

Our man hoppe

# Government censors on wrong bleeping track

by ARTHUR HOPPE

Mr. Nicholas Johnson, our outspoken Federal Communications Commissioner, is furious. He got censored on television for attacking sexy commercials.

What initially angered him was one for a hair spray. Its message to the ladies, he said, was that the product "makes them look so sexy that they'll get (bleeped)."

It seems to me that Mr. Johnson is way out of line here. The question of whether a particular hair spray gets a lady bleeped is not up to the Federal Communications Commission, which controls television broadcasting.

It's up to the Federal Trade Commission, which controls truth in advertising.

THE FTC, of course, is the fighting agency which got the marbles out of Campbell's vegetable soup and is now trying to get Scott Carpenter out of the F-310 bag. It's done wonders for those who don't want marbles in their soup or a bag full of dirty exhaust fumes.

But what has the FTC done for the millions of Americans who yearn to get bleeped.

THAT MILLIONS of

Americans yearn to get bleeped is obvious to anyone who watches television commercials. A minimum 37.5 per cent are aimed at this vast market. But without FTC guidelines, the consumer remains in a high state of confusion.

"Will I," she mutters dazedly, "get bleeped more by smoking an L&M, which is just for the two of us, or will I find more love this fall with Lush Lip Lovesticks by Love

"Do Clairol blondes really have more fun. How much more fun? How often? Should I go from almost bare to almost anywhere with Coty? Or should I settle for a Super-Sheer Love Pat with Revlon?"

NOR IS IT any easier on the males. "If I shave with Noxzema, exactly how many beautiful women will demand that I take it off, take it all off? How often? I don't know karate. Maybe I better put a tiger in my tank."

It's obvious, then, that the lack of Federal standards in this field is driving millions of Americans up the wall. Establishing such standards, however, poses a problem.

AN ATTEMPT by an independent research laboratory in Hornbrook, N.J., failed

dismally. Three young ladies who yearned to be bleeped were placed in a room — one wearing Arpege, one wearing Intimate and one who had done her hair with Frost & Tip — "the only hairdressing that lets you do just what you want. Any way you want to do it." Three young men with similar desires were introduced to the scene.

"As to the comparative effectiveness of the products," said the report gloomily, "the results were inconclusive."

BUT WITH WIDER samplings, perhaps the FTC could set adequate standards ranging from "Mildly Aphrodisiac" to "Caution: This product may be hazardous to your chastity."

On the other hand, I know a buck-toothed, bandy-legged, bespectacled young lady of 214 pounds who is considering suing six perfume manufacturers, four cosmeticians and a girdle maker for fraud.

Let us hope her case is atypical. If the FTC after exhaustive testing is forced to sue half the nation's corporations for false and misleading advertising, it would dash the dreams of millions of yearning Americans.

It would also, of course, destroy the whole bleeping economy.



J'accuse!

## Nixon's Chotmer back in business

by FRANK MANKIEWICZ and TOM BRADEN

Whatever there is in the political past of Richard Nixon of which he may be ashamed can be traced directly to Murray Chotiner. Chotiner's troubles with a congressional committee being now largely forgotten, he has been restored to his old post as political engineer, with consequences which are now becoming clear.

It was Chotiner who engineered the early Nixon campaigns, in which first Jerry Voorhees and then Helen Gahagan Douglas were portrayed as sympathetic to communism. It is Chotiner today who is calling the shots in the nationwide attempt to portray incumbent Democrats as sympathetic to drugs, pornography, student violence and Hanoi.

THERE ARE SEVERAL Chotiner-directed campaigns now taking place in the country, but the most interesting is here in the 5th District of Long Island where a drive of unparalleled ferocity is being waged against incumbent Democratic Congressman Allard Lowenstein.

Lowenstein was the principal leader in

1968 of the campaign to dump President Johnson. Having been turned down by Robert Kennedy, he was finally successful in persuading Sen. Eugene McCarthy to enter the race with results which made history.

IT WAS LOWENSTEIN, too, who led the unsuccessful fight at the Chicago convention for a Vietnam plank somewhat less "soft on Hanoi" than that which President Nixon has now adopted as his own.

But Lowenstein's chief role on the national scene, as Theodore White pointed out in his "Making of the President," has been as advocate for the thesis that the young could effect change by working within the system.

OLDER DEMOCRATIC politicians viewed him as a youth leader and were therefore suspicious, but within the youth movement the left wing regarded him as an Establishment finnik, fighting against the youth revolutionaries and their desire for violence and confrontation. "The biggest threat to the movement" was what the president of the National Student Assn. called him in a recent statement which gave blanket endorsement to both

violence and Lenin.

Against this background, Lowenstein is now being portrayed in the Chotiner-directed computerized mail campaign of his opponent as an advocate of campus violence.

"PRO-VIOLENCE" is the major theme of the marvelously vintage Chotiner-engineered election. Youth is unpopular here, but so is the memory of Adam Clayton Powell, the one-time absentee congressman. Powell's name is now being evoked against Lowenstein in the same fashion that the Communist congressman, Vito Marcantonio, was once used to bludgeon Mrs. Douglas.

The comparison between Lowenstein and Powell is a little thin: Powell took trips abroad at government expense during congressional sessions; Lowenstein visited several countries at his own expense while Congress was not in session. But Chotiner was never one to let intricate fact get in the way of his famous prescription for politics: "Never defend; always attack."

FORCED BUSING is unpopular here as elsewhere, and the Chotiner-inspired mailings may be a foretaste of what

Democratic congressmen throughout the country who voted against the Whitten amendment may expect. The Whitten amendment is, of course, the annual attempt by the congressman from Mississippi to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Chotiner manages to make a vote against it appear as a vote in favor of forced busing. It is an argument which must be used, so to speak, "selectively," because the entire Republican leadership, including House Minority Leader Gerald Ford, also voted against it.

WHAT EMERGES HERE as one watches Lowenstein desperately fending off Chotinerisms is a campaign strategy for local races guided from a White House office and presumably, therefore, guided with presidential permission.

It is a fair guess that the President will not use Chotiner in his own re-election effort two years hence. A Chotiner campaign would never stand up to the bright glare of a presidential race.

But local politicians can be warned. There may be a new Nixon in the White House, but the same old Chotiner is down the hall.