally of nuclear power?

SCHREIBER: Let's just back up one moment. Why do you want to saddle the people of this state with an overbuilding of power plants when it costs \$175 million per percentage point of unused electric generating capacity -- why do you want to do that?

DREYFUS: Because I calculated on the last debate -- I thought it was 18 so I wondered where you've got that --

SCHREIBER: You want me to tell you where your mistake was?

DREYFUS: Yeah.

SCHREIBER: Ok. You are talking about a ten-year plan, aren't you?

DREYFUS: No, I'm talking about one year.

SCHREIBER: Oh... you're just talking about a one-year plan?

DREYFUS: Is your \$275 million a ten-year figure, because that's what I thought it was? I wanted that answer out of you and you didn't give it to me.

SCHREIBER: You're talking about a growth rate in energy capacity for what period of time?

DREYFUS: I was talking about the cost to the people for one year...

SCHREIBER: Tell me how long you want to have your five to eight percent growth...

DREYFUS: That's ten years.

SCHREIBER: See, you've got to multiply times ten

DREYFUS: Was your \$175 million over ten years? That's a detail you left out. You ought to tell the people that's what it's going to cost for one percent. Ten years into \$175 million is only \$17 1/2 million per year, right?

SCHREIBER: You are wrong. We're talking a total cost -- a millstone around the necks of the people of this state for additional energy of some \$500 million. A hundred and twenty dollars a year added on to the bills of the people of this state...

DREYFUS: People are giving you wrong figures...

SHIVELY: Governor, your Public Service Commission has already allowed Northern States Power to proceed with Tyrone to the tune of \$20 or \$30 million, is that correct?

SCHREIBER: That's correct.

SHIVELY: Isn't that gonna' go... isn't Tyrone gonna' be built?

SCHREIBER: It depends upon the need study. The Public Service Commission will be voting on that, I understand, in a period of time, but they are right now in the process of concluding the need study.

POWELL: The other one's in the planning. Are you in favor of the two that are under planning now, the two new nuclear plants?

SCHREIBER: I do want to see the report of that need study.

POWELL: And the second one isn't even to that stage?

SCHREIBER: Are you talking about Haven?

POWELL: Whichever one was second.

DREYFUS: Yes.

SCHREIBER: O.K. We're talking about a need study. But see the planning is what is so very important, because planning can cost tens of millions of dollars.

SHIVELY: Wasn't that need study, couldn't that need study have been available earlier this fall, in the summer?

SCHREIBER: I don't know.

SHIVELY: Have you ever communicated with Chairman Checota on the timing of the need study report?

SCHREIBER: No I haven't.

SHIVELY: It wasn't postponed because of the election, is that what you're saying?

SCHREIBER: That's correct.

DREYFUS: But if that need study says "no" now, then you would stop Tyrone and Haven?

SCHREIBER: That's correct.

DREYFUS: Why, isn't all of that investment then gonna' wind up, as you say, on a millstone on the necks of the consumer? Won't it?

SCHREIBER: Because, as you say, in your own words, sometimes in order to prevent a worse evil you have to accept an evil that is not as bad.

DREYFUS: Wouldn't it have been better to do the need study before they spent \$30 million?

SCHREIBER: Oh, are you telling me? You're right...sure.

DREYFUS: Oh, OK.

SCHREIBER: And that's why I'm in favor of the moratorium, to make sure we don't go ahead and do any more planning until we have those need studies completed.

DREYFUS: Planning is need study! Let's not do building!!

SHIVELY: The moratorium excludes Haven and Tyrone. The moratorium starts there after those two...

SCHREIBER: Yes, that's right.

POWELL: The moratorium starts there after those two... Our time is growing short, do we have other topics we want to bring up?

HINSHAW: I have a related question for both of them. Presuming for the sake of this argument that for federal or national reasons there is no growth in the state's economy, what then? And I guess Mr. Dreyfus, you ought to address this first. What then would you do about black unemployment in the inner city?

DREYFUS: With no growth? Ho ho... I don't see a way to solve it with no growth. There isn't any question in my mind what's operating within the racial biases of this society as to who loses a job first. And I think when you've got no growth, the only option left would be public employment in the public sector, and I think that's dumping ground employment with nowhere to go and basic support of people for their lives, and that's not in their own personal best interests.

I agree if we get to no growth, and that's the thing I'm concerned about, then we're concerned about what we're gonna' do on energy expansion. No growth would absolutely be disasterous for the minority people in this society. Absolutely disasterous.

HINSHAW: If it came to that, then?

DREYFUS: Then we'd have to go to public employment and public support. The people who work would have to support the people who don't work.

POWELL: Governor, can we hear from you on it?

SCHREIBER: I have a plan that we are now in the process of refining that would furnish tax incentives to businesses that locate in our inner cities and areas of high unemployment. In addition to that, we've put together a special team, working with youngsters to help them not only get a sense of the direction they should be headed in to get a job, but also to help them in maintaining that job.

In addition to that, looking very carefully at what Elmer Winter is coming up with, the problems of inner city unemployment are something that have plagued most major cities in this nation. It's a concern of mine, and everything that we can do as a state government is in the process of being done or examined to a further degree so we can have the kind of program, when the Legislature returns in January, that will allow those individuals that are unemployed...allow those individuals to get jobs.

HINSHAW: You're talking again, though in the same sense that perhaps Mr. Dreyfus is, of using public dollars, if we're in a no growth situation.

SCHREIBER: Well, first of all I don't buy his basic premise that adding on another atomic energy power plant is going to have an impact on unemployment in Milwaukee's inner city, because we already have now the availability of energy to construct any kind of plant really within reason. And so as I hear him talk and as I do not hear the kinds of alternative options coming forth to help solve this problem today and tomorrow and for the next five years and for the next ten years, I guess I've become a little bit frustrated.

POWELL: We have just five minutes left. Let me just ask you what's the most important thing people should know about you, if you want them to vote for you for governor?

SCHREIBER: Well, if I would be talking with anyone and asking them to look at this race for governor, I would ask them to look at my record, a record that includes eight years in the Senate, seven years as lieutenant governor, and then also my record as governor over the past sixteen months. I am proud of the affirmative action that I've taken. I'm proud of the programs that we've had a chance to enact into law; ten percent property tax cut; increasing the school aids; putting money into the highway program, for example; saving our abandoned railroad rights; tough nursing home enforcement legislation; some of the toughest drunk driving laws in the entire country; the reform of our civil service system and so on...

And then I guess I would also ask them to look at what I am proposing for the future. Meaningful tax reform -- tax reform that's going to be for a decade and a generation, not just for the next election. I guess I would ask them to look precisely at the kind of person I am.

You know there are many problems that come up that we are not going to be able to discuss here this evening, some problems that we haven't even thought of, being on the horizon. And I guess we're looking at an individual, his sense of being, what he or she is about, and I think that is as much on who you vote for as background, experience, and also as on policy. Is he the kind of person that you can trust? Is he the kind of person you can believe? Is he the kind of person that is going to be good for the future of Wisconsin?

POWELL: We hear a lot about apathy; I want to ask both of you about this, too. Many people, especially through the summer -- maybe interest is picking up now with two weeks to go to election -- people simply have not seemed to be very interested. Why? How can we get to them?

SCHREIBER: Well some people say it's a result of contentment, some people say it's a result of severe frustration. I guess if

you ask me, I would like to have everyone believe it's a matter of contentment. I don't know. I know both of us have been working very hard to try and stimulate voter interest. I know both of us have been doing our best to make sure that this is the kind of discussion that's going to be fruitful for everyone.

POWELL: In the time left... I guess we have about enough time for what should the voters know about you?

DREYFUS: I think they ought to look at my administrative record in running one of the State's larger businesses, and I'm quite willing to stand on that. I think it's been done well, I think it's been done in the most cost-effective manner, I think it's been done with quality, and I think that it has produced the results I was expected to produce up there as a chief executive officer in that branch of government.

But I think there are several other things, too, and one has to do with the fact that I do want to re-establish the two-party system and break what I see as the arrogance of power and the concentration power of one party beginning to take over both houses, all of the constitutional offices. And that begins to demonstrate an arrogance that I think McMillen here in town is quite accurate about when he defined it as such.

And on that basis, I think in the course of the primary and the course of this campaign that I would hope the people would see me as the one to break that kind of power -- which in fact will be a plus for the Democratic party -- and return it to its track. Also what I'm trying to do is to bring the Republican party back to its tracks.

POWELL: Very quickly, do you see apathy?

DREYFUS: Yes, and I think probably for both of the reasons. Some people finally just drop out and say "Nuts to it. I'm against all politicians and politics." And other people are saying "I'm not interested, and it's just not my thing." I run into people who don't vote at all. But it also may be World Series time. Now that the World Series is over we're going to have people...

POWELL: We're just about over for tonight, and I want to thank our guests for joining us once again in this discussion. We've been speaking with the Acting Governor of Wisconsin, Martin J. Schreiber, Democratic candidate for Governor. And, also with us tonight, the Republican candidate for Governor, Lee S. Dreyfus. And the candidates have been responding to questions posed by our guest reporters this evening. On our set is Ed Hinshaw, the editorial director of WTMJ-TV in Milwaukee, and Neil Shively, political reporter for the Milwaukee Sentinel.

We hope you as voters have found tonight's program informative, and we invite you to tune in this Friday night at nine as the member stations of the Wisconsin Educational Television Network

will bring you a special program of election analysis entitled "Forum '78, The Election." Check your local listings for the radio and television broadcast times of the Wisconsin Newspaper Association gubernatorial press conference. Thank you for joining us, I'm John Powell and good evening.

The preceding program was produced by the Wisconsin educational radio and television networks and WHA-TV, Madison.

APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPT OF DREYFUS/SCHREIBER
DEBATE #3 -- WISCONSIN LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS "GOVERNOR'S FORUM '78,"
NOVEMBER 2, 1978 AT UNIVERSITY OF
WISCONSIN -- STEVENS POINT, STEVENS
POINT, WISCONSIN

Hello, I'm John Powell. Public broadcasters from throughout Wisconsin bring you the third and final face-to-face debate between the candidates for governor. Tonight, Democrat Martin Schreiber and Republican Lee Dreyfus will be debating two topics. One concerns the number of state employees; the other, the candidates' personal political philosophies.

The candidates will also be answering written questions from the audience. The election is Tuesday, the polls say it's very close, and tonight both candidates will be trying to score a lot of points with the voters. Now, from the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, the third and final debate of '78.

PRESIDENT OF WOMEN VOTERS: Good evening. Before the debate begins, let me quickly outline the main ground rules. The candidates will engage in two rounds of debate, each round on a specific proposition. In each round, the candidates will present an opening statement, and, then alternating, will present two rebuttal speeches.

At the close of the two rounds of debate, the moderator will pose several questions which have been submitted by the audience. The questions will be selected by a panel on the criteria that they are relevant to the debate topics, represent the major interests of the audience, and are fair. The debate will conclude with a closing statement by each candidate. The participants may use notes for their opening and closing statements.

Candidates have been asked to keep their remarks germane to the debate proposition and fair to each other. The moderator will interrupt a speaker, if necessary, to assure that the debates are fair and relevant. The candidates' remarks will be timed and they have been informed of the time limits.

In the interest of fairness to the candidates, and in the interest of staying on schedule, we have asked the audience in the auditorium to hold applause until the end of the debate. The moderator for this debate is Barbara Knowlton, Program-Vice President of the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin.

MODERATOR: Our first speaker tonight is the Democratic candidate for governor, Martin J. Schreiber, who is currently the Acting Governor of Wisconsin. He has served both as Lieutenant Governor and as a State Senator.

Speaking second will be Lee S. Dreyfus, the Republican candidate for governor, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, currently on leave.

Both participants have kindly agreed to be referred to as "Mr." throughout the debate, in the interest of time and simplicity.

Before reading the first proposition, let me state these propositions do not necessarily reflect the League's view on the issues. They are presented as the basis for discussion.

The topic for the first round of debate is State employment. Specifically, the proposition is : "Resolved: That there should be no increase in the number of State employee positions." I will repeat the proposition. "Resolved: That their should be no increase in the number of State employee positions."

By a flip of a coin, Mr. Schreiber is to present his three-minute opening statement first.

I'm sorry ... we have some confusion. The first proposition will not be what I have just read. It will go to what I thought was the second, I'm sorry. The proposition relates to philosophy of government. The gentlemen are asked to speak to the following proposition: "Resolved: That a sound philosophy of government service requires a commitment to certain basic principles and an understanding of what constitutes the public interest."

In discussing this proposition, we trust you will cover: (1) your personal principles for governing the people of the state; (2) the duties of those governing to the citizens who are governed; and (3) the nature of the public interest. I will repeat the proposition. "Resolved: That a sound philosophy of government service requires a commitment to certain basic principles and an understanding of what constitutes the public interest."

Mr. Schreiber will speak first.

SCHREIBER: Thank you. Again, I wish to thank the League of Women Voters for the sponsorship of these debates. My philosophy of government is as follows: I believe that there is no other reason for government to exist other than to serve people -- to improve their quality of life. The question is: How should government serve? Who can best accomplish this? How do you find an answer to your dilemma as to who to vote for in this campaign to best carry forth those goals? If there is a record, you can judge a person on that record. If there is no record, you must judge a person by what he says and also by his experience.

I understand why people are cynical and disbelieving of promises by candidates, because promises have a way of disappearing after election day. But a record, insofar as it reflects a man's principles, is carved in stone for all to see and evaluate, and thus my record is history, fact.

For the entire sixteen years that I have served the public, my record represents my principles and my priorities: preserving natural resources, the independence and dignity of the elderly, energy conservation, wise spending, safer highways, improved health care, preserving the family farm, help for our disadvantaged, improving the quality of education, keeping government open and accessible. There are no easy solutions to

these challenges, and I do not claim to have solved all of these problems during the sixteen and a half months that I have been your governor.

But, we have made a beginning. We have planted the seed; we have charted the course; and, you can judge my ability to finish that job by my record.

Now what do we really know about the opponent -- other than he has a Ph.D. in Communications, that he is a former professor and a chancellor; a man who believes that government's only job is to defend the shores and deliver the mail; a man who has priorities foreign to what I believe and not those of one who depict himself as a man of the people? Here is his latest priority, as stated in a Madison press conference... Top number one priority from him: road construction. His last priority: his highly publicized tax change.

Moreover, he said he will veto a property tax cut based on your ability to pay. Let him explain why his top priority in September of tax cuts is now his last priority in November. Why does he no longer place a top priority in easing a tax payer's burden? This is an example of what I said earlier about campaign promises -- credibility: here today, gone tomorrow.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your opening statement, please.

DREYFUS: In looking at a philosophy of government, what are the principles for governing? As I see them, "the government that governs least governs best" is one principle. Secondly, to give the individual the greatest possible latitude. Thirdly, that government does what the individual cannot do for society. Fourth, that level of government closest to the people will be that level of government which is most responsive to the people. And fifth, government must be open.

Now what's happened to our government? People not only feel excluded, but they feel alienated. Career politicians and career bureaucratic leaders have taken over and they have taken over with the help of special interest groups. In fact, elected representatives can't get through to the bureaucrats who are creating the rules and regulations because they create them with the help and consultation of technicians and the special interests. People are screaming and no one listens. I tell you we are heading in the wrong direction; we are heading away from the people and they are getting mad.

What to do? That's our duty in responding to what a governor should do in his duties. One, open government up. Two, rebalance the executive and the legislative. Thirdly, rebalance a two-party system; it's safer for people if you've got two parties that are in balance and at each other's throats. Seriously restrict the influence of special interest groups and the money they can put into a campaign with which they can buy influence.

But, maintain the strength of the middle-income working people. They are the people who work and need to support the services for the poor, for the children, for the elderly and the unemployed. But, they must remain strong and not have their strength sapped from them by over-taxation or the whole business comes down.

The League asks what obligations or duties from leadership: absolute candor. Two, a willingness to speak out both the good news and the bad news. Thirdly, a willingness to stand on principle even when it's not popular. I've gotten a feeling around the state that we've got a closed system. So, think about joining government rather than fighting it.

How do I plan to open that government up and return it to the people? That's a very hard thing to do. But, if the people decide next Tuesday that I am to form a new administration by electing me governor, then immediately I do now afford every single citizen an opportunity to recommend and nominate people for appointment.

And, I will ask the press immediately following that election to release job categories so that you know where the needs are -- so that you can send the name and information about that person directly to: People's Government, Box 1979, Stevens Point. We will start volunteer screening committees going over all of those names; they will all be looked at and in no sense will we begin taking in administrative leadership from a few segments within the society. All 4.6 million citizens will be eligible.

MODERATOR: We now commence the two-minute rebuttal speeches, Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: Well, Mr. Dreyfus did not answer a few questions that are very important. Why does he continuously shift his positions on what is a priority? Talk about cynicism and talk about frustration, the continuation of the changing of positions has got to do more to create disbelief among our people than any other thing that I could imagine. Now let's go one step further and talk about his matter of only defending the shores and delivering the mail.

If you're a person in a nursing home bed, it means that my opponent is not interested in you. If you're a college student receiving federal aid for your education, it means he's not interested. If you're a businessperson that is concerned about a balanced transportation system and federal highway funds, it means that my opponent is not interested in you, either.

He used some key words: "closest to the people." He wants to take over the vocational school system from local control by the State government. He mentioned that we have had to help our middle income people. But, he neglected to point out to you that every single tax plan that he offered was geared for the country club set. The takeover of vocational education will mean

approximately \$60.00 per year in a property tax cut for a middle income person -- nothing for the renter -- but, some \$64,000 per year in property tax cuts, for example, for the Sentry Insurance Company.

You should know that he just stated in a press conference earlier this week -- as he talks about opening government -- that he admitted that he would probably be influenced by the people from Sentry Insurance Company as to his appointment for the next insurance commissioner. All I would say, Mr. Dreyfus again, you are saying one thing and doing another.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your first rebuttal.

DREYFUS: Surely. First of all I wanted to do my opening constructive rather than to respond to your question. As to the first priority being roads, you'd be surprised how that's going to help the people. That is the fundamental lifeblood of this society. We've got eight hundred and some communities that are only served by roads and have no railroad input at all. They live by truck in a very real sense. And the basic return of the roads to a condition that is acceptable in this state will benefit the people and benefit them broadly and benefit the economy.

Then, you ask: "Why am I opposed to property tax on the ability to pay?" Because I know about the loopholes and I know exactly what happens with people who make a lot of money and wind up paying very little tax. And, if you're gonna' base that property tax based on what they're paying in income tax, forget it. I know too many people at the top who are not paying what I see as a share on which you can base the property tax.

And, also on the quip of defending the shores and delivering the mail -- come on, be serious. You can't really think that I'm talking about a federal government that has those two functions. I'm surprised -- I've mentioned it before -- that you take a quip and move it out to define the whole philosophy; don't do that in the presence of a whole state audience.

But, as far as taking over the VTAE? There's no question in my mind a vocational-technical education can remain exactly under the structure it is; but, the money comes from the State because it is post-secondary, as is the university and every other one. It will take \$180 million off of the taxrolls and that will do much for people along the line in paying property taxes.

As far as Sentry Insurance getting a \$64,000 benefit out of a shift in property tax? They pay over a million; they're 15% of this city's input and I can assure you I didn't work out a billion dollar tax reform plan to save Sentry Insurance \$64,000. (laughter and applause)

MODERATOR: May I remind the audience of their agreement...

DREYFUS: Lastly...

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your final two-minute rebuttal.

SCHREIBER: I would ask not only anyone who has followed this campaign very closely, but every citizen and also every person in the news media to examine very carefully the constant changing position of my opponent. He said in September that his number one priority had to do with the income tax. It is now November; he has now changed his position once again. He now talks about roads as being the most important. I guess my question for him again is: Mr. Dreyfus...Why? Why change? Why do you wish to confuse the people?

Or, maybe you're no longer interested in tax relief... all of those things that you talked about for that period of time. Now let's just talk a moment about your tax relief program. And please: don't kid the people. The person that's a middle income person under your take-over scheme of vocational schools is going to receive approximately a \$60.00 tax cut per year. Sentry Insurance will receive \$64,000 per year in tax cuts. Fort Howard Paper Company will receive a total of \$103,000 in tax cuts.

What principle, what philosophy guides you to want to make sure that you maintain a tax system that is unrelated to a person's ability to pay? Why? Why do we in the state of Wisconsin -- that have always prided itself as being a progressive state -- all of a sudden have to become involved in dealing with a challenge of reform of a tax system with someone that constantly wants to insure that the rich get richer, to make sure that those that are in the country club set, pursuant to the Republican party tradition, are the ones that are the most honored?

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your final rebuttal.

DREYFUS: Surely. In terms of looking at changes, I'm really surprised that you would mention flip-flopping and changing about. It's like speaking of a rope in the house of a hanged man. I find that first you came out and said: "I know what I'm gonna' do with the surplus -- I'm gonna' give everybody a \$20.00 rebate." And when that didn't fly, you said: "We'll have a tax commission; we'll really study it and we've gotta' be thoughtful so there won't be anything out until after the election." Then came in step three which was -- five weeks before the election -- zap: "Here's a plan." I can't imagine anymore radical changes than that. And, I am surprised that you are concerned about change.

I was asked what the top issue was in this campaign, and I tell you the top issue is taxes. My top priority in terms of moving out in new programs in this state is, in fact, roads; and, you ought to be able to distinguish between those two. Now, what principle maintains that I don't want to relate the property tax to ability to pay? It's because of all the loopholes I see in the tax system that allows those who make a lot of money to wind up paying very little, and their adjusted gross or adjusted income

in many cases is almost zero. And you could have people who wind up with a giant income, a giant piece of property -- under your plan -- and they would pay almost nothing because their ability to pay in that given year is down. And, they don't pay taxes; they have too many write-offs.

And, to get this tied to a tax system that is already looped to death -- I don't want to tie the property tax. At least on the property tax I can go and look at the taxroll and see what your tax is and what my tax is. I can't do that in the income tax and I don't trust that system well enough. We get that reformed -- then we'll talk about tying the property tax to the income tax. But, all in all, as I see the situation on philosophy of government -- I knew we'd get back to the taxes -- let's go back to surplus while we're at it.

The real issue is: the people are not being heard; they are not being listened to; government's become a closed system of bureaucrats and technicians and career politicians. That needs to be opened up. That's a philosophy of government that I think requires a change.

MODERATOR: Thank you, gentlemen. We return now to the other topic for debate this evening which concerns State employment. Specifically, the proposition is: "Resolved: That there should be no increase in the number of State employee positions." I will repeat the proposition. "Resolved: That there should be no increase in the number of State employee positions."

In this round, Mr. Dreyfus presents the first three-minute opening statement.

DREYFUS: In looking at this resolve, proposition two, the real question is: Why? Why freeze? Frankly, it's to get a handle on growth; to get a handle on State spending and where personnel needs are greater than others.

Let's get re-sorted out within State government. Just the question, for example, of how many people we have employed in the State is confusing -- very difficult to obtain an answer. I've heard all kinds of answers; I had them fed to me in different forms; and, in fact, during the course of this debate -- up until this point -- the Governor never came out and said: "Here's the number." You know, is it 71,300, as I just saw today in a political advertisement?

Ah, we need somehow to find out how many people -- darn it -- are working for the State. In fact, if we can't do that, I think I'm going to call an employee census day in which everybody comes to Camp Randall. We get 'em through one gate and we'll count 'em all by nose. Somewhere we've got to know how many people are working.

Now we have a three-year freeze that you have instituted, and I began calling for a freeze last January. Finally, with enough

heat, you put the freeze on -- although I understand after you put some 2,200 people on the payroll. But, is it true that your freeze does not include limited term appointments?

Or, is it true that it does not include positions created through contracting out for services? Because the question is: When you do that, doesn't that encourage the use of limited term people and thus undercut all the regular State employees who give their lives to State service? Doesn't that encourage the Department of Administration to contract out rather than to use State employees? Because, I understand, we got 4,000 employees in the Department of Transportation, and yet, we contracted out of state, at many thousands of dollars, to develop a State transportation plan. Was there no one in that 4,000 qualified to do that?

Or settling, for example, on a Director of Personnel -- and this state has gone two years without one? And, the last attempt to put one in bordered on a scandal and now we've got an all new board -- all of them appointed by you. And the legislature clearly said: "Look within Wisconsin first."

But now, they've decided again to search outside. You mean, out of 4.6 million people, no one in this state is qualified to be Director of Personnel? We need that Director now while the freeze is on or it will cause problems in affirmative action; it will cause a position need evaluation as to where we're long and where we're short. It will also mean we have to begin investigating job sharing possibilities. We need the freeze, then, for growth cooling off period. And, we also need a period to see where we have our priorities. But, lastly to insure tax payers, we are not just continuing to grow and grow until the bureaucrats finally outnumber the tax payers.

The basic need, though, is to protect our dedicated civil servants from a growing Proposition 13 feeling, which if it grows, will not hurt those at the top. It absolutely will hurt those that do the daily work. That's why we need the freeze; that's why we need to get a handle on where we are; we're gonna' make the managers manage instead of lobby; and, that's why we need a State Director of Personnel now -- and, from inside the State of Wisconsin.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your opening statement.

SCHREIBER: Thank you very much. I personally dealt with the matter of the State government and the hiring practices when I dealt with the budget in January of 1978. At that time, as Governor, I proposed a reduction in the number of positions in our State government. I did that because it was necessary to save money and because I know that for every dollar that we save, in payment of wages, we can either cut taxes or return those taxes in property tax cuts. Mr. Dreyfus is not being truthful when he claims that the freeze was merely a reaction to his suggestion.

Each July, the governor, as part of his responsibilities, must instruct his department heads to ensure that they plan properly for the next budget. I told them then as their governor that they should not ask for any new positions because I would approve none. Now, what are limited term employees? And, we should understand that before we go any further in discussion. A limited term employee is a short-term, part-time employee -- such as a National Guardsman when called out at the time of a natural disaster...lifeguards hired in our parks.

Why are there no freezes on LTE positions? Because, simply, there are no fixed positions. They are season, short-term employees hired as needed people and the point of the fact is there are fewer limited term employees now than what there were in July.

Now, what are the facts about State government in Wisconsin? Forty-one other states have more state employees than does our state. Our growth in State government, since 1971 when the Democratic party took over, has been at 2% a year. Whereas, in prior Republican years, that growth has been at 7%. And, in fact, there are fewer people getting paychecks today, than in 1978, January.

Now, while Mr. Dreyfus is lecturing us on how to be more economical in State government, he ought to tell us more how he manages this campus. He should tell us that in the decade that he was chancellor at this university campus, the employment positions at this university increased 41% -- twice as fast as student enrollment. He should tell you why the employment increased on this campus twice as fast as the rest of the state as a whole in State government.

The subject of employment practices in this campaign is significant for two reasons. One: This is the only place where we can find that he has a record as a candidate, and two: the subject again provides the best example of where Mr. Dreyfus preaches one thing and practices another. I think you owe us an explanation. (applause)

MODERATOR: And now Mr... Please, would you refrain from applause 'til the end? Mr. Dreyfus will present his first two-minute rebuttal speech.

DREYFUS: Surely. In terms of looking at the hiring practices, you say that LTE's are short-term, part-time employees; that's not the position I think of those who provide leadership to our State employees, who feel we've got people making an absolute career out of those positions, that they go on and on. Why do you think those people interrupted our last debate and demanded collective bargaining? Because they thought they only had four-month or six-month jobs? They couldn't even live under a contract.

I tell you, the LTE position is being abused; it's a way to get around position control; it's being done by managers. And the people -- who are the people who have given their lives to public service in this state -- are absolutely being worked around. According to John Wyngaard, 16,000 of them. I don't know how accurate John is and I was hoping you were gonna' give us a figure when you said they're fewer than before.

You also say we're in great shape; there are 41 states better than we are. Well, if we are in such great shape and at the low percentage, then I wonder, why did you freeze at all? What was the need for a freeze if we're number 42 out of 50?

Now, as far as the decade of employment here at this institution and -- though I've been gone for six months, I think I can remember the basics of it. You mentioned a 41% increase -- twice as fast as the student enrollment. Our student enrollment went from 6,000 to just over 9,000 and on that basis it's about a 50% growth. But, that assumes that we had the kind of work load, that and the capacity that we had -- not true.

If you'd look at the building that you're standing in right now and then look across here, you will find that all but one of those buildings did not stand at that time and every time you add buildings, you've got to add security. We simply didn't have a campus here.

But, the other real issue: there's only one way to look at the efficiency of an institution and that's the composite support index. It's something created by the Department of Administration under the Lucy-Schreiber administration. And, it lists comparatively all the institutions in the eleven clusters. In the last -- this year and last year -- we were eighth out of eleven. The three years before that we were ninth out of eleven; and, for the prior years we were eleven out of eleven -- the cheapest in the state.

MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Dreyfus. The next rebuttal speech is to be made by Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: I have been governor for sixteen months. During that period of time we have passed civil service reform; we have reduced the number of state employees; and, we are well on our way to making sure that our people get a fair dollar's worth of value from our State employees for their tax dollars. Mr. Dreyfus has been chancellor here for a period of ten years and I would challenge him to tell us what he did, if anything, about any of the problems that he talked about right now. Because, whether or not you know it, he is a bureaucrat. He is the person that has been entrusted to run this campus for a period of time.

And, if you listen to him very carefully, he says: "Well, why? Why did the number of State employees grow? Because we built more buildings, and because we built more buildings we had to add more people, and because we added more people we had to add more

people."

Well, Chancellor, I want to tell you that I think I made an error. The increase in the employment over your ten-year period was not twice as fast, but, it was really 60%. You had 564 students in 1967 -- I mean 564 employees when you arrived in 1967, and in fall of this year you had 917. Now that is a 60% increase. I guess I would ask you if you are going to think that if you are elected governor, you're going to do any better job than the operation of our State government and in curtailing State expenditures.

And, I think I would like you to answer maybe one more question: you are blaming me for a surplus. Time and time again you hold me responsible for the fact that we have a strong economy, that we have government savings. I guess I would ask you why at this campus under your administration within the past three years, you had a deficit of some \$113,000?

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus will now present his second rebuttal of this round.

DREYFUS: I do blame you for the surplus -- not for it's creation, that's double digit inflation. I blame you for sixteen months of inaction. We didn't need a tax plan out of you five weeks before election. We needed it out of you sometime over a year ago. You could have done something about preventing that surplus, and the fundamental principle with me has been and still remains: no state has a right to take money from the people it doesn't need to provide services to the people. That's fundamental.

Secondly, in terms of the Civil Service Reform Act that you say you signed, that included the fact of a belief that you were going to reform that entire structure, put in your own board. They were going to come up with a new Director of Personnel so we didn't go through the fiasco of the last one and, by George, here just a couple of weeks back -- and I listen to Senator Kleczka and I agree with him... he is saying to you: they're ready to take the whole business to court, that you have no right to be doing what you're doing under that Civil Service Reform bill and though you can get by with it legally, although he may be challenging it -- a member of your own party -- they should be getting a Director now while we have a freeze. We need a Director of Personnel and there's been two years without any action.

As far as my being a bureaucrat -- not in the sense of civil service. As a chancellor of this university, I have about thirty seconds' tenure. That's long enough for the president of the board to get to a phone, call me, and tell me I'm fired. That's the way it ought to be; that's the way it is. People who make policy that affects people's lives -- and I did on this campus -- ought not have the protection and insulation from those people by having some kind of permanent tenure or civil service status.

And in terms of the hundred and eleven thousand dollar deficit -- see if I can remember that. I think you're talking about the '76-'77 period in which we found ourselves with \$40,000 in excess sickness that we hadn't been able to budget for -- a very unusual period -- and the other \$70,000 was to pay off a computer that we tried to pay off a year ahead of time.

And by the way, the budget is a little over \$25 million -- that's about one half of one percent that it varied off, and the first time in ten years that it happened.

MODERATOR: The final speech of this round is by Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: In this whole discussion of a number of employees, it should be born in mind that no matter what my opponent might say, it is a fact that the personnel here on this campus during his ten years as Chancellor increased by 60% over a decade, which is really triple -- triple the growth rate in our State government service. It would seem to me that any person who wants to hold himself or herself out in making particular charges, in coming forth with a particular platform, would at least be willing to admit the fact that they themselves had to meet specific challenges, that they themselves weren't perfect.

We heard about your reasons for the increase here at this campus: the construction of more buildings. And, I guess I would ask you: should you be elected governor, will you be in that -- will you be constructing more buildings? Will you be making sure that there are more employees hired? Will you be making sure that there will be an additional amount of money needed because of improper budgeting so that you will have to adjust your schedule to make sure that your computer is paid off?

MODERATOR: Now we will go to the questions from the audience. The first question is: "Broad policy guidelines defining the public interest are laid out in the state platforms of each political party. Are you familiar with your party's platform on state issues? Which do you agree or disagree with?" I will repeat the question and Mr. Dreyfus will respond first.
(question is repeated)

DREYFUS: In trying to think over the platform in an area of disagreement, I have had a conflict within my party on the platform formation relative to the status of civil service and civil service reform. It is the only area of general conflict that I've had because I believe we have got to reform civil service to take people who make policy out of civil service status.

I understand my party's concern with a move that may appear to look like patronage and a move in that direction; but I also believe there is a fundamental principle that says that those who make policy should be not insulated from the voter. We now have people who are insulated from the voter.

On the other side of platform of government -- and those were essentially those that I gave to you initially -- I would also add the belief in the cabinet system and a cabinet system of government -- also a conflict with the elements on both sides, all within my party. I believe that we have got to stay with a cabinet system of government and move more directly toward that, because if you are going to hold the governor responsible for the operation of departments, then he's got to have his lieutenants in place. And when they mess up our lives, then you throw him and them out of office.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your response.

SCHREIBER: The Democratic platform of the party of the state of Wisconsin is a document that I'm more in agreement with than disagreement. The basic areas of agreement include the assistance to our elderly; to making sure we have a tax system that is based on ability to pay; to insure that we allow women and minorities an access to the system; to make sure that we help strengthen our abilities to help our disadvantaged achieve their full potential.

MODERATOR: Thank you. The second question asks: "Acting Governor Schreiber proposes adding no new State employees until 1981. Would either candidate favor a permanent net reduction in the absolute number of state employees?" I will repeat the question. (question is repeated).

Excuse me, Mr. Schreiber, you are first.

SCHREIBER: In response to that question, it is 1981 -- that is the date on which my freeze will expire. I believe that as we evaluate very carefully the budget requests that will be coming in from my State agencies very shortly, we will be able to determine whether or not there is need for a total net reduction.

There are two exceptions in my freeze for State employees. They deal, one, with our prison system and the other with our centers for the developmentally disabled. With those two exceptions, I not only plan on holding firm, but, if at all possible, reducing the overall number of State employees.

Our State government has grown at approximately two percentage points a year. That's roughly a thousand employees. There are 53,769 State employees; at growth at two percentage points, that means approximately a little more than 2000 employees per year, and with that kind of growth -- with that kind of growth stoppage -- we will be able to seriously cut back on the need for any increase in taxes, seriously allow greater opportunity for tax relief.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your response.

DREYFUS: The basis of any freeze is to be short-term, to get a handle on stopping growth, and find out what the needs are. Once

those needs are determined, then there's no longer a need for a continuation of freeze. How long that freeze will be, will be determined on how rapidly the information can be determined as to what the needs are by priority from one department to the other. Because we are now at a point where we're going to have to establish some priorities, and in order to do some things with more people, we're going to have to reduce people elsewhere, rather than continued growth.

The second part of that question was: "Would I consider a reduction?" If it indicates that it can be done with fewer people, the answer is absolutely "yes". You don't go on with the basis that whatever number you've got is parity and is in proper place. You go on the basis of what are the needs of services to be provided to the people; but, particularly: what services do the people want?

And, have we got people at full work load or have we got some people in full-time jobs who could be in part-time jobs? I notice now you gave us a number of 53,760 employees. So apparently the number of 71,300 is not accurate. I suspect what we're dealing with is the difference between FTE or whether actual individuals working part-time.

I don't know, but every time a number comes out, I get a new one. We are going to find out how many we've got; then we're going to find out how many we need; then we're going to figure where we need them most and where we need them least. And then we make the decision about where to go from that point on.

MODERATOR: Our third question is: "What is your position on binding arbitration for public employees?" I will repeat the question which Mr. Dreyfus will answer first. (question is repeated)

DREYFUS: My position on binding arbitration for public employees is that this is the mechanism to avoid a strike, first of all, in areas of irreparable harm. I do not accept the right to strike in areas of irreparable harm. And, we have not done a good job in this state in defining those areas.

The next move, then, is to move to a mechanism of binding arbitration. I do have some concerns about the method in education -- using a single arbitrator -- and would prefer a paneled jury of people representing all the elements in education: parents, teachers, union leaders, administrators, school board and taxpayers.

And bring in from outside that community some kind of representative jury panel. That is not the method now; I would ask the teachers to look to that approach and use binding arbitration through that mechanism. But, on the last-best offer approach -- if you have, particularly, people who cannot strike under the law, then they've got to have a mechanism to protect them from arbitrary and capricious power.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: As governor I signed into law Senate Bill 15 which was a major piece of legislation that allowed this nation -- that allowed this state -- to be a leader in the nation in handling the matter of challenges of collective bargaining impasses between teachers and their school boards.

This piece of legislation is the very first piece of sunset legislation that was signed into law. That piece of legislation will be evaluated after a three-year period of time following an opportunity for experience. In essence, it does call for a type of binding arbitration. It calls for each side, when an impasse occurs, to submit their very last best offer.

The arbiter then comes along and evaluates both of those offers and can only choose one of those offers. With the choosing then of that one offer, with both sides agreeing to that procedure pursuant to Senate Bill 15, that then is a decision. It then is no longer necessary to be concerned about the problem of striking.

MODERATOR: The fourth question is: "If the freeze on State employees remains in effect, how will affirmative action be affected? What will be the effect on women and minorities? Most LTE's are women and/or minorities." I will repeat the question and Mr. Schreiber will answer first. (question is repeated)

SCHREIBER: Alright, the freeze will have absolutely no effect on the matter of affirmative action. What we are saying, pure and simply, is that we are not going to increase the number of positions in our State government. Now, it may very well be true that many of the limited term employees are women. That is understandable because some of the limited term employees, or many of those that are hired, are at times hired to do the kind of secretarial work that many mothers find an opportunity to do because of part-time employment.

The limited term employee situation, pursuant to the Civil Service Reform Act, is going to be substantially changed within a short period of time. The Civil Service Reform Act precisely points out that a limited term employee can be hired for no longer than a period of six months. Because of that then, the affirmative action programs can be maintained for limited term employees, but, at the same time, adjusted and applied to people that are hired in permanent employment.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: First of all, I think the freeze will have a chilling effect on affirmative action. And, I think it is a genuine concern on the part of minority groups and on the part of women's groups because as we stop the growth -- it's in the process generally of growth that we have been able to really move

affirmative action ahead within agencies and within the private sector when one is talking about a static situation. And especially if you ever get to a point where you start pulling down in a department, the last ones hired in are going to be the first ones taken out. And since affirmative action is relatively new in our State hiring procedures, I tell you the people that are going to come out will be disproportionately minorities and females and there isn't any question in my mind about it. And, I simply don't agree with the Governor's position at all: that it will have absolutely no effect.

I think those are genuine concerns and I think that as one begins to look at a freeze, if it looks like it's going to last the length of time -- and, in fact if I were thinking in terms of a three-year freeze as with 1981, then I think very definitely we'd have to lay out some guidelines to protect the concept of affirmative action -- to make sure that we have retained access for those people who have been denied too long equal opportunity into positions in State government. That can be built into it. That should be built into it.

And, I think the notion that there are only six months in an LTE position -- the point is that there just are reshifts in appointments and the same person getting moved around. That will take some commitment to see that women and minorities are protected under a position of either freeze or decline. Those are not good conditions for either of those two groups.

MODERATOR: The fifth question is: "What is your definition of local control?" Mr. Dreyfus, you respond first. I will repeat the question. (question is repeated)

DREYFUS: My definition of local control in this case would relate primarily to municipal, town, and county government -- those three forms of government. And the question is: To what extent do they have the latitude to respond and be responsive to the needs of the people within their particular constituency as to the laws under which they live, as to the method by which they will govern themselves, as to the principles on which money will be spent, etc?

In the case of local government, the property tax appears to be the only revenue source available to local governments at this point. And as that tax becomes the one that is a key to be reduced, that will reduce their allocation of resources.

The amount of mandates that come in -- we are now at a point where we are third highest or fourth highest in the nation in State-mandated programs. There's no question about the value of many of those mandated programs; the point is, the State has said: "This is what you will do; the local will not determine it." So that we begin to do things more and more alike.

We have a tradition of home rule in this state. I think it can, in fact, be undermined by a movement of dollars to where, with the

dollars, will float the control and that was the original golden rule as I laid it out: "He who has the gold makes the rules." And, the more the State has the gold, the more they make the rules.

And, the question is whether or not people can have that government closest to them respond to their particular geographic needs, or whether the State will legislate and mandate over the whole state and know better what is best for the people.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: The response by my opponent to this question points out again one of the major examples of a difference in his position on one given day compared to the next. He has just spoken out in favor of local control, but yet just the other day he came out in favor of the take-over of vocational school education -- the kind of take-over of vocational school education that has the very opportunity of destroying what could well be considered the finest educational system in this entire nation.

You have at that point -- and this has to deal with my definition of local control -- but, you have in our education systems the kind of local control which representatives from business, representatives from the private sector, representatives from labor, determine the kind of curriculum that should be established in a particular vocational school district.

My opponent's position on this will take away that local control. My opponent's position on this will not only take away that local control, but make it more difficult for the property taxpayers in that particular area to maintain control over things that are most important. Because, while his proposition not only takes away local control under the guise of property tax relief, his proposition only means about sixty dollars per home owner. It means absolutely nothing to a renter.

The degree of local control by a community is not only based on their dedicated effort to make sure that they have control over their destiny, but also their ability to afford it.

MODERATOR: Thank you, gentlemen. That concludes the question round. We will now proceed to the four-minute closing statements and Mr. Dreyfus will speak first.

DREYFUS: Let me restate again my basic philosophy of government. I want to reduce government intrusion where it doesn't belong and I think that that's part of what's involved here and that's part of this last local control question. And I do not see the VTA shift from local taxation to State dollars as being part of the same involvement.

You see, under Article 10 of the constitution of the state of Wisconsin, education is in fact a legitimate involvement of the State; but, I have stated and stated repeatedly, I want the local

boards to stay in place exactly as they are and the way in which this would be done would be to legislate it in exactly that fashion: that the local vocational board stays with it, that the money now comes -- instead of off of the local property tax -- from the State source because it is post-secondary. And, by the way, there is a governmental philosophy problem in that taxation by vocational boards. It is the only one of two instances in the state of Wisconsin where an appointive board can levy taxes.

I admit it has not been abused, but I tell you it is not good government. You should not have people ever levying taxes against the people who have not been elected to office. And, other than the city of Milwaukee, all the rest of these boards are appointive boards and come out of the county board system and generally by a county chairman.

I would also say we've got to reduce. In reducing the intrusion of government, the best way to do it is to build a two-party system, because in the contest between parties, it is in that clash of balance that you can't get the kind of arrogance that begins to corrode good government. It is when you have one-party control, as we've been able to observe in Madison over these past years, that one is able to say I will take top legislative leadership and literally seduce them out of the legislature by offering top bureaucratic jobs. And I watch that honed to a fine degree.

We will legislate through the budget process; that has been honed to a fine degree -- very corrosive of good government. We have watched a situation in which out of that control, coming out of the executive, attempts to create a balance back with the legislature have been stopped -- including by my opponent -- who vetoed three bills that would have returned the oversight function to the legislature over rules and regulations produced in the executive side.

That imbalance between executive and legislative, I tell you, is a very real problem. And, when you have a balance in the governmental structure and a balance in the political structure, the people will benefit because they are constantly watch-dogging each other.

But when you have one-party control, then you can avoid the wishes of the people -- you don't need them at all. And that will allow you to just simply decide, as my opponent did, that while not moving to reform taxes he could reform the governor's salary, from somewhere in the area of \$45,000 up to \$65,000, with one signature of the pen, making it the fifth highest paid governorship in the U.S.

You can only do that when you have imbalance in the political process. I do then say let individuals try to work out their needs, protect local government, but never tax beyond the need; there should be no surplus, it is wrong. And the governor must now learn to speak openly, provide leadership with no obligation

to special interest groups, and be willing to lead in an unpopular direction when the people need it. And therein is a problem.

As I came in tonight and the anti-nuclear demonstrators -- and by the way, they maintained the tradition on this campus that in fact it was a demonstration which they expressed themselves and let me express myself. But, as I talked to them and they said: "Mr. Schreiber will not build Tyrone and Haven," I can't buy that.

And, I say now, it is that kind of candor that is needed. They need it before election. You and I, I believe, do not differ on that issue. I wondered why you haven't spoken with candor. That's what leadership needs to know. They need to know where do you stand. Stand on the dime and then you take your lumps -- as I had to take mine coming in tonight. I understand how they feel, but I am concerned about the minority environment down in the middle of Milwaukee, too.

That's what I'm talking about -- candor and leadership in government. That's what we need and we need it now in the state of Wisconsin. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Thank you. Mr. Schreiber, your final statement. (Someone in the audience: "Why don't you...") Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Schreiber, your final statement, please.

SCHREIBER: On behalf of the League of Women -- on behalf of the people of Wisconsin -- I want to once again thank the League of Women Voters for sponsoring these debates. The debates have provided tremendous opportunity for you to observe the fundamental differences between Mr. Dreyfus and myself.

I ask you to study what has been said and not how. I would ask that you judge each of us by our views on the issues. My efforts to hold down the growth of our government is not merely an exercise in thrift. A dollar saved in State payroll is a dollar that can be returned to you in tax relief. However, we can still afford to help those in need and to offer quality services without waste and without inefficiency.

My record in public life for the past 16 years is the best answer to anything that my opponent may have said here this evening or at any other time. From the time that I served in the State Senate, it had been under domination of the Republican party for a period of 80 years. I served in those twilight years -- of thirty-three members in the State Senate, I was one of eleven. At no time did I hear anyone concerned about maintaining the two-party system. But, we survived; we were responsive; and we grew.

That record that I have is not only the best answer to every single argument that my opponent would make, but, in addition to that, it is perfect evidence of my principles of government. And, it is

also the very easiest way for you to judge what I will do in the future. There's a dramatic difference between Mr. Dreyfus and me. I believe that our views on taxes, transportation, energy, economic development, have been presented in the two prior debates and should have allowed all of you to have a clear indication of our differences, and also provided a look into the future of what you can expect for the next four years. (There's a disturbance in the audience - as a woman interrupts: "Schreiber -- you murderer! Your leader's on the Titanic! You work for the devil!")

MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Schreiber, for continuing. Please go on.

SCHREIBER: I believe that tax reform must be based on the ability to pay, with a priority towards property tax relief and not the proposals that principally benefit the rich. I believe in attacking the problems of the unemployed by education, by job training, by business incentives, and not by building nuclear power plants. I believe your most pressing concerns also cannot be solved with a number one priority of building roads.

As your governor, and as long as I am governor, I will fight to ensure that every person in this state has an opportunity to achieve their own full potential; to make sure that they can live a life that is worth living. Government is not here to punish people; it is not here to unfairly tax; but rather, I say to you -- the laborer, the white/blue collar worker, the teacher, the professional, the business person, the homemaker -- we will serve you, but there are limits.

We must tax you, but we will be fair. To the elderly, the sick, the handicapped: I say that we will work to preserve your independence, your dignity, your hope. And, most importantly, to our children, I say that we will leave you a legacy of clean air and water, a government that is open and accessible, a tax system that will not force you to sell your home or farm, and a wise spending policy that will not mortgage your future. I would like to complete the job that I started only sixteen months ago. Vote on November 7 as if your future depended upon it. It does. (Applause)

PRESIDENT OF WOMEN VOTERS: Would the audience please stay in order? Thank you, Governor Schreiber and Chancellor Dreyfus for debating your differing views on the philosophy of government and on State employment. Because this is our last debate, I really want to express the League's appreciation for your participation in this series. It's been a long, hot, difficult, and sometimes troublesome road. But, we do believe that it's been a constructive step in bringing about serious discussion of the issues and we can't tell you how much we appreciate your participation in this kind of discussion.

Thank you again, gentlemen, the League and the various co-sponsors...

Now, will you give the candidates a warm round of applause?
(applause)

MR. POWELL: And that concludes the third and last of the League of Women Voters' debates between Democrat Martin Schreiber and Republican Lee Dreyfus. The crowd here at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point has been by far the largest of all the debates; it's at least twice as large as that for any other debate, the ones before the primary or the previous two after the primary election.

And, there will be only one more appearance of the candidates -- that will be tomorrow. It's a news conference with all six of the candidates for governor along with the Wisconsin Newspaper Association. So, thank you for watching the debate this evening and good evening.

APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPT OF
DREYFUS/SCHREIBER DEBATE #4 --
WISCONSIN LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
"GOVERNOR'S FORUM '78,"
OCTOBER 24, 1978 AT UNIVERSITY
OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, MADISON, WI

Welcome to the University of Wisconsin - Madison. I'm Peggy Schuker of the Wisconsin Union Directorate. The Directorate, the United Council of the University of Wisconsin Student Governments, and the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin are sponsoring this second debate between the major candidates for governor of Wisconsin.

May I present Eleanor Fitch, President of the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin.

PRESIDENT OF WOMEN VOTERS: Good evening. Before the debate begins let me quickly outline the main ground rules. The candidates will engage in two rounds of debate, each round on a specific proposition. In each round, the candidates will present an opening statement, and then alternating, will present two rebuttal statements.

At the close of the two rounds of debate the moderator will pose several questions to the candidates which have been submitted by the audience. The questions will be selected by a panel on the criteria that they are relevant to the debate topics, represent the major interests of the audience, and are fair. At the end of the question period, each candidate will give a closing statement.

Candidates have been asked to keep their remarks germane to the debate proposition and to the issues implied in it. And they will also be requested to be fair during the rebuttal rounds and the closing statements. The moderator will enforce these rules.

The candidates' remarks will be timed, and they've been informed of the time limits. In the interest of fairness to both candidates and in the interest of staying on time and being able to hear, we have asked the audience in the auditorium to hold their applause until the end of our debate.

The moderator for tonight's debate is Mary Grady, Organization President of the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin.

MODERATOR: Our first speaker tonight is the Republican candidate for governor, Lee S. Dreyfus, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point, currently on leave. Speaking second will be Martin J. Schreiber, who is currently the Acting Governor of Wisconsin. He has served both as Lieutenant [Governor] and as a State Senator.

Both participants have kindly agreed to be referred to as "Mr." throughout the debate in the interest of time and simplicity. Before reading the first proposition, let me state that these propositions do not necessarily reflect the views of the League of Women Voters on the issues. They are presented as a basis for

discussion.

The topic for the first round of debate is tax reform. Specifically the proposition is: "Resolved: That Wisconsin's state-local tax structure is in need of major reform." I will repeat the proposition. "Resolved: That Wisconsin's state local tax structure is in need of major reform." By a flip of the coin, Mr. Dreyfus is to present his three-minute opening statement first.

DREYFUS: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to come back to the Memorial Union Theater. Last time I was here it was on "Snoopy and the Red Baron," so I feel some obvious opportunity to upgrade that, hopefully.

I think the issue of reform is clearly a key issue of what's involved in this entire campaign and obviously it's something that the Governor and I don't agree on. I assume you don't agree because you didn't reform in the 15 months you've been in office. In fact, you opposed a reform bill very similar to the one you've now put forth, and preferred your famous \$20 rebate approach as a way to turn money back to the people.

So of course, the first question that arises is why so much changing in position? Why are you flip-flopping? Why do we start out in the beginning of the year with a \$20 rebate? Why do we then go to the tax commission and say, "Well, we're really gonna' study this thoughtfully and I won't do anything until after the election?" And then just three weeks ago, out we come with a plan and it's the same one that you opposed earlier when you were pushing for rebate.

So the question is, then, why reform at all? Any tax system that steals \$500 million from the people beyond that which it was intended to take, needs reform. Any tax system that, frankly, overtaxes the middle-income people primarily, badly needs reform. Any tax system that is the third highest income tax system in the United States needs reform. And any tax system that is the highest in the United States for a \$10,000 a year family of four needs reform.

You think reforming that system only helps the rich? Well \$14,000 is the top bracket. Is \$14,000 rich, Mr. Schreiber?

Now last time you called me "Professor." Alright, let me give you a true or false quiz. (laughter)

One: You proposed the \$20 rebate. True or false? True.

Two: I proposed a major income and property tax reform this summer. True or false? True.

Thirdly: Wisconsin's surplus is the largest in the United States. False - it's only the third largest in the United States. (laughter)

Number four: You opposed a bill for property tax relief in February similar to that which you put forth now. True.

Number five: You had 15 months to do something but you did nothing. True.

Number six: Your current plan doesn't provide relief, if passed, until 1980. True.

And, to date, you've proposed nothing to stop another big surplus. True.

Frankly you just flunked that exam. (laughter) So let me give you a couple of homework questions. What will you do now with this thoughtful study? Will you just dump it when it comes in? Or the last big question for 10 points: Why couldn't you sign tax reform, but you could reform the governor's salary and sign that from somewhere around \$45,000 to \$65,000 a year? That's the new Robin Hood: Take from everybody and keep it.

MODERATOR: Thank you. Mr. Schreiber - May I remind the audience, please? Mr. Schreiber, your opening statement.

SCHREIBER: There is no question but that everyone wants to ease the burden of taxation. The question is how. Who will and who can deliver fair and considerate tax reform? It is not a question of who promises the most the quickest. I have already chartered a course for tax reform in Wisconsin. Tax reform was my first priority since July of last year when I first became Governor.

We have already enacted a 10% property tax cut. We have already enacted a \$20 million income tax cut for elderly citizens and for low income. And on January 3, the rest of my proposal will be in the Legislature and I'm confident with the support that they assured, that it will be a reality.

My tax proposals encompass across-the-board reforms for property, income and inheritance taxes. But the foundation of my plan has been, and always will be, an unwavering belief that the most perverse, the most punishing tax we have, is the property tax because it does not recognize the ability to pay.

My priority is to reduce this tax and to more importantly, make it on the ability to pay. For example, under my proposal, the typical income, middle-income family, will receive a \$400 a year cut; renter, nearly \$300; farmer, \$575; an elderly couple, \$615. And in addition, my proposal's inflation-proofed the income tax for all tax payers so a person will not be thrust into a higher tax bracket because of inflation alone.

My program, in addition, virtually eliminates the inheritance tax for widows and widowers. It reduces the tax on small businesses. It eliminates the tax on personal residences for people over 62 years of age. And we included a \$100 energy offset on heating

utilities.

As I have previously stated, my opponent's proposals have a \$1.7 billion price tag. And it's based on an assumption that the economy will continue to grow at the 1977 rate. Also, on the belief that there will be a \$1.3 billion surplus by mid-1981.

As you can see, he has already over-promised by some \$400 million. But that's not the worst of it. "You can't predict the economy," he said in April in Stevens Point. And he apparently finally realized that last night in response to a question from Neil Shively of the Milwaukee Sentinel and Matt Pommer of the Capital Times today on whether, if elected, he would in January stop collecting withholding for 3 months. He said, "No, too much risk."

My tax reforms are for a generation and not for an election.

MODERATOR: We now commence the two-minute rebuttal speeches.
Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: Apparently when you talk about tax reform, you mean what you are going to do with the taxes after they come in and give it out, and that's spending. That's not tax reform, Mr. Schreiber. Tax reform means changing how you take it, and how much you take. That's the key issue at heart in this question, and that is what's being discussed here.

Now you say that you admit we need tax reform. Spending it back out after it's in will not reform the taxation process. So again I would say let us look at how we are going to change the process by which you take it in. Where will that change take place? And the key income, obviously, to the State, is through income tax, sales tax and corporate tax. Almost everything else is earmarked. That's what needs the reform in those areas.

And as far as I can see, the key reform required is in the income tax area where for eight years, inflation through hidden taxation has now moved us well beyond anything that we ought to be taking from people. Seventy-eight percent of all of the income that comes in now comes from people under \$25,000. And I tell you at today's inflation rates, those are the working people today.

I still repeat the question, though. In terms of where you were going to go initially, why have you waffled so from the \$20 rebate to the study, to now the plan? I still haven't heard the answer to that and I'm wondering what it is, or why you're not willing to give it to me. If you want to talk about spending, then I'll remind you spending has gone up 150% in the GPR area in the eight years of your administration and Mr. Lucey's administration.

Isn't it odd that you were able to raise all that spending and never went out to enact a tax? How strange. The answer, of course, is inflation. The cruelest of all to everyone else, has

moved every single 1.8 million taxpayers into a bracket he doesn't belong in. And that's why this thing needs reform. Stop stealing from the middle-income people.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your first rebuttal.

SCHREIBER: Needless to say, stealing as indicated by Mr. Dreyfus, is a gross over-statement. He is wrong. That surplus is there because we have a strong economy. That surplus is there because of efficiencies in our government. That surplus is there also because of inflation. But now that the surplus is there, what do we do about it? What is the most responsible manner of making sure that we return that surplus to the people in a manner that's fair and responsible?

There is no question we have that surplus. The question is how we give it back. Now someone at one point or another thought about giving it back to the people in the form of a 25% across-the-board income tax cut. And that, my friends, was the golden rule, the golden rule. You heard of the golden rule as proposed by Mr. Dreyfus. The golden rule is: "He who has the gold, makes the rule." Well he has a golden rule for taxation. And that golden rule is: "He who has the gold gets the gold." Every proposal that he has come forth with, particularly his 25% across-the-board tax cut, favors the rich.

Now I would ask a question. The question I have for you is: Where do you stand on your 25% across-the-board withholding tax cut? Where do you stand on that position that blazed headlines across the state of Wisconsin on September 17, just a few days after you won the primary election, just a few days after you changed your position? Where do you stand specifically on returning the amount of money to the people of the state of Wisconsin in a fair and equitable manner, not a quick fix mind you, not the kind of return that some would have comparable to going to Las Vegas for a weekend and blowing it, and coming home and have nothing on which to build, nothing of substance.

Everything that I, as Governor, have done in relating to this surplus is to ensure that we build for the future, that we reform our system.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your final rebuttal.

DREYFUS: Let me answer the first question, where do I stand on the moratorium that he's talking about to stop the taxation when the State didn't need it? And I thought that was a simple matter.

When you recover stolen property you always give it back to the people you stole it from. (laughter) That didn't seem too difficult to figure out. I think the real issue where I stand is that the moratorium is dead. And I want you to look down in your right hand, just below you, and you'll find the smoking gun. You are the one that killed it off. You had your chance. Now you

blew that chance. Let's set that aside. And we will in the next question get at how we are going to get at the issue of tax reform and what tax is.

But when you say the real question is how we give back the surplus, no, it's not. You really still don't understand where I'm coming from. I say the real question is don't take it in the first place. Then you don't have to have a plan to give it back.

Now if you think it's an example of the rich, let me give you one, and this is a very specific example based on Diller figures of 73.6, and you know all the business. I don't want to go through math with you 'cuz every time I do you say you don't understand it. (laughter)

There are \$8,000 in 1973. It takes \$10,080 in 1976, just three years later, just to stay even, to have the same amount of purchasing power. It's a 26% increase for that workman. But there was no real increase. But the taxes on that in that period went from \$248 to \$369. That's a 49% increase in taxes. Well you say that's only \$121; we need to do that in order to soak the rich, in order to get the guy at the top. There are only 2% of the people paying on over \$50,000. You're kicking the heck out of the other 98% in order to get at those two.

I tell you the issue on reform is to change the method by which we collect the taxes so as not to have a surplus. Eliminate the surplus before it's there. That's where I stand. It's fundamental. No State has a right to take money it doesn't need.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your final rebuttal.

SCHREBIER: In my final rebuttal, the debate is over, and I've won. Of all of the things that were in discussion between my opponent and I, it's our tax plan. On the one hand, my proposal to return money directly to property tax payers. On his proposal, a direct 25% across-the-board income tax cut, and he is now admitting that his plan is something he no longer supports.

Why don't you support that plan any more, Chancellor? Why don't you support a plan that gave you blazing headlines across the state of Wisconsin, the kind of plan that captured some people's imagination? I do not understand how you are willing to back down so quickly. I don't understand how you can, in all good conscience, stand before us here today, and say that now that proposal of yours is dead, you no longer are supporting it. I think you owe us an explanation. I think you owe everyone here an explanation as to why you choose to take the major structure, the cornerstone of your campaign, and all of a sudden, pull it apart.

Professor Dreyfus, your withdrawing of that plan does not leave you with much... does not leave you with much at all as it relates to presenting yourself to the voters of the state of Wisconsin in offering something as to how we are going to, in a responsible

manner, conduct this campaign. Now what you should all know when we talk about tax reform, and talk about this surplus and the error in probably why he chose to withdraw his plan, is because his plan was wrong.

It was absolutely, positively wrong because it assumed that all of that surplus came from the income tax, and it didn't. Less than half of that surplus came from the income tax, and 25% of that came from the sales tax, and the balance remaining came from the inheritance tax and from the corporate income tax. Now, if we talk about reforming a tax system, we're talking about getting, at those taxes that are inequitable. And that's what we're gonna do.

MODERATOR: That concludes the first round of this debate. Thank you, Mr. Dreyfus and Mr. Schreiber. We turn now to the subject of the impact of tax reform, and you are asked to speak to the following proposition: "Resolved: That major tax reform can be achieved without adverse impact on Wisconsin's citizens and services." I'll repeat the proposition. "Resolved: That major tax reform can be achieved without adverse impact on Wisconsin's citizens and services." In this round, Mr. Schreiber is to present the first three-minute opening statement.

SCHREIBER: My tax proposals have already accomplished significant savings for the poor, elderly, as well as middle-income families, homeowners and renters. And my proposals for January will add to those gains as well as providing major benefits for farmers and small businesses. The groups which have suffered most will be those who will benefit most, because it attacks the worst plan that there is, the property tax.

Farmers are only 5% of our population, and yet, they pay 12% of the property tax. Do you know that a family that earns between \$5-10,000 a year spends 6% of their income for property taxes, while a family that earns between \$50-100,000 pays only 1% of their income for property taxes?

Now, to illustrate the impact of what my opponent formerly proposed in his \$300 million across-the-board withholding waiver, the richest 20% under his plan would get 60% of the cuts. The main thrust of his proposal was the fact that it was an income tax moratorium. He ignored the need for the very groups that deserve the relief the most. He knows, and that's why he changed his plan that the 25% across-the-board income tax cut favors the rich whether it's a one-time shot or not, the 10% cut in income taxes that he also was wrong.

And let me quote how wrong Mr. Dreyfus was as he criticized Bob Kasten...how wrong he was because he said the plan that he proposed was absolutely dumb because the wealthy person gets the biggest cut and that's the image the Republicans had been fighting, that they're the party of the fat cats.

As further proof of his tax proposals being purely electionary bunk, and some that he has little belief in, I want to take the

time to quote five different and contradictory positions that he has publicly taken on the question of what to do with the surplus.

March 18, Oshkosh: "Increase aids to localities, build a vet school, pay off state debts." May 2, Superior: "Don't return the surplus, use it to finance tax reform next year." August 22, Racine: "Return the surplus in the form of property tax relief." September 17, Milwaukee Journal: "\$300 million, 25% across-the-board tax cut." Position number 5, October 23 and 24 in Madison, WI: Now, he believes it will be too risky to do if he's elected governor.

In contrast, my approach has always been the same, return the surplus in a fair and reason manner. I've already done so in property tax and income tax cuts, and the remainder will be returned to the people, further and fair tax relief in January.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your opening statement.

DREYFUS: Apparently both you and Mr. Kasten are still confused on the difference between reforming the taxes permanently and a one-shot cessation so as not to build the surplus. That's all that was involved there, no more, no less.

That stopping of taxation when the State didn't need the money was simply intended to stop the surplus from getting greater than it already was. In fact, as you push that now -- and you say you have withdrawn my plan -- no, I just told you my plan was killed, it was dead, by the only guy who can kill it, namely you, the Acting Governor. You had a chance to put it into action and that chance went buy.

Now, apparently you never did hear my plan, so let me give it to you. It's basically a three-part plan for the next two years, and it is based on the premise, one: don't build the surplus, and there's \$900 million that should not be collected. Eight hundred and twenty million in income tax reform by changing every bracket by the cost of living, and by raising the standard deduction from \$2,000 to \$3,200, because inflation has made that \$2,000 deduction no longer as valid as it was when it was first enacted.

Also, the removal of 4% of the sales tax on home heating. The whole proposition, then, is \$900 million that won't come in. I also intend as a second part of the plan, basic property tax relief so that we take \$180 million right straight off the local property tax. Put the vocational-technical educational system as post-secondary education at State support, and stop charging the local taxpayer. They cannot handle it. Local property taxes can be reduced locally without sending that money to Madison and back out through. That adds up to just over \$1 billion, but it's not being given away, it's not being spent. Mr. Schreiber, it's not coming in. That's the issue.

And the Wisconsin public expenditure survey, their figure now is \$1,350,000,000. So frankly, that's where I want to go for my figures. I don't trust the Department of Revenue. I don't trust the Department of Administration, and I no longer trust your office. Every time I turn around you give me another number, and I've had four different numbers on the size of the surplus.

If their figure is anywhere near accurate at \$1,350,000,000, then I am going to have that surplus reduced to \$270 million in the next biennium. That's all it will be. And as Governor, I will never again allow such over-taxation and surplus as you have. I say it was legal theft. I view it as stolen property; that's why it ought to be returned.

The third part of the plan covers transportation, the elderly, relief in terms of ability to sell their homes, maintaining state school aids at a peak level, and covering local taxes for the M&E losses.

That comes to \$238 million; there's still \$33 million unallocated from the public expenditure number. That's more reasonable, don't you think? Your plan covers \$400 million as I see, and that's the property tax. What are you gonna' do with the rest of it, you haven't told us?

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber will now present his first two-minute rebuttal speech.

SCHREIBER: Well, if my opponent thinks that that's stolen property, we had just better march over to the sheriff's office, talk to him about the fact that someone stole some property, and get him to take action.

That surplus is something that is a result of a strong economy. Our economy in Wisconsin is growing twice as fast as the rest of the nation. Where other states in the Mid-west are losing manufacturing jobs, Wisconsin is gaining. We have enacted significant cost-saving activities that have resulted also in the building up of that surplus. I know that there is only one issue he has against me in my campaign that he seeks to use. Only one, and that is the surplus, and he is going to have a devil of a time taking that surplus and making it into something that other states and other cities would like to have.

Now, lets take a look at your call for a special session -- a political gimmick, if I ever heard of one, a call for a special session in an election-charged atmosphere. A summerfest, he called it, for lobbyists, but really now an Octoberfest because he proposed it... his across-the-board tax cut. There was no distinction that you raised, Chancellor Dreyfus, at all. When you call that across-the-board tax plan absolutely dumb because the wealthy person gets the biggest cut and that's the image the Republicans have been fighting, that they're the party of the fat cats, there was absolutely no hesitation on your part, no criteria for re-evaluating your particular position on that

issue. We have just heard - that's it already, huh?

MODERATOR: The next rebuttal speech is by Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: Apparently you still don't understand that the plan has got nothing to do. That cut for this year has nothing to do with what we're talking about in this debate. I've just given you my proposal. I want to take the tax schedule, Mr. Schreiber, and adjust it for the inflation of cost of living for the last eight years.

Now the tax schedule, if you remember, goes from \$1,000 through \$14,000, every thousand. I want to change all of those to make them the same as they were in 1970. I want to change it by approximately 75% inflation for the state; in fact, in Milwaukee that tends to be more. That's no longer \$14,000, that is now \$24,500 or \$25,000. That's the point. These salaries have been going up and they really have not gone up in earning power, and that's why you cannot continue to talk about any across-the-board. I'm talking about adjusting our income tax to reflect where this terrible inflation that's occurred, and that's the reason for the surplus.

Can you really believe the surplus is due to a strong economy? Don't you really think that it's due to the fact that 1.8 million taxpayers are all in brackets they don't belong in? There are people, in fact, at the bottom who are in brackets that still pay taxes who ought to have those brackets changed so that they are no longer involved. You cannot answer in that direction, it just simply isn't workable.

We must recognize inflation. If you don't believe it, start checking with the people who are paying the bills, with the people who now know that it's middle-income people from 14-24. All of that's been inflated, and it's meaningless. But it has changed them from the top bracket. And \$14,000 paying 11.4%, I tell you, is criminal. There is no reason to do that to human beings, and it's all hidden taxes and it's obviously producing a half-billion dollars a year more than the Legislature planned on spending. Under that basis it ought to stop.

MODERATOR: We now enter the second rebuttal round and we hope that each of you will address the impact on the citizens of your reform proposals. Mr. Schreiber, it's your turn to present your second rebuttal of this round.

SCHREIBER: I'm going to tell you the impact of the citizens on the proposals of the opposition. One point seven billion dollars, up to now, has been promised by him, and tonight he now readjusts it down to \$900 million. You have changed your position time and time and time again. The tax system that we have has been in effect for 22 years, and there is no question but that we must have meaningful tax reform.

How it will affect the citizens? My plan: direct property tax

relief. Taking that property tax and adjusting into that property tax the ability to pay. To ensure that we can give to our elderly, our middle-income families, our farmers, our renters, an opportunity to have help with the most regressive tax we have, the most unfair tax, the most perverse tax. That's the kind of impact that I want to have in my reform of the tax system.

But in addition to that, I do not lose sight of the fact that we must inflation-proof our tax system. My proposals for inflation-proofing the tax system take the deductions and tie them to the cost of living index. My proposals for inflation-proofing the tax system take the brackets and attach them to to the cost of living index. His proposal wants us to go back to 1970. I think we should go forward. I think we should take this point of time and look at how we can develop the kind of tax system in our state that's going to be meaningful for the next generation.

Nineteen-seventy was the year that no other state in the nation took more money from it's people than did the state of Wisconsin -- the last year of Republican administration.

As far as I'm concerned, tax reform, direct property tax cuts based on ability to pay. Inflation-proofing our income tax system, taking care of our inheritance taxes so widows and widowers don't have to sell the family farm -- that's my proposal.

MODERATOR: The last speech of this round is by Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: Surely. I'm glad you're for inflation-proofing, finally, and that we will go forward without more inflation. We'll go back to 1970 because in 1970 there was only a \$21 million surplus. That's the difference, and if the Legislature and the Governor want to tax the people more, accept the responsibility for doing that.

Now I was asked to give you the impact on the groups, and the three, as I remember you listed them, were the elderly, the poor and the farmers. In the elderly, for those in the lower income group, there are some there who are paying taxes who shouldn't be paying taxes at all. And when this is adjusted for cost of living, they will all be dropped out of the tax paying situation.

There are also elderly who do pay taxes, of course, and all of them are in the wrong bracket. They are on fixed incomes. The theft from them, though smaller in numbers, is in a sense a greater theft. For those who have to pay their heat bills, 4% sales tax on that heat bill -- and that's a heavy burden on the elderly -- clearly a factor that's going to change how much money they have in their pocket.

Property tax relief by taking \$180 million of vocational-technical education off -- clearly going to be benefit to the elderly. The reimbursement for M&E exemption will allow those cities to balance out that budget, reduce that local property tax

benefit to the elderly, and the one-time sale of their home near the end of their lives when they don't have to get socked by this terrible income tax in this state, when it's all called profit, and you know it's not and I know it's not. All of those things will benefit the elderly.

All of those I repeat, too, for the poor, who are in almost the same category, except now that standard deduction from \$2,000 to \$3,200. What a benefit to the poor. And for the farmer, he shares in those benefits plus one other I proposed; get rid of that land preservation act and begin to access farm land as farm land, and not as potential for developing apartments or whatever. That's what's killing the farmer. It's reassessment on potential, not on tax base.

MODERATOR: We will now go to the questions from the audience. And the first question is: Do you support strong cost controls and levy limits in conjunction with State-generated property tax relief?" I will repeat the question, which Mr. Schreiber will have 1 1/2 minutes to answer. "Do you support strong cost controls and levy limits in conjunction with State generated property tax relief?"

SCHREIBER: In response to the question, we already have levy limits and cost controls. I support that.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus, your reply.

DREYFUS: Yes, on levy limits, and if you had a referendum I believe it would go 10 to 1. But on State-involved property tax relief, that's really the golden rule. You applied it in the wrong way, Mr. Schreiber.

Your talking about reducing property tax by running the money through Madison first and getting back about twenty cents on the dollar. I noticed that's the way it's going this last time around. That's when you add Madison and its controls, and rather than reducing property tax directly at the local level, we send it to Madison first and send it back. And that's where the golden rule applies of "He who has the gold, makes the rules." And we see a reduction in town government, county government and in city government, and its very real and those people understand it.

So yes, I stay with levy limits, but no, I think we ought to reduce local property taxes at the local level and stop continuing to do it through the State, or ultimately we get to a point where all property tax will come through the State and in that instance, I tell you, the State will be the only meaningful government in this state.

MODERATOR: The second question asks: "What do you propose to do to ensure that renters also receive property tax relief?" I will repeat the question, which Mr. Dreyfus will answer first. "What do you propose to do to ensure that renters also receive property tax relief?"

DREYFUS: The current proposal now is to do it through income tax reduction, and that one has been passed, and it is my understanding that renters will receive relief unless I have been misinformed. And that that \$110 or \$105 million program, the 10% that has been passed through, it contained that. It seems to me an effective way to involve renter relief. It seems to me to be the only way in which you can directly relate rent to property taxes without taking over on rent controls. And if rents do not begin to come into line, we may have to look at rent controls rather than renter relief.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber, your reply.

SCHREIBER: The renters are a critical element in my plan. In the \$110 million property tax cut, renters are a part. In my property tax cut plan, where I told you we wanted to establish ability to pay as a criteria for paying property taxes, renters are very much an important part of that program.

The typical renter in Wisconsin will receive up to a \$300 credit on their taxes under my proposal. It is based on the fact that when a renter pays rent, we will be recognizing under law, that renter has approximately 25% of his or her rent going for property tax, and we are going to help that renter make that payment. There is nothing in any of the proposals that he has talked about, whether or not it's the \$1.7 billion worth of promises that I have been listening to over the past number of months, or whether or not it's the \$900 million program he talked about just tonight. If you're a renter, you are completely out of luck when it comes to my opponent's proposal. You are just not considered.

MODERATOR: Our third question is: "Do you support full State assumption of the cost of education?" I will repeat the question, which goes to Mr. Schreiber. "Do you support full State assumption of the cost of education?"

SCHREIBER: Answer to the question is "no," I do not. And I am assuming we are talking about kindergarten through twelfth grade. Is that correct?

MODERATOR: I believe that was the intent of the question.

SCHREIBER: With that assumption, I do not agree with the full assumption of the cost of education. I believe very strongly in the matter of local control. Currently, we are assisting our school boards and our school districts with approximately 40% of the cost of education. Within a short period of time, we will be assisting to the extent of 45% of the entire cost of the education for our youngsters. I'm very concerned about getting any closer to that 50% area because of the temptation by the Legislature to begin to inject itself in wanting to make decisions for our local school districts.

My opponent has at least two positions on that... both issued on the same day. (laughter) One, when he debated Robert Kasten in which he criticized Robert Kasten for any increase in school aids. And the other position in a position paper he sent out that arrived in the homes of many farm families where Mr. Dreyfus indicated he supported support for education up to 50%.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: Well somehow I don't know what you're reading but you're not reading it accurately. Let me tell you where I am on the question. I, too, in this case, I would say Mr. Schreiber and I are absolutely in agreement. I do not believe in full State assumption of the cost of education, though it is clear under the Constitution, Article 10, that the State has the preemptive right in education over the local situation.

But we have developed this tradition of local involvement, and I think too that if part of it is tied to that local property tax base, it's based on a philosophy that's worked well in this country since about 1850 -- that those who live on the land, have an obligation to educate those who, or those who own the land, have an obligation to live those who live on the land. It's a unique system in the world, and it has proved, I think, very effective as I've traveled the world, and looked at other systems of education. At least I think it has sprung loose more capability than any other society I've seen.

What I'm talking about is the difference between dollars and percentage. We are going to see a decline in the enrollments of this state, and we are going to see a decline in somewhere in the magnitude of 35-37% in enrollment over the next 12 years. Now, with that formula, there will be a decline in State dollars that will follow that. I have made a proposal that we will retain the peak amount of dollars into any system that wants it -- even though the numbers decline in the system -- if in return, they will maintain a constant teacher-pupil ratio, meaning administrators, teachers, special programs have to be maintained, and so forth.

But in that way, the percentage may in some communities, probably rise as high as 60%. The point is the actual dollars will not go beyond the peak. We've been dealing in percentages too long.

MODERATOR: The fourth question is: "What is your feeling on providing tax incentives for young, small acreage farmers?" I will repeat the question, which goes to Mr. Dreyfus. "What is your feeling on providing tax incentives for young, small acreage farmers?"

DREYFUS: I think it may be the only way along with low income loans, or low interest loans, that we are going to be able to get new people into the farming situation. Farming and agriculture is a new area for me. No question about it. My only relationship has been I've been a great eater all my life, obviously. Beyond that, I just don't get into the agricultural

situation. And in the process of looking around, I find out what's happened to the incredible cost of land. I find these are million dollar businesses in family farms. So when those who want to start out on a small acreage, even that small acreage gets to be a pretty hefty involvement.

So I think that we're going to have to help on the basis of first, providing loans at an interest that can get them into it, and also tax incentives as they get into the capital investment of \$28,000 tractors and trucks and so on. It's the only way we're going to get new young people into the farming business. Otherwise, only those born into it who can inherit are the only ones who are going to get a chance to be farmers in the state of Wisconsin.

MODERATOR: Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: There is no question but that we should be helping our farmers get a start. We must help because the challenge of meeting not only fixed costs but the high costs of capitalization. One of the reasons that I propose the break in inheritance taxes, is to ensure that we do as much as possible to keep that family farm from having to be sold in order to pay the inheritance taxes. One of the reasons, also, that I am so critically interested in making sure that we have a property tax reform program in Wisconsin whereby we establish again as a principle, that our property taxes should be based on the ability to pay.

A young farmer must meet those property taxes whether or not he has a successful year. Everything that we can do we should be doing to help out those farmers meet their property tax burden the same as middle-income people and our elderly citizens. Tax incentives for young, small acreage farmers, absolutely. But we also have to help them keep the land, and we can help them keep the land by reforming our property tax structure, making it on the ability to pay.

MODERATOR: Thank you. We have time for a fifth question: "Tuition costs are rising every year. What, if anything, do you intend to do about providing tax breaks to the students and parents paying these high costs?" Mr. Schreiber.

SCHREIBER: At the present time, a student, Wisconsin resident, pays about 25% of the cost of his or her education. The state of Wisconsin pays about 75% of that cost. My objective as Governor, is to help as many young people as possible receive a college education. Because of that, because of that, we are working directly on developing the kinds of programs that will help our young people get through school. For every single percentage point between 25%, for example, down to 24%, that enrollment tuition is reduced, it cost \$4.3 million to the people of the state of Wisconsin.

If, for example, a decision is made to change the cost of student

contribution from 25% down to 20%, we are talking roughly \$20 million. I believe very strongly in developing the kind of program that is going to most directly help our young people.

I do not believe that the sole solution to that problem, as of this moment, is a direct reduction of student tuition. I believe that we can use in a creative, innovative manner, some of that \$20 million to, for example, establish a student work program to ensure that the state of Wisconsin would help meet part of the costs of that student's pay, thereby allowing that individual student to not only gain the opportunity of work experience but also additional financial support.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: When I was in New Berlin with Mr. Schreiber, I said then I would consider a reduction from 25% to 20%, at which point he characterized that as a \$21 1/2 million giveaway. But you see, I've been closer to what's happening to the cost of students. When I was a student here it was \$48 a semester. That \$48 was easier to come by despite the differences in inflation than what is happening now. This is becoming incredibly expensive; I think we are going to have to look seriously at altering our formula downward, and I think the other thing we've got to do is to change our limits on work study money.

We've got limits on until we've got people, particularly those who come from families in the middle-income, who are simply not eligible for help. We ought to be able to move that up to let those people become eligible to be able to put in time, to be able to work to earn the money to help pay an ever-increasing tuition, because education now at probably the cheapest level, at probably the cheapest level, is somewhere between \$12-15,000 for a degree in a public university and that wouldn't be at this one. And that is getting to be a burden on the young, that they have to go into life starting with that kind of a background, and I think it is no way to start the next generation off. I did not have to start off that way, I've no intention of letting this generation start off that way. I feel strongly about that difference.

MODERATOR: Thank you, gentlemen. That concludes our question round. We will now proceed to the four-minute closing statements. Mr. Schreiber will speak first. (there is an inaudible disturbance in the audience)

SCHREIBER: I don't consider this election to be a contest as to who can promise the most. But, who through his ability to work with the Legislature, and sense the feelings of the people, who can deliver the most. It's wrong to promise more than what you know you can deliver. And the choice is clear. And this debate on taxes has clearly demonstrated the difference between the economic and political philosophy of two candidates.

Professor Dreyfus has offered promises that change with the seasons... promises for tax cuts that are unaffordable, and fail

to deal with current tax inequities. I have a record of performance. I've set a course for tax reductions and comprehensive reform of our entire tax system, and I have been consistent. The taxpayers who will be first in line for tax reductions under my plan are middle-income families, where Mr. Dreyfus offers, or at least until this very moment, has offered across-the-board cuts that favor the rich.

Now remember Mr. Dreyfus' golden rule: "He who has the gold, makes the rules." Well, the golden rule also that he has incorporated with his program is the golden rule of taxation: "He who has the gold, gets the gold."

Now the surplus is a result of a strong Wisconsin economy... increased employment and reductions in State spending. There are many cities and states, who face budget deficits, who would love to have our problem. It's not a problem, it's a unique opportunity to cut taxes and to reform our entire tax system in the state of Wisconsin.

Steps have already been taken to return the surplus in the form of a 10% property tax cut, including renters. A \$20 million income tax cut for elderly, senior citizens. And I pledge to complete the job in January of the coming legislative session, and to do it in a fair and prudent and comprehensive manner that is consistent with Wisconsin's progressive tradition. I don't have to explain five different positions on tax reform and return of the surplus. Nor do I have to explain a change of mind on the withholding moratorium.

Chancellor Dreyfus likes to talk about the old politics, but let me tell you that there is nothing older in politics than promises that expire on election day. My proposal benefits the people who need it the most -- farmers, elderly, renters, middle-income -- through a property tax reform, while at the same time including income tax reductions and inheritance tax eliminations for widows and widowers.

Let me emphasize again, these are the benefits that will be received by the typical farmer, \$575; the elderly couple, \$615 per year; the average renter, \$300 per year; the middle-income family, \$400 per year in direct property tax cuts. We haven't forgot the need to remedy the inequities in the income tax. Do not accept simple band-aid solutions to complex problems. These are decisions that will affect you, your children, and generations to come.

MODERATOR: Mr. Dreyfus.

DREYFUS: In looking at the issue of band-aid solutions to complex problems, I guess one has to say, how did those complex problems arise? How did we arrive at that point in 1978? Why is it so complex? Why are we now taxing at a point that we now have a half-billion dollars a year coming in, and we never legislated for that? We never asked the people, and its been fundamental in this

country and in this state that if you want to take money from the people, you ask the people through their elected representatives. And yet we've had eight years now in which they've been able to increase the taxation continuously through a hidden tax. And they use inflation itself as the means to avoid going to the people and letting the people decide how much they wish to be taxed.

The over-taxation, quite frankly, is essentially hitting that middle-income group. You see the fat cats are at the top, and the only part that's going to be affected under my proposal is that portion of theirs below the \$24,500 mark. Every dime over is in the top bracket. It belongs in the top bracket, and they ought to get socked with the 11.4. I have no fight with that. None whatsoever.

But I do say that in order to make sure we also sock them from \$14,000 up to the \$24,500, we tag everybody else in that income bracket? It's a very unfair thing to do to the middle-income people, and say, 78% of the dollars are coming in from people under \$25,000.

Then it's the hidden tax of inflation that is critical here. It is a hardship on the lower-income people, and it is a hardship on the middle-income people, and those are the people who provide the basic economy that makes this society run. It doesn't help the rich. It really will help those in the middle- and lower-income primarily who need that help, and I tell you they need it now.

The surplus is legal theft. That's why we don't go get the sheriff. Secondly, I believe it has purposely been allowed to be able to increase spending without asking the people. This non-reform for eight years and the last 15 months of this man's administration have been with intent -- intent to allow that surplus to come in, to allow the spending to continue to increase, without asking the people. That's why there has been no reform.

And note the unanswered question then as to why no reform plan. Or why are you going to continue the surplus? And it will continue, and it is still projected. And why we are going to continue over-taxing, and why we keep spending. None of those questions are answered. Everything is how we will return it after we bring it in.

I tell you, Mr. Schreiber, you're not really kidding anybody. People know something's wrong in these last years. They know there's a lot more spending going on. They know there's a lot more taxes being taken, and they know that they can never find that anyone's to blame. You didn't enact the tax increase. Mr. Lucey kept saying no tax increase. Every legislature says we haven't enacted any tax increases, but they're coming out at an incredibly higher rate -- 150% increase in GPR spending in the last eight years without asking for a tax increase.

Well someone is, frankly, to blame, and I say you are; and the people will have a chance to send that message to you November 7, that you've had a chance for 15 months to do something, and you didn't do a thing about it, and now you give us the proposal. Another thing I'm sure you're going to notice in all of this plan talk of his, he's never said a word about less spending. So be sure to vote November 7, because I tell you there's no one we have to blame other than ourselves. We are the cause by not paying attention.

MODERATOR: Thank you, Governor Schreiber and Chancellor Dreyfus, for debating your varying views on taxation this evening. We look forward to hearing you debate other topics on November 2.

The final debate between the two candidates will take place at Stevens Point, on the campus, on November 2, starting at 7:45 p.m. If you wish to attend, tickets will be available at that campus, and from the League of Women Voters of Stevens Point.

The League of Women Voters of Wisconsin, along with the United Council of University of Wisconsin Student Governments -- that's hard to say -- and the Wisconsin Union Directorate, has presented these debates tonight in order that you may make an informed choice in the upcoming election. We certainly hope that you've been able to serve that purpose.

The election is November 7; we urge you all to vote, and I thank most of the audience for its courtesy and cooperation tonight. And let's give the candidates a round of applause...

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Sources

- Bormann, Ernest G. Communication Theory. New York, NY: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1980.
- Bormann, Ernest G. Theory And Research In The Communicative Arts. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- Brock, Bernard L. "Political Speaking: A Burkeian Approach." In Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, edited by William H. Rueckert. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Bryant, Donald Cross. Rhetorical Dimensions In Criticism. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Press, 1973.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969.
- Burke, Kenneth. Attitudes Toward History. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1951.
- Burke, Kenneth. Counter-Statement. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968.
- Burke, Kenneth. Language As Symbolic Action. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1966.
- Burke, Kenneth. Philosophy of Literary Form. 3d ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973.
- "Debate Expert Resolves That Debate Format Is Faulty," Milwaukee Sentinel, 3 November 1978, p. 14.
- "Dreyfus Boosters Found That Affection, Respect Got Votes," William M. Kraus, Milwaukee Journal, 20 September 1982, p. 6.

- "Dreyfus Optimistic As Campaign Closes," Milwaukee Sentinel, 16 November 1978, p. 5.
- "Dreyfus Reflects On Campaign Disparities," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 28 October 1978, p. 6.
- "Dreyfus Running Maverick Campaign," Milwaukee Journal, 22 October 1978, p. 12.
- "Dreyfus, Schreiber Ignore Interruptions During Debate," Stevens Points Daily Journal, 25 October 1978, p. 17.
- "Dreyfus Style Buys Hopes Of Republican Fund Raisers," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 26 September 1978, p. 9.
- Duncan, Hugh D. "A Review of A Rhetoric of Motives." In Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, edited by William H. Rueckert. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Duncan, Hugh D. Communication And Social Order. New York, NY: The Bedminster Press, 1962.
- Duncan, Hugh D. "Communication in Society." In Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, edited by William H. Rueckert. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Duncan, Hugh D. Symbols In Society. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- "Governor Choice Is Lee Dreyfus," Milwaukee Sentinel, 25 October 1978, p. 10.
- Griffin, Leland M. "A Dramatistic Theory Of the Rhetoric of Movements." In Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, edited by William H. Rueckert. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Griffin, Leland M. "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements." Quarterly Journal of Speech 35 (1952): 185.
- Hockett, Homer Casey. The Critical Method In Historical Research And Writing. New York, NY: MacMillan, 1955.
- Holland, Virginia L. "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech 39 (1955): 354.
- "How Lee Dreyfus Really Won Wisconsin," The Capital Times (Madison, WI), 11 February 1980, p. 15.

- Kirk, John. "Kenneth Burke and Identification." In Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, edited by William H. Rueckert. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Kraus, William M. Let The People Decide. Aurora, IL: Caroline House Publishers, Inc., 1982.
- "LaFollette Calls Dreyfus Media Novelty," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 14 October 1978, p. 2.
- "Letter To The Editor," Scott-Schultz - Stevens Point, WI, Milwaukee Journal, 26 October 1978, p. 18.
- "Money Not There For Dreyfus' Plan - Schreiber," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 25 September 1978, p. 1.
- "On, Wisconsin," Wall Street Journal, 4 December 1980, p. 22.
- Rueckert, William Howe, ed. Critical Responses To Kenneth Burke. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- "Schreiber Assesses His Defeat," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 10 November 1978, p. 2.
- "Schreiber Blames Loss On Surplus Issue," Stevens Point Daily Journal, 10 November 1978, p. 2.
- Scott, Robert L., and Brock, Bernard L. Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Shayon, Robert L. Open to Criticism. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1971.
- Smith, William Raymond. The Rhetoric of American Politics. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1969.
- "The Gubernatorial Battle," Fort Atkinson-Jefferson County Union, 29 September 1978, p. 8.
- "Two Candidates Battle To Tie On Tax Issue," Milwaukee Journal, 25 October 1978, part 2, p. 1.
- Winks, Robin W. The Historian As Detective. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1969.

Unpublished Sources

- Ambrester, Marcus LaRoy Jr. "Identification: The Rhetorical Motive." Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, Ohio University, 1972.

Davidson, William C. "Sam Houston And The Indians: A Rhetorical Study Of The Man And The Myth." Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, University of Kansas, 1971.

Dreyfus, Lee Sherman. Lee Sherman Dreyfus, Inc., Stevens Point, WI. Interview, 23 January 1984.

Dreyfus, Lee Sherman. "Persuasion Techniques In Modern Congressional Debate." Doctoral Dissertation, Library School, University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI, 1957.

Giggleman, Linda Jean Cadenhead. "Kenneth Burke's Concept Of Identification As Applied To Selected Speeches Of Edmund Sixtus Muskie." Master's Thesis, Library School, North Texas State University, 1974.

Williams, Robert W. Idea Associates, Stevens Point, WI. Interview, 23 January 1984.

Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks,
"Governor's Forum '78," 19 October 1978,
"Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 1 -
Milwaukee, WI," John Powell, narrator.

Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks,
"Governor's Forum '78," 23 October 1978,
"Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 2 -
Madison, WI," John Powell, narrator.

Wisconsin Educational Radio and Television Networks,
"Governor's Forum '78," 2 November 1978,
"Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate Number 3 -
Stevens Point, WI," John Powell, narrator.

WMTV, Madison, WI, "Governor's Forum '78," 24 October 1978,
"Dreyfus/Schreiber Gubernatorial Debate - Madison, WI,"
Mary Grady, narrator.