

RICHARD M. NIXON

WBTv(CBS)Interview

9:45 p.m.  
September 11, 1968

WBTv Studios  
Charlotte, North Carolina

MR. ALVORD: Mr. Nixon, events in Miami would lead an observer to believe that the South would play an important role in your strategy to win in November, but some recent statements suggest that you might be concentrating rather on just the larger states.

Now, for the record, what role does the South play in your campaign strategy?

MR. NIXON: Well, first, I have a national strategy. I don't believe that any candidate for the Presidency should divide the country and should write off any part of the country.

As far as the South is concerned, present indications are that we will do best in what I would call the perimeter of the South. This would be in Florida, in South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and Texas. That doesn't mean that we are writing off the rest, but we will definitely put as much emphasis on the perimeter of the South as we put on any states in the Midwest or North with that same population complex. We are going after the South as well as the North, because at the end of the campaign we want this to be one country, and only by taking your message to the whole country and knowing what the whole country feels, can you make it one country,

MR. ALVORD: You say you feel you would do best in these parts of the South. Do you feel that you will win these states or do you feel that you will have an active majority in the states that you mentioned?

MR. NIXON: Yes. Well, when you talk about an active majority, all we are hoping for this time, of course, is a plurality, because with a third candidate in the field, getting over 50 percent is out, but all you need is a plurality to get the votes.

But what we are doing in the states that I mentioned is to -- we think that in each one of those states we have an even chance or better than even chance to win, and when we come through, for example, a state like North Carolina, it is a swing state. We were close here in 1960. This time we think it is even, and we think with a major effort we can win it. And that is the same thing I would say about these other states that I mentioned in the South.

MR. WHITEHURST: Mr. Nixon, you brought out this third force in this year's election. Now, there has been a great deal of speculation as to which of the major candidates would be most affected by it, the Wallace candidacy. Whom do you feel is going to be most hurt?

MR. NIXON: It is a mix. When you look at the Deep South, the polls would indicate that the Wallace candidacy

would hurt the Republican candidate more than the Democratic candidate. On the other hand, when you look at the states of the Midwest, the Northeast and the Far West, it is a wash in those states, and in a state, for example, like Michigan, our policy there indicates, and also in Illinois, that the Wallace candidacy would hurt the Democratic candidate more than the Republican candidate. The Wallace candidacy apparently in these Northern states primarily is strong among union members who would traditionally vote for the Democratic candidate. So, consequently, as they cut into that vote, that means that these are votes that Humphrey otherwise might get, and that, therefore, we now have an opportunity to put off to the side.

MR. WHITEHURST: There has been a great deal of speculation, of course, that this election might not be decided by the people but it might be decided in the House of Representatives.

Do your personal plans call for attempting to elect a great number of Republican members of the House, or will you be concentrating primarily on trying to win an outright election?

MR. NIXON: First, I am endorsing all of the candidates up and down the line, because I believe that in our two-party system you not only need a President, but you also need Congressmen and Senators who will support his program.

But I am not working for the election of Republican Congressmen because I think this is going to go to the House. I don't think it is. It could. But I believe that when we finally get closer to the election, that the great majority of the American people are going to recognize that either Nixon or Humphrey are going to win this, and they aren't going to want to throw their votes away. I think as far as the votes for a third-party candidate are concerned, the same thing is going to happen this year as always happened in the past. It will go down as you get closer to the election, and that either Humphrey or I will go in with a clear majority in the electoral college.

Of course, I expect to.

MR. ALVORD: .. There are some factors that could affect that. If racial tensions were to continue high throughout the campaign, obviously this would tend to keep perhaps the third-party movement high. In any case, you have a problem of wooing some of those conservative votes away from the Wallace campaign. Do you feel this is possible, and, if so, how do you propose to do it? What would you say to these people?

MR. NIXON: With a positive program, rather than with a negative program. First of all, I make it very clear in my campaign, and I will from now until election day, that this is a contest between two men, and between the two major parties.

I am not campaigning against Governor Wallace or, if a fourth party gets in the race, against him.

Second, what I do is to try to present my positive solutions to the problems that are at the present time distressing many Americans. And those problems, of course, involve the respect for the United States abroad, the fact that we want a program that will lead the peace abroad and keep the peace; the problem of respect for law at home, that we need a program that will stop the rise in crime; and, of course, the problem of progress, how we can have progress through not more and more big Government programs, but through more and more emphasis on individual and private enterprise.

I think that kind of an approach, if I may say so, is the most effective way to keep down the third-party approach -- third party vote. I don't think a slam-bang attack on a third-party candidate would do anything else than build him up and give him a bigger vote and bigger visibility than he otherwise would have.

MR. WHITEHURST: You spoke of trying to capture the perimeter of Southern States. On Sunday of this week Vice President Humphrey stated that you had entered into a Southern strategy, which he implied was an alliance with racists in order to take votes away from Governor Wallace.

How do you feel about that statement?

MR. NIXON: Well, now, I think that Mr. Humphrey has enough troubles in his own party without making such an attack on me. And second, if he believes that going after what I call the New South, going after, trying to make this one country, not writing off the South, if he believes that is bad for the country, I just disagree with him.

I just think that right now the South is moving into a position where it is going to play a very great role in this nation, and I want these fine new leaders in the Southern States, I want them to play a role in my administration. That is why I am going after these states.

Now, I could follow a different strategy. I would just forget the South as some people would recommend and go after only the big states. But if I did that, that would mean that the South would be out here without feeling that they had a part of the action. The South, incidentally, is a lot more like the rest of the country than a lot of people would have you believe. I don't go along, after all -- I went to school down here thirty years ago, and it was a lot different then from the myth that many of us had about the South.

Today, as I campaign in the North and the South, people here think the same as the people in the northern states.

They have many of the same problems. Sure, the Wallace vote in some of the Deep South is considerably higher than it is in some of the northern states, but you have a heavy Wallace vote in other states.

So what I am simply saying is this: I am going to concentrate on the whole country and I am not going to write off the South. If Mr. Humphrey wants to say that that is a racist strategy, I will say my record on that I think speaks very, very well, and I am sure he would retract it if he looked to my record.

MR. ALVORD: You mentioned the role that Southern leaders might play in an administration. Texas' Senator John Tower, who campaigned for you recently in South Carolina said that he was sure that Senator Strom Thurmond would have an "influence" in your administration if you are elected, and he said that he thought Senator Thurmond might even be in line for consideration for a Cabinet post.

Does this square with your thinking, and, if so, what particular post would Senator Thurmond's talents and abilities most lend itself?

MR. NIXON: Let me make one thing very clear. One determination I have made in this campaign is both in seeking the nomination and since the nomination, not to put out a laundry list of who is going to be in the Cabinet.

Second, as far as Senator Thurmond or any other

Senator is concerned, with the number of Senators we have on the Republican side in the Senate. I don't believe that any Senator really should go to the Cabinet. We need them there in the Senate. That is my view on that.

MR. WHITEHURST: Mr. Nixon, if we may turn a bit from how you are going to be elected to some of your stands on issues, there are some things that are particularly important in this part of the country. One thing is tobacco. In light of the present knowledge of the relationship between cigarette-smoking and cancer, do you feel the Federal Government has gone too far or far enough in, say, the warnings in the efforts to convince people to stop smoking cigarettes?

MR. NIXON: As a non-smoker -- and I suppose that is not going to win me many votes in this great tobacco country, although I spent a lot of time in Durham and am well aware of how much this industry means to North Carolina and the rest of the South, my view on this is purely objective. I can say that it seems to me that the Federal Government probably has placed the warnings before the people in an adequate manner, and it seems that no matter how many warnings are placed before the people, those who are potential smokers, that it doesn't seem to have a -- very much effect on what people do.

Now, I have read the studies, some of the studies, on the relationship of the use of tobacco and cancer. I know that

it is quite controversial. But I would say that the job of the Federal Government here is simply to lay it before the people and then if people determine on their own that despite those warnings they are going to continue to smoke, I don't think the Federal Government can go further than that in protecting the people against what they think is a vice that they are willing to pay the price for.

MR. WHITEHURST: Of course, there is an effort now to strengthen this warning on cigarette packages, and I was wondering if your administration would support such an effort to make that warning even more frightening.

MR. NIXON: I have no present intention to do that. No one has recommended it from any of my task forces, and unless I get some pretty strong evidence that the warning that is presently used is not adequate, I would not move in that direction.

MR. ALVORD: Do you consider the general philosophy of the type of campaign to sell an idea on the part of a Federal Government agency such as HEW's use of Post Office trucks and things of this nature to get out the word. Do you consider that good government policy? Is this something that could be dangerous?

MR. NIXON: It could be dangerous if it were in the hands of a potential dictatorial type in the Presidency of the United States. I just don't think we are going to elect

that kind of a man, in any event.

I must say that I am going to watch very carefully in my administration, however, the use of Voice of America, either abroad or in those areas where it could be used at home, and the use of all Government agencies with this immense power that the Government could have over the minds of people. I think it is very important not to let that power to be used to influence the people in a way that would not be proper and appropriate to the Government function.

MR. ALVORD: Mr. Nixon, you have taken a stand which would favor or give stronger support to the domestic textile industry against the encroachment of foreign imports. I wonder if you would be specific as to how you think we can reconcile these two problems of the American industrial interests and the interest of world trade and the lowering of tariff barriers.

MR. NIXON: It is very difficult to reconcile them, as a matter of fact. This is one of the most difficult decisions that I have had to make in developing my campaign program, because, basically, I feel on this whole area of trade as most of the people from the South used to feel. As you know, the old Democratic South was free trade. And I think most of us in America recognize that the future of this great nation is going to be, certainly it seems to me, secure if we have more trade

rather than less. Our future goes in that direction rather than our becoming an island in a world completely apart from other nations.

But let's look at the textile industry and let's look at the steel industry. These are two that have been affected by these factors. One, that markets abroad for our exports have been curtailed by a variety of devices used by foreign countries; and, two, that as far as our markets in the United States are concerned, they have been opened to the imports of both steel and textiles.

Now, that just isn't a fair shake for American producers and for American workmen. So what I think we have to do as far as textiles are concerned is to have a more effective enforcement of the international textile agreement, and I would also extend that agreement to include other textiles other than those that involve cotton, and so forth, in other words, manmade textiles as well.

This is a step that I feel is one which is temporary in character, but at the same time that I would take this step I would move very heavily with countries abroad, countries of Europe and Japan to see if we couldn't negotiate with them opening up their markets so that this is a two-way street.

I don't want, I don't think it is in the interest of the United States, not in the interest of our textile industry or our steel industry, for us to be isolated. But I think we have

to have a better job on the part of our State Department negotiators in seeing that other nations open up for us if we open up for them.

MR. ALVORD: Well, now, we have had a system of -- sort of system of quotas which has applied to the cotton situation, have we not, and you mentioned enforcement of this? Why are we ineffective in enforcing this? We have had the agreement on paper. It hasn't worked. Now we are thinking of extending it to other areas as well?

MR. NIXON: The reason it hasn't been effective is that, frankly, it is a question of people. It is a question of an administration that I do not think has made an adequate effort to enforce it, an Administration that has listened too much to what people abroad are saying and too little to the problems of our own people here at home.

Our foreign policy is deeply involved. It is greatly to the interest of the United States to have friendly relations with Japan. But our first consideration has to be the American workmen and the economy of the American people. And I believe that a forceful enforcement of these provisions is called for, and that is what I intend to do, and I think we can do it without completely jeopardizing our relations with other countries abroad.

MR. ALVORD: You mentioned two industries that have been suffering from foreign imports. There are also others, and

one would presume that as you travel about the country when you reach areas where those industries are very involved, that they will also require the same sort of suggestions. Is there a danger in this?

MR. NIXON: Yes, yes, and, incidentally, let me make it very clear. Only when I become convinced, as I have become convinced as a result of the presentation of textile people representing all segments of the industry, that unless action were taken it would be detrimental to thousands of workers and to a whole part of the country, only when I become convinced of it will I move in that direction.

My tendency basically is to move toward reciprocal trade, toward freer trade, toward implementation of all these great programs and I will move in that direction. But on a case by case basis, if a major industry is suffering, then I think we have to move in on it.

Incidentally, of course, there are a lot of other factors that are involved here. The factor of inflation -- as we have inflation in the United States that means that our industries become less competitive, and I believe that as we wage an effective battle against inflation, that will have a major effect in making some of our industries more competitive, looking to the future.

MR. WHITEHURST: Mr. Nixon, if I may, I would like

to discuss another particular worry in this part of the country right now, and in other parts, and this is the HEW guide lines regarding school desegregation. We have had in this area several communities threatened with the withholding of Federal funds because the "freedom of choice" plan has been held not valid and not sufficient. Do you have a position on this?

MR. NIXON: The "freedom of choice" plan is one, as you know, that has been extremely controversial, not only in HEW and not only in these states in the South in which it has been applied, but within the two great parties, and it was considered in their platforms.

My view, generally speaking, is that there has been too much of a tendency for both our courts and for our Federal agencies to use the whole program of the -- of what we would call school integration for purposes which have very little to do with education and which, as a matter of fact, I do not believe serves a very useful purpose insofar as the long-range desire that we all have, to bring up the educational level of all people within the South and other parts of the country.

With regard to "freedom of choice," I would have to look at each one of the states involved to see whether actually it was a true "freedom of choice." If it were, I would tend to favor that. I tend to look with, I would say, great concern

whenever I see Federal agencies or whenever I see the courts attempting to become, in effect, local school boards. I think the decisions in the local areas should be made primarily by people who are more familiar with those problems.

Now, if you come to a school district or to a state where "freedom of choice" is simply used as a device to perpetuate segregation, that is something else again. But if "freedom of choice" is not used as that kind of device, and if actually it really means what it says, then I believe that the Federal Government could well leave its hands off.

MR. WHITEHURST: How about this whole philosophical idea of threatening to withhold Federal monies in order to, for want of a better term, bludgeon a local community into accepting an agency's doctrine? Do you feel that this is a valid weapon?

MR. NIXON: I think that the use of that power on the part of the Federal Government to force a local community to carry out what a Federal administrator or bureaucrat -- what he may think is best for that local community -- I think that is a doctrine that is a very dangerous one. It is one that I generally would not approve.

You understand, now, I want to make it very clear, simply because I am speaking here in North Carolina where there is great interest in this, I want to make it clear that I supported the actions of the Eisenhower Administration in this field.

I believe that the Supreme Court decision was a correct decision, Brown versus the Board of Education. But, on the other hand, while that decision dealt with segregation and said that we would not have segregation, when you go beyond that and say that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Federal courts to, in effect, act as local school districts in determining how we carry that out, and then to use the power of the Federal Treasury to withhold funds or to give funds in order to carry it out, then I think we are going too far. In my view, that kind of activity should be very scrupulously examined and in many cases I think should be rescinded.

(Continued on Page 18.)

MR. ALVORD: What sort of a directive would you propose then to the Department of Housing, Education and Welfare in this area? Would you propose specifically that they lay off that, that they not do it?

MR. NIXON: I would propose specifically that our long-range objective in education is to provide equality of opportunity and for the chance for any individual to go to the school in the neighborhood in which he lives and to have, of course, freedom of choice. We should not have legal segregation in this country. I feel very strongly on that point.

But I would also make it clear that having stated that principle, that I would not want a Federal agency on a case by case basis to use its power without regard to the legislation passed by Congress, to use its power in individual cases to punish a local community because it happened to disagree with what the local community was doing.

MR. ALVORD: What sort of an effective timetable would you set for total desegregation of schools in the United States?

MR. NIXON: Total desegregation of schools, and when you are talking about desegregation, let's understand it, it just isn't a southern problem. You have de facto segregation in the north. This problem is one that troubles us all over the country.

I think that you can't say that it is going to be one year, two years, five years, ten years or any -- pick out any figures out of the air. I say that what we should do is to move forward on a basis which puts primary emphasis on the quality of education. For example, let's take the whole matter of busing. I am against busing. I am against busing in the northern cities for a fundamental reason; because I believe that you pick up children who are two or three grades behind and then bus them over to a school in a neighborhood, what you do is to destroy

their ability ever to compete and you destroy their morale. I think that it is the kind of a procedure that is forced integration rather than putting emphasis on education.

Education should come first. Let it be our long-range objection to have it the integrated kind of education, but only when it works out in a way in which education does not suffer.

MR. WHITEHURST: Mr. Nixon, *Time Magazine* this week says that you have avoided taking either side in the debate over whether the Chicago police were brutal or used enough or too much force. Is this an accurate portrayal of your position or do you have an opinion on what happened out there and whether it was right and wrong?

MR. NIXON: Whatever opinion I have, I am not going to discuss for a reason I think is a very good one. I will "sock it to 'em" when I think it is proper. But right after our convention, I remember Mr. Humphrey was so quick to jump in, and he really gave it to us. Oh, this was a southern strategy and that was supposed to be bad, and there were so many things that we did wrong, and our convention was closed, and so forth. and so on.

As I sat in Miami, I happened to be in Miami during the Democratic Convention and saw that one on television. I said, "Oh, boy, just wait until I get up to Chicago and start to talk about theirs." Now, let's look at that convention. The people saw it. They can judge for themselves what the managers of the convention did, what happened on the streets of Chicago, and I am not going to prejudge it.

Several investigative agencies, including the President's Commission on Violence under Dr. Milton Eisenhower, are conducting an investigation, and having been only a witness of it on television, I say let the commissions conduct an investigation. For me as a Presidential

candidate to lob in my opinions from the sidelines in prejudging the issue I don't think serves a useful purpose. They can criticize our convention. Let's let theirs speak for itself.

MR. WHITEHURST: At the present there is a lot of, it would seem, criticism of the news media rather than logical discussion of what happened in Chicago; there have even been discussions that perhaps the news media should be better controlled, which I don't think is in keeping with our --

MR. NIXON: Well, I have a strong opinion on that. I remember when our convention was set up they -- some of the convention managers were suggesting that we adopt the same rules that were adopted at the Democratic Convention, you know, where they limited the number of cameras that would come and wouldn't allow pictures to be taken downtown to be covered live at the same time that the convention was going on. And I personally intervened and said, "Look, this has to be an open convention in every way." Ours was open. It was a real contest. I didn't win until we got down to Wisconsin. Mr. Humphrey won when he got to Pennsylvania, if you recall.

In addition to that it was open from the standpoint of coverage. ~~That~~ There is one thing I have very strong convictions on. If I think the news media wrong, I will say so, as you gentlemen are quite aware. On the other hand, I believe that our country will be served in our conventions and in an Administration through more openness to the news rather than less.

And that's another thing that I think we are going to be different from the previous Administration. I believe that we have not had enough, shall we say, on the part of the Administration in the past four years, we have not been leveling with the American people enough about our foreign policy, about our domestic policy, and as a result we

have a credibility gap. I think that in our Administration we need to open it up, let the people know, let the people know, and then I think the people can decide.

MR. ALVORD: Mr. Nixon, while you have not spoken out on the convention and have not spoken out on several other issues recently, your Vice-Presidential running mate has. Is this going to be a pattern that we are likely to see through the campaign?

MR. NIXON: Let me make one thing very clear. In our Party at the present time I am very delighted to report that we have under the tent everybody from all ends of the spectrum, and whether it is Governor Reagan in California, or Governor Rockefeller in New York, or Governor Romney, Governor Shafer, Mayor Lindsay, Senator Percy, Senator Brooke, they are all working together for victory in November.

I am often asked, "Well, now, how can you have all these people in because you don't agree on everything?" And the answer is we certainly don't. I don't even agree with my Vice-Presidential candidate on everything. I can't find any man that I can agree with on everything. On the other hand, his views are very close to mine on the great basic issues of what we do abroad, what we do at home.

For example, looking at the problems at home, he has been criticized because when he was governor of Maryland, as he is at the present time, and when there were the great riots and violence in the City of Baltimore and all the burning there, that he took a strong stand for law and order. I agree with his position in that respect.

I think, as he does, that we should rebuild America's cities, but I think, as he does, that we don't have to burn America's cities down in order to rebuild them. Now, in some other areas, for example, we may find that Governor Agnew disagrees with me. But,

generally speaking, I think you will be finding us working in tandem.

MR. ALVORD: Mr. Nixon, thank you very much, and our time is up.