When H. R. Haldeman and John D. Ehrlichman resigned last April 30, Mr. Nixon was confronted with a crisis that went deeper than personalities. With Haldeman and Ehrlichman as symbols, his entire concept and conduct of the presidency seemed to many persons to have been discredited.

The arrogance, the political amorality, the ruthlessness, the obsessive secrecy, the dirty tricks and espionage, the "enemies list" of critics and dissenters who were to be punished—it was argued that this concept of the presidency had brought Mr. Nixon to the edge of disaster.

In the months since April 30, a new presidential staff has been assembled.

Only a few of the faces are really new to the White House; there are many holdovers from the old team. What is new, it is being said, is the atmosphere, the style, the way of doing business.

The White House—that euphemism for the President and his staff—is describing itself these days as a different kind of place. It is the new, open, friendly, accessible White House.

**THE PRESIDENT,** according to his staff, is trying hard to improve his relations with Congress. He is holding more press conferences. He is seeing more people, seeking more advice, encouraging discussion and dissent, and decentralizing power by curbing the authority of his staff and unleashing his Cabinet.

In these and other ways, Mr. Nixon and his new team hope to rebuild confi-

# City Fathers Are Incensed Over Rand's Findings

By GERALD MEYER
Of the Post-Dispatch Staff

ST. LOUIS'S POLITICAL and business leaders have sent up a loud and angry chorus of protest in response to a Rand Corp. study predicting that the city probably will soon lose its position as the commercial nub of the metropolitan area.

"It's made me so mad, it's made so many people so damn mad, that it's probably been a beneficial thing," said Ethan A. Shepley Jr., president of Downtown St. Louis Inc.

"A negative report at a time like this is something we need like a hole in the head, but maybe it will give us the impetus we need to keep things moving ahead in the city."

Alderman Richard A. Gephardt, a Democrat representing the Fourteenth Ward, dismissed the report as largely "a gentle grubbing through outdated statistical data."

**HARRY T. MORELY,** executive vice president of the St. Louis Regional Commerce and Growth Association, said that the Rand findings "did an injustice to the city."

The report, made public last week by the California-based Rand Corp.'s Urban Policy Analysis Program, blamed the Federal Government for much of the economic decline that has beset St. Louis in the years since World War II. Highway construction, home mortgage programs and property tax incentives all helped drive city residents and businesses into suburban areas, according to the report.

The effect of such policies is not likely to be reversed, the report stated. It suggested, in effect, that the city accept a diminished role as "one suburb among many in metropolitan St. Louis" and seek federal and state revenue-sharing programs and area-wide earnings taxes as ways of supporting a shrinking and underprivileged population.

These suggestions came as stinging blows to many persons who in the last few years have been heralding the arrival of a period of new growth for downtown specifically and the city generally. Such persons have reacted by leveling three kinds of counterattacks at the Rand organization.

**THE FIRST** local criticism of the study charges that its findings are based on statistics reflecting the economic decline of the city in the years between 1960 and 1970 and pay inadequate attention to the last three years.

In this vein, Mayor John H. Poelker said that the Rand researchers "didn't take into consideration recent renewed optimism on the part of local and out-of-town investors." The Mayor and other city officials pointed out that new construction scheduled to cost about $400,000,000 is now planned for the downtown area. The Rand study paid scant attention to this new investment, they say.

Second, the city's defenders accuse the Rand Corp. of failing to fulfill what was supposed to be a major purpose of their study: the proposing of new Government policies that might help to reverse the decline of older central cities.

The study, which also included more optimistic analyses of Seattle, Wash., and San Jose, Calif., was financed with a grant of about $2,000,000 from the National Science Foundation.

Several prominent St. Louians have accused the Rand researchers of making hand-wringing laments about St. Louis's difficulties instead of seeking answers.

**"THEY DIDN'T** follow through with specific policy recommendations," said Norman Murdoch, St. Louis's director of planning and development. "Considering the amount of money they got, the failure to do so is absolutely ridiculous."

The third basic criticism has been a

TURN TO PAGE 3, COL. 5

## *Aldermanic Retort...*

*"Be it resolved that the Board of Aldermen records its deep appreciation to the Rand Corp. and its benefactors for choosing to spend their time and treasure in studying the city of St. Louis and fashioning its obituary. The Board of Aldermen recognizes the study . . . as an interesting exercise in the historiography of the time period 1950 through 1969."*

*In drawing up this resolution, written primarily by Alderman John G. Roach, Twenty-eighth Ward, the board stressed its rejection of "this particular manifestation of the crabgrass philosophy even as it is buttressed by the jargon of social science and the blinking lights of computer technology."*

*The resolution, adopted Friday, dismissed the Rand report as "remarkably deficient," adding: "It is based on the demonstrably false assumption that the future of all large American cities, and particularly St. Louis, lies in the suburbanization of our former hub cities and that an older core city must measure its success by its ability to thrust itself through the Xerox machine of a suburban America increasingly rejected by the younger generation and the most sophisticated of our citizens."*

Oct 21, 1973

# ond

rather than pay the
Vashington University,
rchitectural school in
ig Eight states at pub-

iversity of Missouri al-
in that direction, says
. Brice Ratchford. The
eements with the Uni-
as, Kansas State and

LS waive out-of-state
uri students studying
neering, architecture,
echnology, nuclear en-
ity and regional plan-
and actuarial sciences.
University of Missouri
m those states courses
itry, wildlife manage-
ngineering.
that similar co-opera-
sharing of specialized

ration among schools
existed for more than
dition, New England
been practicing such
eral years, and South-
tates are in the forma-
kind of pact Bond has
ig Eight.

E BOLDEST exper-
try occurred this year
Wisconsin. Those
ped out-of-state tuition
e other state, making
ional offerings of one
o students of the other.
irector of the Big Ten
that those institutions
save money and in-
by eliminating the du-
sity presses and pub-
s, and by some joint

he benefits have been
hile, he said. For ex-
have combined sum-
geology, and African
ges. These programs
xpensive when offered
Now they rotate yearly
ampus at a considera-

N, a traveling scholar
150 Ph.D. students to
her institutions without
tuition if the courses
at the resident institu-

mphasized the limited
procal arrangements.
San and academic, can
cle to any large-scale

is an impossibility at
level and for most
s. But it has limited
n Ph.D. students and
s."

Ethan A. Shepley Jr.
*"It made me so mad . . ."*

# City Fathers Irate Over Rand Report

■ FROM PAGE ONE

contention that its authors reflected, in their recommendations, a bias in favor of low-density suburban development. Democratic Alderman John G. Roach of the West End's Twenty-Eighth Ward accused the Rand staff of displaying "crabgrass mentality" at a time when many younger persons are leaving suburban communities and moving into the central city.

"The study also displays a kind of economic Calvinism," Roach charged. "We're being condemned to damnation by some ineluctable force. I think that's kind of silly."

Within the framework of these three basic kinds of rebuttal, the city's defenders rejected many of the Rand conclusions. One such conclusion was that the traditional inner city, as the center of a metropolitan area's major business activity, is "technologically obsolete."

**"THAT'S BALONEY,"** said Edward A. Ruesing, executive director of Downtown St. Louis Inc.

"St. Louis has a strong central business district and will continue to have a strong central business district. That's not to say that downtown will dominate the whole area the way it did 50 years ago, but simply that it will always be an important part of the community."

Ruesing challenged also the report's emphasis on the fact that much housing within the city limits is old and therefore likely to be abandoned.

"If old housing is so decisive," he asked, "why are people staying in Boston?"

"Or Munich?" Roach chimed in. "Or London?"

**"ROACH WAS AMONG** several St. Louisans who criticized the Rand staff for talking more with academics than with local leaders and developers in researching the St. Louis situation, suggesting that some professors share the Rand Corp.'s alleged bias toward suburbanization.

But Norton Long, director of the Center of Community and Metropolitan Studies at the University of Missouri at St. Louis, also was critical of the Rand findings.

"The report is astounding," Long said. "They apparently want to use massive federal spending to turn the city into a kind of vast Indian reservation."

"Apparently they don't have any concept of the city's economy. They ought to get nailed for the irresponsibility of this piece of work. This report seems a pretty sad commentary on Rand's ability to do effective research."

Attacks on the report came from highly varied perspectives. Alderman Roach said the Rand researchers followed the lead of President Richard M. Nixon's Administration in studying problems without doing anything to correct them.

**CONVERSELY,** the Commerce and Growth Association's Morley, who was an assistant secretary in the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development until early this year, accused the Rand Corp. of ignoring the Administration's efforts to find new solutions to city problems.

"The only innovation proposed by the study is that the city should get more money through revenue sharing," Morley said. "I frankly don't find that very innovative.

A note of anger ran through virtually all local responses to the study.

"It's a blow well below the belt," said Shepley of Downtown St. Louis Inc. "I've never seen a time when more encouraging things were happening in the city of St. Louis. When things are beginning to move, something like this report gets under my skin to the point where I want to go to Washington and burn the thing."

# Nixon's New Team Courting Respectability

■ FROM PAGE ONE

al in office than with restoring confidence.

There is a general impression that power is more widely shared and more diffuse in the new White House operation. Since May, when Mr. Nixon abolished the so-called "super-Cabinet" arrangement, the power of individual Cabinet members in their own bailiwicks appears to have grown.

No longer must they report to the President through three super Cabinet members — Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Casper W. Weinberger and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development James T. Lynn.

In this changed environment, controversy and public disagreements have been allowed to take place to a greater extent than in the Haldeman era, although the Nixon Administration still cannot be described as a collection of talkative individualists.

**NEVERTHELESS,** Butz and Director John T. Dunlop of the Cost of Living Council have argued publicly over controls on agricultural exports. Lynn and Weinberger have differed over cash subsidies to the poor for housing. And administrator Russell E. Train of the Environmental Protection Agency has clashed with White House energy adviser John A. Love over relaxing air pollution control standards in the face of the fuel shortage.

Laird and Secretary Shultz engaged in a well-publicized spat over tax policy. When Laird raised the possibility of increasing taxes to curb inflation and lowering them to avert recessions, Shultz fired back that the presidential assistant should "keep his cotton-picking hands off economic policy."

Discussing the change in the role of the White House staff, Haig says the idea now is that the staff serves as "a communicating link between the President and the Cabinet, not as the imprimaturs of policy."

Ash puts it this way: "There are a greater number of people directly serving the President. There are more people than before with direct access to him. More papers are interacting with each other."

**UNDER ASH,** the Office of Management and Budget has compiled a list of almost 300 proposed governmental programs and goals that will form the substance of Mr. Nixon's remaining three years in office. With Ash's office doing the prodding and co-ordinating, the programs were put together by the 11 Cabinet departments and 10 other federal agencies.

The budget office's role as a sort of central desk compiling the material with which Mr. Nixon hopes to rebuild his presidency gives Ash great potential power, especially in domestic policy. However, there are differing opinions among the White House staff whether he or Laird is emerging as the domestic czar, succeeding Ehrlichman.

**MONDAY: How the new Nixon team operates.**