

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>
50	25	09/28/1960	Report	Remarks by the Vice President at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Magazine Publishers Association, New York.

Haldeman 303
Herbert G. Klein
Press Secretary to the Vice President
Nixon-Lodge Campaign Headquarters
1146 19th Street, N.W., Wash. 6, D. C.

FOR RELEASE
IMMEDIATE

file

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N. Y.
SEPTEMBER 28, 1960.

Mr. Weeks: (Business Week Director, moderator of panel) Mr. Vice President, it's very gracious of you to be with us this morning. Every one of us saw your debate with Senator Kennedy on Monday night, and we know that you have not slowed down your pace since then, -- in West Virginia yesterday, flew into New York this morning for this breakfast, and before this breakfast, I am told, oatmeal at 7 o'clock.

But this is not a debate. We are here for information, and we will obey your rules. We want to stretch out and those editors who are around you will try to keep you awake.

I am going to open the proceedings, if I may, by asking a teaser. When I have a long haul ahead of me, I like to think of the fishing trip that I'm going to go on as soon as I get out in the clear. Would you tell us what form or kind of vacation or rest do you look forward to when the election is over? I don't seem to remember that you ever play golf.

Vice President Nixon: If you don't mind, Mr. Weeks, and members of the panel, I will stand to answer the questions.

I would say, as far as my relaxation is concerned, your comment that you don't remember that I ever play golf is probably the most objective comment about the quality of my golf that I've ever heard. If I have the opportunity to have a little relaxation, I would say that would be the latter part of November, possibly the opportunity to go to the seashore would be the one that I would take, first of all.

I'm not a good swimmer, but I like salt water. I like to walk up and down the sand and collect shells, do the things that people do when they go to the beach.

As far as golf is concerned, never having become good enough at it to enjoy it as I should, I think probably I have given it up for the duration. But I've said that before, so I don't make that as a promise. That's not a campaign promise, I assure you.

Mr. Weeks: We will open the heavy artillery with Mike Cowles. Mike, will you be heavy artillery for the first question?

MORE

Magazine Publishers Association
New York City

-2-

Mr. Cowles (Cowles Magazines, Inc., Chairman): Mr. Vice President, I hate to ask you tough questions this early in the day. Unfortunately, we know very little about what is happening in Red China. I think this audience would appreciate it if you would tell us what you feel is happening in Red China, what you feel the present relationships are between Red China and the Soviet Union, and under what circumstances would you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?

Vice President Nixon: Well, first, my observations with regard to what is happening in Red China would not be worth much more than those on this panel. I, of course, do have access to intelligence information but the information we have from Red China is limited and, of course, it is mixed.

Looking at that information and considering the other types of information that we get in addition to intelligence information, these are the conclusions that I would arrive at: Red China has a very dedicated, aggressive Communist leadership in the early stages of the development of Communism.

I think perhaps the best way to indicate the difference between the Communist leadership of Red China and the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union is in their attitude toward the use of war as a means of accomplishing the Communist objective of world domination.

Now there's no disagreement whatever between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung with regard to the fact that Communism must conquer the world and will. And they will use any means to accomplish that end.

Mr. Khrushchev, however, in recent years, particularly the last three or four years, has taken the line, as we all know, of saying that they do not have to resort to the use of force and that they will not resort to the use of force. In fact, he has even at times indicated that they can and will accomplish their objective through what he calls peaceful competition between the two systems, Communism and the system of freedom.

Mr. Mao Tse-tung, on the other hand, does not go along with this philosophy. He says that, in a nutshell, after the first World War we had the arrival on the international scene of the Communist government of the Soviet Union. After the second World War, he said the result was the extension of Communism to over

600 million people, a third of the earth's population. He goes further and says that after the third World War it may be that Communism will dominate the world.

Now, when we look at this almost diabolical reasoning, here is what he is saying. He is saying that China with its tremendous population does not fear a third World War, that they believe that a third World War might result in Communist domination of the world and, while of course they would suffer more, that the end result would be the extension of Communism and not the extension of freedom.

That brings us to the basic difference between Mr. Mao Tse-tung and Mr. Khrushchev at the present time. When I use these two names, incidentally, I am not, of course, trying to downgrade other Chinese Communist leaders, who may be more influential or as influential as Mao Tse-tung at the present time. But the basic difference is in their attitude toward what means Communism will use to dominate the world, and we find here again that Khrushchev is insisting on following the line of so-called peaceful competition.

He follows that line because, one, he knows the terrible power of the atomic weapons and he respects our power, despite what those who downgrade our power indicate he thinks of it.

In addition to that, Mr. Khrushchev honestly believes, I think, that he will accomplish more through peaceful means than he would through war in extending Communism.

As Chancellor Adenauer said to me when he was over here, Khrushchev does want to rule the world, but he doesn't want to rule the world of ruined cities and dead bodies. He wants to rule live people. But Mao Tse-tung looks at it differently. So, we find here a basic ideological conflict going on among Communist leaders who do not follow Mr. Khrushchev's thoughts on peaceful co-existence, peaceful at least as far as words are concerned but, nevertheless, compared to Mao Tse-tung's thoughts, extremely peaceful. This, therefore, has resulted in ideological conflict between the two.

Now, can we base our policy on the assumption that this conflict will result in a split? Here you have a very great disagreement in the international community. There are those who believe on our side that we can assume that

China and Communist Russia are inevitably going to break apart and that the line of U. S. policy and Free World policy should be to drive them apart.

Now to comment on that point: Any obvious attempts to drive them apart would be counter-productive as we can well see, because they are bound together by a strong ideological bond. That is, the Communist ideology, like any religion, binds them together and in some respects binds them together more than any religion has ever bound people together in the history of the world.

And so I say to base our policy on the assumption that they're going to break apart would be an error.

Now we come to the final point. What, then, should be our attitude toward recognizing Communist China and admitting it to the United Nations?

It has been my position -- it is now and it will continue to be in the future, until circumstances change -- that we would make a very great mistake to change our position on admission of Red China to the UN or recognizing it, and the two must and would go together, I believe.

The reason is, when we look at the UN, for example, that Red China simply does not qualify to belong to an organization which in its charter says membership in effect is open to peace-loving nations.

You can read every day in the papers a statement by Mao Tse-tung or "The People's Daily" in Communist China indicating that they are not a peace-loving nation. They are in an aggressive posture toward the United Nations in Korea today. They are engaging in aggression, both indirect and direct, all over Southeast Asia at the present time. To admit this country, which in addition to these things is, as far as the United States is concerned, holding prisoners, violating all the international laws. As far as we are concerned, to admit this country to the UN, to recognize it, to raise it to the level of a respectable member of the world community would have the effect, I think of violating, first, basic moral concepts, and, second, it would have the effect of spreading the Chinese Communist influence through the balance of Asia.

Now, what should our attitude be toward the future. Our attitude should not be rigid. We cannot and should not say we will never recognize the government that rules over this tremendous land mass in Asia and the government which also rules over 600 million people, but we must say, if we are to maintain moral

leadership in the world, if the United Nations is to mean anything, we must say that this government cannot be admitted to the UN, that we will not recognize it and elevate it to the position of respectability until it changes its policy of aggression toward the free nations and toward the peace-loving nations of the world.

Once it changes its policies of aggression, then we can consider recognizing it. Until it does that, I believe it would be a great mistake.

Mr. Weeks: Elliott?

Mr. Elliott V. Bell (McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.): Mr. Vice President, I would like to ask you what is your view of the proper role of government in seeking to maintain a stable economy. Specifically, in the event of a business recession and the threat of growing unemployment what actions should government take? How promptly should it move and what should be the nature of the things it does?

Vice President Nixon: May I say, incidentally, that I beg your pardon for answering the last question in such detail, but, as you can see, these editors think of questions that require speeches rather than answers.

I'm not criticizing the editors. I'm only trying to explain why my answers may be in more detail than you would expect.

The role of government toward the economy is one that, of course, is an important issue in this campaign.

Now, as far as the particular role of government, where a recession is threatened, I think my views have been pretty well known, and I will reiterate them at this point.

I think, first of all, that it is the responsibility of the President and his economic advisers constantly to watch the economic cycle and to anticipate as much in advance as possible the economic trends that would indicate that a down-turn, which could be detrimental to the economy, is approaching.

The quicker you act when such a down-turn is coming, the more effective that action will be. Once the down-turn goes too far and once a psychological reaction sets in, where you not only have a recession in fact, but a mood recession as well, when people are depressed, when consumers, for example are not buying, when, for example, your advertisers are not buying advertisements in your

magazines, you know then that things are getting to be in bad shape. Therefore, the action must be as quick as possible.

Now, what kind of action should it be? You have two schools of thought.

Well, you have a number of schools but there are two schools of thought with regard to what the government should do. There are those who suggest that what the government should do as a recession is coming along -- or I would prefer to call it a down-turn in the economic cycle, because we're going to continue to have them since you can't have an absolutely level ^{economy} and have a free economy, as we want it -- there are those who say that the proper thing to do and the primary thing for government to do is to move in with massive government spending programs.

I'm against that. I'm against it for this reason. Most of the massive government spending programs that are suggested to fight recession would take effect not in time to deal with the recession, itself, but they would come into effect, as far as spending and money flowing into the economy, after the recovery cycle begins, and what would that mean? It would mean that at a time when the danger is inflation rather than deflation, at a time when an inflationary cycle is beginning, that you would have on your hands spending programs adopted to meet a recession, which exert pressures you do not want at this point. So what kind of government spending should be adopted as you see a recession coming along? The spending should be highly selective, and it should be only for programs that will act during the period that you expect a recession to last. It must be money that can be spent, that can be fed into the economy at that point, and the government must be aggressive in spending the money at that point. But it should not, in effect, adopt policies which would say that we would spend money two or three or four years from now, after the recession was already passed.

The second point: I believe you must use the credit functions of the government, the fiscal policies of the government, very imaginatively at this point, and again it is a question of using them early rather than late. If you wait too long -- and the matter of timing is so essential here -- to lower interest rates in order to encourage more investment in the economy, if you do that at a time when you are in the bottom of a recession, too often it has a psychological effect which just makes you go lower. So you

must move a little sooner than that if you possibly can.

Then, third, there is the tax device. As far as the tax device is concerned, I believe that generally speaking when you have moved into a recessionary period the more effective way to stimulate economic activity, more effective than huge government spending programs, is tax reform and tax reduction.

Now, this would seem also to be dangerous. But on the other hand I believe this for these reasons. When you are in a recession and when you want to come out of it, too often we think the way to get out of it, the way to get the economy going, is by expanding the public sector. These are the people who advocate massive government spending. I don't agree with that. I think when you are in a recession the thing you should try to do is expand the private sector of the economy. Let me explain. Our Gross National Product is approximately 500 billion dollars. 400 billion dollars of our Gross National Product is in the private sector, leaving a hundred billion dollars in the public sector. So when you act with the credit facilities of the government, when you act with the tax facilities, you are encouraging the expansion of the four hundred billion, the larger part of your economy rather than one hundred billion dollars, and it stands to reason, therefore, that it will mean a greater up-turn.

One last point I would like to make as far as recession is concerned: I think we can do some other things that will smooth out the business cycle. One in particular is with regard to unemployment compensation. I think that unemployment compensation -- our unemployment compensation principles and program -- should be revised so that we can have a more effective method. That means longer periods which the unemployment compensation covers and also standards which are more general throughout the states, so that you can have a greater cushion during a recession that we presently have. These are the devices that I would use, one, to anticipate recession and, second, to fight it as you get into it and as you get out.

Mr. Weeks: Mrs. Hickey:

Mrs. Hickey (Ladies Home Journal): Mr. Vice President, of course, as far as these issues of the campaign concern men and women alike -- but I am certain at this point I am expected to ask a question that would affect a woman's

point of view, and it is this: The unprecedented activity of women in this campaign, I think, indicates that we have great numbers of women politically active and experienced.

Now, how do you plan to use greater numbers of these women in appointments to policy level, that is, the thinking, the planning, the higher administrative levels of your official family?

Vice President Nixon: That's a good leading question, may I say.

I want you to know that I'm aware of the fact that more women are eligible to vote than men. But I think one of the most interesting developments in America's political history has been the tremendous increase in the activity of women in our campaign. In our crowds yesterday -- incidentally, I was not only in West Virginia, but it was a rather light day, as we were only in Arkansas, Tennessee and West Virginia -- but in our crowds yesterday the women outnumbered the men by about three to one. They show tremendous interest.

They show great understanding of the issues, and another thing: They do more work in the campaigns. The men talk; the women work.

You can quote me on that, too, in the Ladies Home Journal.

Now, I have a great respect for what women can contribute in policy-making positions in government.

I don't think that we have done as well as we might in using their talents, although we have made considerable progress in this Administration.

I speak, for example, of Mrs. Hobby's contributions, and, of course, we have at the present time the Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Bertha Adkins, who is a very effective public servant. I have on my own staff, for example, several women on the research side who are among the ablest of my very small team of research assistants, and so I have a high regard for the contributions they make.

I think as we look at the government and at what the next President ought to do with regard to using various people from our society in government, that we have to break away from any of the rigid ideas we have had in the past.

Let me put it this way. I will expand the answer to your question to this

extent. In the struggle in which we are engaged in the world today, America cannot afford to do less than use the best people that we have.

This means that you must not, therefore, have a bias toward men as against women. You must not have a bias for one group in the society as against another. You must tap the best, whoever they are. I think that means also the best, whatever party they may belong to. I would think that whoever becomes President, considering the fact that we are in a struggle which will be just as decisive as a shooting war, appointments must be made to policy-making positions, where the world struggle is involved particularly, appointments which tap the best brains of both parties.

Now, this brings me back to your point. Where the women are concerned, we must do a better job of enlisting the best women in this country in positions which they are able to fill, because we have a tremendous potential resource here that has not been used adequately.

I can say the same, for example, with regard to various racial groups, minority groups, within our society today. As I have often said to John Johnson, (when he was going to Africa, we discussed the matter of our foreign service), we have to make better use, and use more of our Negro citizens, for example, in Foreign Service positions, not just in the African countries, which to a certain extent is not equality -- and it's practicing segregation in effect -- but in other countries as well, because we have able people, and failure to use them is not tapping the best of the whole society.

So, my answer is: Of course, from a political standpoint, you expect me to say we're going to use more women, but from the standpoint of the country we ought to use more women, because otherwise we won't get the best.

Mr. Weeks: Mr. Johnson.

Mr. John J. Johnson (Editor of Ebony Magazine): Mr. Vice President, I would like to ask a question in the area of civil rights. I have read the planks in both party platforms and I think they are both quite strong. So it seems to me the question is not what we are for, but how we will go about achieving it. So I would like to know, if you are elected President, what specifically will you do to extend equal justice and equal opportunity to more of our citizens?

MORE

Vice President Nixon: Mr. Johnson, what I would specifically do first is to carry out the Republican platform. In this field I had special responsibility in writing the plank -- I know every one of the provisions. The Republican platform is not as extreme insofar as the promises it makes in the civil rights field, but there isn't one item in that Republican platform that cannot be carried out, that won't work, that any reasonable Congress should not adopt, and that is what we need.

The difficulty in the field of civil rights, as I have looked over it through the years -- and both parties are at fault in this respect -- is that every time they have national conventions they include in their platforms a lot of promises for action which they know cannot be carried out and which are forgotten soon afterwards.

I believe the important thing here is first to keep trust, keep faith, by keeping the platform. In this area, as you know, we deal with voting rights, we deal with employment through the medium of the Committee on Government Contracts being expanded into a committee which will have statutory authority and which will cover about one-fourth of all the employment in the country, directly or indirectly.

Now, that deals with what we do in the field of law. In the executive branch of the government a great deal can also be done, not only where government employment is concerned but also through activities such as the Attorney General of the United States recently engaged in with regard to certain problems -- the situation regarding sit-ins.

I don't know whether all of you are aware of this. When you talk about sit-ins people usually think of the fact that here was a very, very difficult situation. It was one where people understood it and were hopeful that it could be worked out without violence, without setting a bad example to the world. Finally it goes to the courts. Now, we could have waited three years or so to get a Supreme Court decision on the sit-ins, and that decision eventually will come down. But the Attorney General did not wait. He called in on a voluntary basis the heads of the major chains in this country. They sat down, and the Attorney General got them voluntarily to adopt a regulation to the effect that they were going to break this barrier themselves. This is executive leadership. This is the leadership which

does not wait for the law.

I would say, finally, we will carry out our platform. We will do what the law can do. But we must recognize that in this field of civil rights the need primarily is for leadership, which will anticipate what the law would have people do and which will get people to do voluntarily what the law would compel them to do against their will at a later point. Here is where the President of the United States can do a very effective job. I have very strong convictions on this subject, as you are well aware. That's why I have spoken on it in the Southern states I have visited. When I speak on civil rights, in Arkansas and Tennessee, in Virginia and the other states like that, it isn't easy. It's much easier to ignore. It's much easier to tell these people things they agree with. And I'll tell you why I speak of it. I don't speak of it because I go down there as a Westerner or a Northerner, who is preaching to the Southerners and telling them the things that are wrong with their system. This doesn't mean anything, but the reason I speak of it is because it's the responsibility of our national leaders, recognizing that this is not just a Southern problem, but a Northern and Western and Eastern problem as well.

It is the responsibility of our national leaders to lead the people, to lead them and to develop public opinion on the side of carrying out the law. Why? Because of three basic reasons: One, because it's right; two, because the United States cannot afford in this world struggle to fail to develop to the fullest the talents of fourteen million of its citizens; and, three, because in the international arena we cannot afford to have a man like Khrushchev come to our shores, a man who has enslaved millions, slaughtered thousands in the streets of Hungary, and point the finger to the United States and say, "Look, you're enslaving people of this country," and I say this to any audience.

I say that the next President, Democrat or Republican, should, and I think can, exert leadership which will give the people generally, men and women of good will, the kind of action, constructive action in all of these fields, which will mean progress in education, progress in employment, and in all the other fields which mean equality of opportunity.

Mr. Weeks: Mr. Luce.

Mr. Henry R. Luce (Editor-in-chief of Time, Life, Fortune, Sports

Illustrated, etc.): I thought I might ask a question which would give you a chance to say something that hasn't been covered. I have in mind your acceptance speech in Chicago, in which you said that the greatest task the next President of the United States will face is to develop a new grand strategy for winning the battle of freedom for men and women, all men and women, without war.

What perhaps are some of the elements of this grand new strategy, as they begin to shape up in your mind?

Vice President Nixon: As far as the grand strategy for winning the battle for freedom is concerned, the first responsibility of the next President, as it has been of our present President, is to inform the people as to what the struggle is really about, and that means that our people must understand the importance of the non-military aspects of this struggle.

We all understand the necessity for maintaining America's military might.

Any Congress will appropriate anything that a President asks it to appropriate within reason to keep up our military strength, and this is essential, because without more military strength than have those who threaten the peace we are not able to be the guardians of the peace as we are at the present time. But the trouble is too many people stop here. They say we will be militarily strong. We'll be good and tough at the conference table, and then we will have peace -- and we might. But we are not going to win the struggle for the world because it is going to be won clearly apart from the strength that we have, no matter how tough we may be in our diplomatic policy, how resourceful, how able, how firm.

What I am speaking of, of course, is that the struggle of the world is being decided in Asia, in Africa, in South America, in the Near East. Over a billion people live in this area.

It is necessary for us to understand that to win this struggle we have to recognize what the Russians are doing first. We've got to counterpunch, but in addition to the counterpunch, we have to develop an offensive strategy.

What are they doing? Well, they are attempting to win these countries. They are doing it with every device possible. The main thing they are doing is presenting hope for change to the peoples of these countries, most of which are newly-developing, all of whom have less of this world's good than they want and

need, all of whom are living virtually on subsistence with the exception of part of South America.

The Russians, the Communists, come in but they don't say, "Go Communist. They don't sell it that way. They say, "You need a change. What you have is wrong. We offer change. And the Western, free world, tells you: 'Stay as you are.' They fight only for the status quo."

And so the first responsibility in developing a new strategy is for us to change our attitude. We've got to recognize that holding the line against Communism, defending the free world, erecting tremendous military barriers will protect ourselves. But being firm at the diplomatic table and all of these things are not enough. We have got to go in and fight the battle in Asia, and Africa, and South America, just as resourcefully, just as ably, and more resourcefully than they are.

Now, how do we do this? What are the elements of this struggle?

First, it is economic in character. Second, it is ideological in character.

Now, as far as the economic aspects of this struggle are concerned, this means -- as unpopular as this is to great numbers of people in our country -- that the United States cannot leave to these people the alternative of either staying as they are in their economic development or turning to Communism and paying for progress by giving up freedom.

If that is the alternative they have, they're going to go with the Communists, because they are not going to stay where they are.

So therefore we have to have an economic program combining developmental loans, some grants and technical assistance, an economic program -- and I particularly emphasize this -- which will encourage private international activities and investment in this area of the world.

With economic activities, I would mention one other thing. We must get our allies in this struggle, the Germans, the French, the Italians, the Japanese, others that have now recovered from the war, others who also have ability to contribute, get them to go with us in helping to bear the cost of this tremendous enterprise of helping these countries to develop economically.

Now, the difficulty is that too many people stop here too. They say, "The answer to Communism in Asia, in Africa and South America, is a huge new Marshall

Plan. Pour out the money, five, ten, twenty billion dollars more. This is the answer."

But it isn't the answer. It is wrong. It is just as wrong to give to a newly-developing country, that doesn't know how to use money, two or three million dollars a year without providing the technical assistance so that they know how to spend it as it is to leave them where they are.

And so what we must do, in addition to providing funds, under the circumstances that I have mentioned, is to recognize that it is our responsibility, with our allies, with the UN, with new confederations that may be set up, to train the people who can develop the economies and run these countries.

Take the Congo. Twelve people in the Congo, it is said, have a college degree. How can you expect a group like that to take this tremendously rich area and be able, one, to run a government, and, two, to run an economy, however much money you give them?

And so we need a greatly broadened educational program, a technical assistance program which will train men in the field of government and which will train them in the field of running an economy if they want it, if they're willing to have it.

This must not be unilateral in character where we can avoid it, because then it looks as if we are doing this solely for ourselves, solely in our own self interest to extend our power and domination.

That is not why we are doing it. We're doing it for them. We must make it clear that we're doing it for their interests, and the interests ultimately will be in the interest of ourselves and the free peoples everywhere.

Now the other point that is made is in relation to the so-called ideological struggle to which I referred. This is a lot harder to explain, a lot harder to justify before any kind of audience. But we must remember that what Communism really offers the world today, what it has made its great gains from, has not been in the economic assistance it has poured out (very little as a matter of fact compared to what we have done), it has not been in its military strength, but it has been in the power of its ideological appeal.

Here we have not done as effective a job as we can. This is not just a

question of a bigger U.S.I.A., it is a question of quality. It is just a question of understanding what we are fighting for, what we present to these countries, and it is to that point I would like to talk for just a second before I conclude.

The greatest mistake we make is to present our case in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America as being one in which we are helping them to fight Communism.

Now we're helping them for that reason, because certainly if the Communists came we know that would be worse than what they have today. But these people do not want to be pawns in a world struggle. What they are interested in is their own future and so the United States must present to these people and to all the world the picture of a people who are wanting to help these people of Asia and Africa and the newly-developing countries, not because we're fighting somebody else but because of the traditional American idea of having compassion for people who do not have as much as we have, of being concerned about poverty and misery and disease, because there is poverty and misery and disease.

This is what people have to understand. When they know that then we will have appeal.

And then we combine this concern for their problem, a concern which is expressed not only by government but by private organizations as well, with a strong program in which the people of these countries, through exchange and otherwise, understand what we really have to offer.

And I refer here to the fact that Communism comes promising independence, promising freedom, promising plenty, but produces none of them.

We come promising these people they can have progress but at the same time retain freedom. Freedom means very little to them at the present time, but the fact that it means very little now doesn't mean that it could not mean something. For us to make our case economically solely on the basis of materialism is the greatest mistake we could make. We have got to get some idealism into our people.

Now, how do you do this from the standpoint of the executive?

I have already indicated -- I'm going to spell it out more in the campaign -- that I think we need within the executive branch of the government a reorganization of all of the activities that deal with this non-military struggle -- the economic, the information, all of those activities that deal with the battle of ideas, technical

assistance. These should be drawn together into one compact striking force under the direction, as I have tried to divide it, of the Vice President of the United States, reporting directly to the President, and then on a day by day, week by week, month by month basis, this battle should be fought aggressively.

Fighting it for what? Well, of course, in the long run for the interests of the United States, for our freedom, because whoever wins this part of the world wins the whole world; but, as far as our immediate aim is concerned, and what we must present to the world, we fight it because we are concerned about the future of these people, we are concerned about their freedom, about their progress, and whether there were any communism in the world or not we would still be concerned. If we can present the case that way, if we can be tough-minded, realistic, but at the same time have a heart in our international relations, we will win against the Communists, for the fundamental reason that we're on the right side and they're on the wrong side.

But we have to present the case better than we have done in the past.

#####