

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	12	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Connally Reservation" tab. March 23, 1962. 2 pages.
64	12	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "The United Nations" tab. The United Nations from a nationally syndicated column by Richard Nixon, March 22, 1962. 3 pages.
64	12	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Nixon-Brown Major Issues" tab. Addresses specific questions; based on an article in the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, April 1, 1962. 11 pages.
64	12	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Sample Speech" tab. Nixon's qualifications to be Governor of California. 3 pages.
64	12	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Endorsements" tab. From the Independent Press Telegram, Newsweek, and the Book of the Month Club News. 4 pages.

CONNALLY RESERVATION

CONNALLY RESERVATION
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 23, 1962

Domestic matters must remain within the jurisdiction of our own courts. The Connally Reservation was originally adopted for the purpose of assuring that this would be the case. The Eisenhower Administration in 1960 called for a modification of the Reservation because its language was obscure and confusing. The primary purpose of the proposal was to establish a clear definition of what was domestic and what was foreign.

In no way did I support then nor do I support now any proposal which infringes upon or diminishes the sovereignty of the United States. The United States retained the right to get out of the World Court on six months' notice and the right to veto any action of the Court by reason of our veto in the United Nations, the enforcing body of the World Court.

In any case, the overriding consideration is United States security and United States control over its own sovereignty. Because of the increasingly intransigent attitude of the Soviet Union, there is, in my opinion, no possibility that a modification of the Connally amendment will be approved until that attitude changes.

THE UNITED NATIONS

THE UNITED NATIONS
FROM A NATIONALLY SYNDICATED COLUMN BY
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 22, 1962

The administration proposal to buy \$100 million worth of United Nations bonds is a carelessly designed financial scheme. But the key question is whether the United Nations is worth saving at all. I believe the great majority of Americans, regardless of party, share the hope that the United Nations can eventually become an effective instrument of peace.

However, before Congress approves the purchase of any U.N. bonds, there should be these added safeguards to protect the American people:

First, it should be made absolutely clear that the bond issue will not set a precedent for future U.N. financing.

Second, the true financial need of the United Nations should be carefully determined so that no U.S. money goes for imaginary bills.

Third, above a reasonable level the United States should buy bonds only as other nations also support the bond issue.

Fourth, and most important, the President should take steps to eliminate the real cause of the U.N.'s fiscal chaos -- the unpaid bills of 82 out of 104 U.N. members.

The United Nations is financially sick today because many countries refuse to pay their share for operations that they oppose, such as in the Congo and the Middle East. This is like a child saying that if you won't play my game I'll take my marbles and go home. The American people, who have paid nearly half the total cost of the United Nations since its inception, deserve an end to this kind of kid stuff.

The President should demand that the United Nations make all assessments mandatory and force the delinquent nations to pay up or get out.

Far from being an anti-U.N. position, this would actually strengthen the United Nations by forcing it to operate on a sound financial basis. Obviously no company could stay in business for long if its buyers refused to honor its bills.

If the United Nations is to become an effective instrument for peace, the administration must recognize that the United Nations is a battleground in the fight between freedom and Communist slavery. Its members are not all men of good will, and lofty words spoken in a lofty forum will not make them men of good will.

Today there are still Americans, unfortunately some in high government positions, who do not admit that this has happened and who

treat the United Nations exactly as if there was no Communist threat. Clearly the first duty of an American policy on the United Nations must be to correct this fatal misconception. Until our government brings a new realism to our actions in the United Nations, we will continue to be played for a sucker by the Communists.

The primary instrument for Soviet obstruction in the United Nations is the veto. When an action doesn't fit into their design for a Communist world, they use the veto - or else they simply ignore the United Nations as they did when the General Assembly asked them not to explode a 50-megaton bomb.

Instead of standing up to the Soviets, we have allowed ourselves to be consistently tricked into allowing them to control the United Nations. We got mousetrapped on the Congo vote because we refused to veto a Soviet-backed resolution. It is cold comfort to keep our veto power in the deep freeze when peace is being threatened by our failure to use it. We have a duty to promote peace by every legal means available to us - including the veto.

By failing to block the Communists by veto, we have forced added responsibility onto the U.N. General Assembly, where all nations, regardless of geography, population or economic development, have the same voice. When the General Assembly votes against our interests, can we blame it for actions that we could have prevented?

The General Assembly has grown to 104 member-nations, many of whom are no bigger than our smallest state. These newly independent nations have very special problems, which often appear to them to be more important than the battle between freedom and communism. Without belittling their problems, we must convince them that the fight to preserve freedom is also their concern.

Let us understand once and for all, there is a difference between freedom and slavery, a difference as old as civilization. We proudly stand for freedom. The Communists brazenly stand for slavery. This is the great moral issue of this century. Men and nations cannot stay on the side lines where this issue is concerned. They must choose. There can be no moral neutralism.

I believe that every American supports the principle of the United Nations charter - the settlement of international disputes by peaceful and just means.

The United Nations is not a Utopia, but it is worth saving. It can be a valuable channel of diplomatic communications, an excellent forum for world opinion, a potential vehicle for resolving conflict, and a performer of many good works in such areas as world health, agriculture, economic development and technical assistance.

NIXON-BROWN MAJOR ISSUES

BASED ON AN ARTICLE IN
THE LOS ANGELES TIMES
SUNDAY, APRIL 1, 1962

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN?

Brown: Until the other candidates for governor speak up with some constructive criticism of this administration's record, I can't really say. The main issue, for my part, is preparing for the 6 million more people that we'll have here during the next 10 years and taking care of the present population.

That means that in the field of education, we must move ahead to build the classrooms needed, to pay the teachers' salaries, to equip the libraries and do everything necessary to keep California first in education.

In the field of water development, which is the economic lifeblood of the state, we must move ahead with the program started by my administration in 1959.

We must see that the economic climate of California continues to encourage business and industry to locate here.

We must speak up strong in the enforcement of our penal laws to protect the lives and property of our citizens.

We must adequately take care of those entitled to social welfare benefits from the state to make sure that the chiselers who would make any good program bad are eliminated.

We must fight for equal rights for all our people irrespective of race, creed or color.

Nixon: I would like to identify the campaign. I consider this a November (general election) campaign rather than a June (primary election) campaign. In that light, some of the issues are:

The issue of the competence and quality of those who are in administrative positions in state government, starting in the governor's office and moving through all the appointive positions other than civil service. I happen to believe that as far as this area is concerned, the present administration is extremely vulnerable, that while it has some people obviously of competence, a great number of second-rate hacks have been put in positions that are far above their capabilities.

Second, government spending and the related issue of taxes, nobody should or can suggest-- if he's going to be responsible-- that taxes can be cut, for example, next year. But the tax burden must be kept no higher than its present level and our objective must be eventually to reduce it.

Then there are such issues as law enforcement and crime prevention, agricultural policies, modification of our educational programs, how to deal with subversive influences and welfare law changes.

HOW DO YOU PLAN TO DEVELOP THESE ISSUES?

Brown: I plan to move ahead with experts in every field as I have in the past, I intend to speak of what we've done and to clearly and precisely tell what we'll do in the future.

Nixon: In each of those areas I have task forces at work. I will develop the issues in two stages: one in which we point out the deficiencies in the present state programs, and one in which we set forth positive programs to deal with them.

WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL AREAS IN WHICH THE BROWN ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED AND/OR SUCCEEDED?

Brown: Answering the question of failure first. I don't think we failed in any particular. We haven't been as successful as I would liked to have been in one area--the field of metropolitan problems. We had a commission that made a study and made certain recommendations but we've been unable to bring any legal regional development together.

I think we've been particularly successful in schools. Under my administration, we've initiated three new universities, one medical school. We've been able to attract outstanding educators. Our state college system has become independent under my administration. We've given aid to junior colleges and we've emphasized the quality of education in the elementary schools.

Nixon: The failures are these: One of the failures has been the level of competence of the state government. One of the reasons for this is the tendency on the part of the present administration to look upon political appointments as pure patronage. I intend to appoint Republicans where I feel they are best qualified. Where the best man or woman happens to be a Democrat, there will be Democrats in the Nixon administration.

I think the Brown administration has been deficient in the field of law enforcement and particularly in the climate of law enforcement.

I think that the Brown administration has been deficient in its attitude toward California agriculture in failing to give it the priority and attention and the consideration it deserves.

WILL YOU USE OUT-OF-STATE SPEAKERS IN YOUR CAMPAIGN?

Brown: I have no present plans of inviting anyone in at all, but I certainly have no objection to people who are experts in their field, such as the Secretary of Welfare, Secretary of Agriculture or the President himself.

I've never discussed it with him (the President) but I certainly hope he comes into this campaign.

Nixon: None.

The only person who may be used--only because he has now become a part-time California resident--is Eisenhower. But I haven't asked him yet, and I don't know. But nobody else.

WHAT IS YOUR VIEW OF THE CALIFORNIA ELECTORATE--RIGHT-WING, LEFT-WING, MODERATES?

Brown: I think the California electorate generally is moderate. I think it's proven itself in almost every election since the beginning of the century.

I do think that there has been a rapid rise in right-wing extremists, probably more in Southern California than in Northern California. I think they're sincere people but I think they're very misguided. I think they're doing the cause of democracy and the fight against Communism more harm than good.

Nixon: The California electorate is a replica of the whole country. There is perhaps a 10% group on the far right and a 10% group on the far left. By the far right and the far left, I mean that the far right is extreme and sometimes reactionary in its views. The far left is extremely liberal and sometimes left wing in its views and its approach to its problems.

The great bulk of the California voters is in neither of these categories. They may be conservatives and they may be liberals but they are people who are repelled by both extremes.

HOW WILL YOU DEAL WITH EXTREMISTS IN THE CAMPAIGN, INCLUDING THE ISSUE OF THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY?

Brown: I'll have nothing to do with the extreme right wing and I certainly will have nothing to do with the extreme left wing. I think they're both equally dangerous but I think in California

Nixon: As far as extremists are concerned, I will deal with them as I always have, by stating my own positions and attempting to lead my party in the direction

at the present time, internally in this state, that the right wing is far more dangerous than the left wing.

I would defend neither extreme. We have two flanks to protect in our struggle to preserve our democratic freedoms. It would be the sheerest folly to concentrate on the right at the risk of exposing our left to an infinitely more skillful enemy.

I think the John Birch Society is in charge of men like Mr. (Robert) Welch who have accused former President Eisenhower of being a conscious agent of the communist conspiracy. I think that any such organization is un-American and slanderous and does more harm than good in the fight against communism.

which I think is responsible and best for the state.

I don't think the Republican Party should hold itself before the people as an instrument of reaction. I think the Republican Party must hold itself before the people as an instrument of progress--progress built on sound, conservative principles.

There is no place in the Republican Party for the John Birch Society or members of the John Birch Society who, by the very act of becoming members, have agreed to accept the dictatorship of Robert Welch who has declared that Dwight Eisenhower is a conscious agent of the Communist Party.

HOW DO YOU PLAN TO HOLD THE LINE ON TAXES AND WHERE SPECIFICALLY, CAN ECONOMY BE ACHIEVED?

Brown: We can do it only by keeping a good business climate in California. The economic life of our state is good. We must continue to keep it good because that will produce the money necessary to meet our growth requirements in California.

We must continually economize in every field of activity so that we don't have to continue to spend money on capital structures that cost tremendous sums of money.

Nixon: In the general area of state spending, we have some ideas.

First of all, you can economize in those areas which are immediately around the governor's office. I have never believed in the principle that the way to economize was to put in super-cabinet officers.

Second, I believe that directives can be issued by a governor not for the purpose of discharging existing employees but for the purpose of indicating that there should be limitations on the hiring of new employees to do specific jobs. I have yet to see a government agency that was not over-staffed.

The third area that I would deal with is in the area of welfare. I believe in welfare. I think California has done a better job than many states in taking care of our older citizens than others in need.

On the other hand, one of the things that endangers the welfare program in this field and endangers the people who are receiving welfare is the chiselers and the lack of procedures that have been adopted by the state. I believe we can make some substantial economy here.

WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMIC CLIMATE PARTICULARLY IN REGARD TO INDUSTRIAL GROWTH, JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND THE RELATION OF BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT?

Brown: I would quote from the issue of The Times for Feb. 22 which read: "Good news about the local economy continues to flow from the Security First National Bank which keeps close tab on Southern California business.

"The Bank's business index reached a new high in January, the fifth record in five months. It now stands at 238.4 which is 11.1 above January, 1961."

Maybe the opposition can argue with those figures, I certainly cannot and I would also add to the fact that every appointment that I've made in the regulatory agencies, such as insurance, corporation, savings and loan and real estate, I've tried to bring people in who are familiar with the problems of the businessman so that we won't have any bureaucratic directors who feel that they can kick business around in California.

Nixon: At the present time, the situation has not yet become critical. This is the time to take the steps to make sure it does not become critical.

In my travels about the country, I have found that increasing numbers of potential investors are becoming cautious about investing in California because of their beliefs that our state government does not have enough concern for government economy, or about keeping the tax burden down in California as far as new investment in businesses is concerned.

It is necessary, therefore, to get in Sacramento a new, aggressive attitude with regard to going after the new investments we need and doing the things at home that will attract it.

In our welfare program, for instance, there is an attitude in other parts of the country that California is a hand-out state rather than an opportunity state.

REGARDING THE CALIFORNIA WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, HOW WOULD YOU IMPLEMENT THE \$1.75 BILLION BOND ISSUE? AND LOOKING BEYOND THE FEATHER RIVER PROJECT, HOW, AS GOVERNOR, WOULD YOU ACT TO INSURE A LONG-RANGE WATER SUPPLY FOR CALIFORNIA?

Brown: Well, we have in California sufficient water to take care of 40 million people, but the water is in places of little habitation and we have to bring it to where the people are.

As we move ahead with the first phase of this--the Feather River plan--we are also studying the Eel, the Mad, the Russian and the Klamath rivers for future development.

We've set aside the money from the tidelands oil lands in this water resource fund and as we put this money into the Feather River project or the California water plan, we will set aside bonds to bring in the second phase of water development in our state.

And we'll be able to do that because the program is self-supporting. We've already entered into contracts with water agencies throughout the state. We anticipate entering into several more before the deadline on Jan. 1, 1963.

Nixon: I will only say now that we have taken a good start in the right direction with the Feather River Project. Now we come to the implementation in which I have some constructive criticisms to make and the program for the future in which I have some novel suggestions.

WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON THE METHOD OF JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS?

Brown: The present system of a governor referring names to the State Bar for confidential reporting and communication with a local bar association

Nixon: I think judicial appointments first should be made on the basis of the qualifications of the potential appointee, I think

is about as good a way as you will find to select your judges.

I don't think the present method is perfect but I haven't seen any other that would be any better, I think the present system has produced a great judiciary in California.

I oppose the program of the State Bar where they would present a panel of names from which the governor must choose. I think a governor is just as able, if not better able, to make these selections than even the State Bar.

the recommendations of the Bar Association should be given great weight. There should also be a thorough check on the part of the governor's staff itself supplementing the Bar Association because lawyers are not, I find, the best judges in this instance. They are good judges on technical grounds and technical qualifications but they sometimes miss other factors that can have a great bearing on the judge's appointment.

The other point that I feel very strongly about is that judicial appointments, above all others, should be made on the basis of legal qualifications rather than on the basis of party. If I have two people that are equally qualified, I obviously would hope to appoint a Republican. But there will be Democrats as well as Republicans appointed.

WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT IN CALIFORNIA AND HOW CAN IT BE IMPROVED?

Brown: I think law enforcement today in California is the best in the U.S. We have the finest chiefs of police, we have excellent sheriffs, most of them with FBI training.

We've set up minimum standards and academies that smaller cities can send their police officers to attend, and I think they've met this great migration of people in a competent, efficient and honest manner.

I think the greatest step forward would be in the county jails. This is the breeding place for future criminals. We have to do a better job at the county jail level.

Nixon: In some areas of law enforcement in its component parts-- city, county and state levels-- California has set a high standard.

As far as the state is concerned, it is the responsibility of the governor and the attorney general to set the tone for law enforcement. I think that as far as that tone is concerned, it has been one of weakness, it has been one that has been discouraging to the law enforcement agencies at the city and county levels.

REGARDING A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT, WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON IT AND ON THE GENERAL FIELD OF CIVIL RIGHTS?

Brown: I think we've made steps forward in the field of civil rights and I think things are far better than they were four years ago.

I think FEPC has been a success, but I do believe that we must move further in the field of housing. There still are ghettos in the state of California inclined to one particular racial group and I think the state will have to take some affirmative steps to eliminate the discrimination in housing in our state.

I think the new housing commission that we've set up will move in that direction by making low-cost housing available to those who are displaced by urban redevelopment.

Nixon: The FEPC program needs, above all, effective leadership. I am for the FEPC law. I will see it is effectively administered but I want to supplement it with a program of leadership from the governor's office which will go beyond simply saying no one should discriminate. We want to have employers positively attacking this program before the law moves in.

Our aim is not simply on a negative basis--not to discriminate--but on a positive basis to open up opportunities for employment for minority groups and for promotion, too.

It would be my view that as governor I could mobilize on a volunteer basis the major employers of this state in an effective program to move in this area before a complaint is filed under FEPC.

WILL YOU STATE UNEQUIVOCALLY THAT, IF ELECTED, YOU WILL SERVE FOUR FULL YEARS AS GOVERNOR, REGARDLESS OF WHAT OCCURS AT THE NATIONAL PARTY LEVEL?

Brown: I'll make the same statement that I made four years ago--that I will serve four full years, God willing.

Nixon: That's the easiest answer and the shortest. I will.

WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF YOUR OWN PUBLIC IMAGE AND THAT OF YOUR OPPONENTS?

Brown: I can only tell you that I'm like a lawyer who has a good case and I'm perfectly willing to go to the jury

Nixon: I would doubt that any candidate could give an accurate impression of his own image

with it. I know that I've taken unpopular steps to make power influences in the state very unhappy but I'm proud of the fact that there has not been a single scandal attached to my administration or any of my appointees.

I consider myself a moderate. I think that Mr. Shell and Mr. Nixon are both conservatives. I can't tell you any single solitary thing that Mr. Nixon has ever identified himself with that gives me anything to give him a real image of what he's really for.

and he would probably be even less qualified to give an accurate impression of the image of his opponent. He is only giving his own prejudices.

So, consequently, I am going to avoid making a comment on that question because it would be self-serving in my own case and perhaps not accurate as far as either of my opponents are concerned.

WILL YOU DEBATE YOUR OPPONENT IN THE FINAL CAMPAIGN IF NOMINATED AND, IF SO, WHAT FORM SHOULD THE DEBATE TAKE?

Brown: My actions as far as debating the winner of the Republican primary will depend upon, to some extent, whether the Republican candidates debate among themselves. If they do not, I will consider that after the primary.

As to the form of the debate, I think we'll have to leave that until we sit down and see what issues have developed. These are things I haven't given any thought to because they're so far away. I want to see who wins the middleweight division, anyway.

Nixon: Yes.

The form, of course, is something that the candidates can't control completely. From my experience, I would say that the best form would be to take specific issues, rather than covering the whole range of issues, and debate those. I think each debate should last at least an hour. I don't think you can really get into the subject in less than an hour and the debates, to be effective, must be a face-to-face contest, rather than one that is simply an interrogatory with the press or a television commentator.

DO YOU BELIEVE THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S ROLE IN STATE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE ENLARGED AND, IF SO, HOW?

Brown: I think it could well be enlarged by bringing him into social contact with

Nixon: I not only think his role should be enlarged but I believe his

the executive branch. I've tried to do this by making him a member of this informal cabinet that I've set up. The present Lieutenant Governor, Glen Anderson, has devoted tremendous time to the Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the state colleges and the State Lands Commission, three of the most important agencies in the state. He will be a very important person in state government.

status should be substantially changed. I think he should be what I would call a chief administrative officer of the governor. He would be a trouble-shooter, a liaison man with the Legislature and with the state agencies. I don't think he should simply be a standby presiding over the Senate waiting for the governor to leave the state or waiting for the governor to get a fatal illness.

SAMPLE SPEECH

SAMPLE SPEECH

The Democrat King Makers are saying that Dick Nixon's primary interest in life is foreign affairs; that he is not interested in state issues; that all his experience is in foreign affairs, and therefore he is not qualified to be Governor of California.

This may have a certain appeal -- on an over-simplified basis. But stop to think a bit. Can't a Vice President of one company move on to another? Can't he do this whether he moves from a large company to a smaller one; or from a smaller one to a larger one? Of course, he can. It happens every day in America.

Would you believe that just because a man spent eight or fourteen years of his life mining gold, he could not change and mine silver? Can't a farmer change his crop?

The criterion is not the precise experience, but general experience and background and, most important, ability. That's the reason why Lockheed might hire an engineer away from Hughes Aircraft! Why? Because Lockheed believes that that particular man has the background, experience and ability for his job, because he has shown he can handle his job well--so he is hired by Lockheed to turn his attention from the problems of his old company to the problems of his new company--even if the specific problems are different. That is why I tell you Dick Nixon can give leadership, decisiveness and imagination to the job that needs to be done in Sacramento.

Some people have been advising him: "Forget that you were Vice-President; now you are only another candidate for Governor of California."

Why should he forget that he was Vice President of the United States? Why should he forget that he was a Congressman and a Senator representing his native state? I am proud of his record of public service. I am proud of the way he represented California and the people of California in the nation's capital. And, I would hope that the people of California will not forget his work and service and the demonstration of qualities of leadership.

I would like to add also that I am proud that he was a candidate for President of the United States. Our opponents would like to forget that; they would like the people to forget that. Now, the people might have a short memory--or so that political theory goes--but not that short.

As you all know, in the 1960 election, Dick Nixon carried California by a very slim margin. But, I know, it is still a source of pride to him that he carried his home state. After all, the entire election of 1960 was so close that President Kennedy carried the election by the

slim margin that Dick Nixon carried California. And, I am sure John F. Kennedy is proud of his victory.

As Dick Nixon has said a number of times, one of the primary reasons he decided to make this race was on the advice of some of his friends in California that he would make the strongest Republican candidate and that he would make the best Governor of California among the various candidates seeking the office--both Republicans and Democrats.

His job in this campaign is to convince the majority of the people of California the truth of what his friends and supporters tell him. I know this is a subjective opinion. But I am convinced it is right. I am convinced the people of California will see this, too. That is what this campaign is going to be about.

One of the most heartening things, as I look over the current political scene, is the probability of his being elected. On points, he is ahead of his Democratic opponent.

I think measuring the background, ability and imagination of two men would prove this to you. I think one need not stretch his imagination too much to see that John F. Kennedy is head and shoulders above Edmund Pat Brown in background, ability and imagination.

So, if Dick Nixon carried this state against John F. Kennedy, I think he can carry it by a substantial margin against Edmund Pat Brown.

For one thing, Brown has a record here in California and that in itself should win Dick Nixon two or three million votes from people who normally would vote Democratic. By the end of this campaign, we hope to widen that margin.

ENDORSEMENTS

FROM THE INDEPENDENT PRESS TELEGRAM
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
SUNDAY, APRIL 8, 1962

L.A.C. SAYS: NIXON'S ERROR

Democratic opponents--Republican opponent Joe Shell and Alger Hiss--are all pleased over an error in Nixon's book, "Six Crises." The error was the statement that the FBI had the typewriter which convicted Hiss. Actually, the testimony by the FBI in the 1948 trial was that it had been established that letters written by Mrs. Hiss were typed on the same typewriter as were some of the secret State Department documents which had been turned over to a Communist agent by Hiss.

* * *

The error in Nixon's book had nothing to do with the testimony that convicted Hiss. It was an error to say the typewriter was in the hands of the FBI when the evidence was based on comparisons of letters and documents typed on the same typewriter. The correction is being made in the next edition of the book. But we doubt this error in detail justifies the clamour it has caused. Attorney General Robert Kennedy has the past week stated a review of all the evidence fails to support Hiss in his claim of innocence.

If this is the only serious error his opponents can find in the 460-page book, it is quite a record for accuracy. It covers 14 years of the widest public experiences of any man in public life today. It is natural many people disagree with many of Nixon's actions. The Hiss case is one that does great credit to Nixon. But it also brought him implacable enemies who will never forget the part he took in that case.

* * *

The attacks on Nixon have been severe throughout his political career. But a man who has taken so vital a part in government must expect such attacks. The remarkable fact is that with all the evidence that has been brought to bear on his career he received only a fraction of a per cent less votes than did his opponent in 1960--and carried his own state, which has a 60 per cent Democratic registration.

So many of the attacks have been made without evidence damaging to Nixon--it is probable the large majority of the people have tired of reading them. Every experienced politician knows there is a point where extremism starts working to the benefit of the person attacked. There is good reason to believe Nixon has reached that point. His opponents will need much more conclusive evidence of his weakness or unfitness for office if they are to accomplish their purposes of eliminating him as a public figure. The attacks on the Hiss case have brought about some strange bedfellows.

NEWSWEEK
19 MARCH 62

EVERYTHING'S GO

POLITICAL NOTES

Capitol Hill - Republican campaign strategists have passed this to all GOP candidates: In a recent private poll they took themselves, the seven astronauts found that all of them had voted for the same man in the 1960 Presidential election -- Richard Nixon.

SIX CRISES
FROM BOOK OF THE MONTH CLUB NEWS
APRIL 1962

"SIX CRISES by Richard M. Nixon: Richard Nixon is not everyone's 'boy'. But he has had the support of millions, and this book will rightly win him the admiration of many who have not been his admirers before and are not his boosters now. He comes through its pages as a man of quick intelligence, unflagging persistence and tremendous guts."

SIX CRISES
FROM NEWSWEEK
MARCH 26, 1962
REVIEW OF SIX CRISES

"All in all, SIX CRISES is an enlightening account of the stormy life of a sincere man undergoing the stresses and strains of cold-war and red-hot politics. It is the story of a man who fought hard - if not always successfully - for what he believed."