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Mr. H. R. Haldeman,
Nixon Headquarters,
Hotel Pierre,
New York, N.Y.,

Dear Mr. Haldeman:

I take pleasure in sending you a copy of our current issue of PAN AMERICAN HEADLINES, with our open letter to President Nixon.

Many of us believe that the enunciation of a new Nixon Doctrine for Latin America would be a crowning achievement of the Nixon administration. The suggestions which we have made for the content of such a Doctrine are, of course, only a starting point.

We invite your interest in this possibility.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Harold Lord Varney, President
December 18, 1968

Mr. James H. Stoessel
2126 La Mesa Drive
Santa Monica, California 90402

Dear Jim:

Thank you for your kind words regarding my appointment.

I am delighted to learn of your potential interest in joining our crew, and I will indeed follow your suggestion of keeping your name in mind for possible future use.

Offhand I can't think of any particular spot that would be of overriding interest to you but lots of things are developing, and as we move into the intensive staffing phase, I am sure some possibilities will come to light and when they do I will be in touch with you.

Thanks again for writing.

Best regards,

H.R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President-elect

HRH:ds
December 17, 1968

Mr. James H. Stoessel  
2126 La Mesa Drive  
Santa Monica, California 90402  

Dear Jim:

Thank you for taking the time to write concerning my recent appointment, and for your interest in a position with the new administration.

I have forwarded your letter to Mr. Harry Fleming, who is handling the staffing phase of the transition period. Please send your resume to him at the Office of the President-elect, Federal Office Building #7, Seventh & H Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C.

You will hear further from us as soon as possible. My best to Deborah.

Best regards,

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman

HRH/mc
December 13, 1968

Mr. Chauncey Starr  
Dean, College of Engineering  
University of California at Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Chauncey:

Thank you for taking the time to write concerning my recent appointment. I am sure it will hold many exciting challenges and opportunities that are as yet unthought of.

Thanks too for your generous offer of assistance during the forthcoming administration. As you know, Dr. Lee DuBridge has been named Science Adviser to the President, and I am sure he would be most interested in discussing with you ways to coordinate the contacts you have available with the new administration.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

H. R. Haldeman

HSH/mc
December 11, 1968

Mr. Charles Stearns
Boyle, Atwill, Catterlin & Stearns
1900 State Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Dear Mr. Stearns:

Thank you for your letter recommending the inclusion of the Dos Pueblos High School (Santa Barbara) Band and Pep Girls in the inaugural ceremonies.

We have forwarded your letter to Mr. Robert McCune in Washington, D.C., and you will be hearing from him as soon as possible.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President-elect

HWH/sc
cc R. McCune
January 2, 1968

Mrs. Wayne E. Thompson
Chairman, Patron's Committee
Whittier Guild of Children's Hospital
14030 E. Marsha Lane
Whittier, California 90602

Dear Mrs. Thompson:

Mr. and Mrs. Nixon have asked that I reply to your invitation to join you by becoming honorary patrons of the Whittier Guild of Children's Hospital. They are deeply interested in the work of the hospital. However, they feel that at this time it will be impossible for them to formally support this activity.

I want to thank you for your kind offer and I know the President-elect and Mrs. Nixon join me in extending their best wishes to you and your fine organization during this holiday season and throughout the year.

Cordially,

Lawrence Higby

LH/mc
I.D. RN
Request P.M.I. Honorary
Patron of L.A. Children's Hospital.
This is an issue.
Dear Mr. & Mrs. Wilson,

The Whittier Guild of Children's Hospital cordially invites you to join in its support of Children's Hospital of Los Angeles and the Rehabilitation Unit by becoming Honorary Patrons for the year 1969.

Last year 5,520 free clinic visits, 137 hospital admissions and a total of 993 days care were made available to children of the Whittier Area.

A response from you by December 31 will assure your name being included on our roster of Honorary Patrons, of whose Whittier Shield is justly proud.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Wayne E. Thompson
Chairman, the Realms Committee
Hold —

Haven't we already replied to this letter?
November 21, 1968

Mr. H. R. Haldeman
465 Muirfield Road
Los Angeles, California 90005

Dear Mr. Haldeman:

I am sending you a copy of my letter to the President Elect at both your California and New York addresses in the hope that you may find time to digest its contents and relate them to Mr. Nixon. I have also sent a copy to Mr. Robert Finch.

Sincerely yours,

Frank J. Tysen

FJT/ls
enc:
November 21, 1968

President Elect Richard Nixon
Key Biscayne, Florida

Dear Mr. Nixon:

I would like to take this opportunity to write you regarding the nation's environmental crisis. I have both a deep personal involvement in this area as well as a professional concern having just completed for publication a three year intensive study on environmental ugliness and what might be done about it.

The little attention which this issue received during the recent Presidential election made it appear as if, in this respect, all of us had become forgotten Americans. Yet, perhaps like no other issue the deterioration of the quality of our environment deeply affects everyone old or young, rich or poor, Republican or Democrat.

You briefly addressed yourself to this problem during the TV marathon the night before the election when you mentioned the difficulty of loving an unlovely country and stressed the need for a quality environment. I would like to remind you of this statement today and make some specific suggestions how to promote this goal for the problem is severe.

During the next four years of your administration at least four million acres of America's natural beauty will be bulldozed to make way for new residential, commercial, and industrial developments. The way the cards are currently stacked these four million acres will most likely be developed in the same ugly "slipshod, slovenly" manner which has been customary during the postwar years. I hate to think about the amount of water pollution that will be pumped into our streams, lakes, and oceans during the next four years. As an ex Southern Californian you hardly need to be reminded of the air pollution that will be discharged during this period. As a matter of fact, as I am writing this letter even Santa Monica beach and the ocean is engulfed by smog. I could go on mentioning...
the third pollution (solid waste disposal), noise pollution, thermal pollution, and so on. And I haven't even referred to our existing urban areas which are bound to further deteriorate, producing environments conducive to crime and violence.

The point simply is that unless a strong environmental concern is built into your appointments and your public policies things will not only become worse but it will become more difficult to retrieve the situation. "God's Own Junkyard" may well become our permanent American heritage. We desperately need strong Presidential leadership to help us combat the despoilation of our land. The crisis cannot do with less for as a recent Los Angeles Times editorial put it: "The primary goal of conservation is no longer to keep America beautiful but just to make it livable."

Many environmentally concerned citizens doubt whether you indeed will rise to the challenge. They point at the eight years of the Eisenhower administration during which no new national parks were created contrasted with twelve new ones during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. They remember President Eisenhower's 1960 veto of water pollution control measures based on his belief that this was not a proper federal responsibility. They recall the strong Republican opposition to much of President Johnson's Natural Beauty legislation such as the 1965 Highway Beautification Act.

There is a certain irony in these events since around the country community battles against ugliness are led more often than not by Republicans. It appears to be an unfortunate fact that as the environmental problem has rapidly taken on nationwide proportions the national Republican party has been slow in responding which accounts for the gap between public concern and national party policies.

Given your view of the Presidency as an active office responsive to all the people, I, for one, am encouraged that you will help bridge the gap and give the nation the environmental quality leadership it so desperately needs and desires. Meanwhile, may I be so presumptuous as to offer the following recommendations for operationalizing this leadership.

(1) It is imperative that particularly those Cabinet officers to head the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior possess strong environmental consciousness and concern. Secretary Udall demonstrated that environmental sensitivity during his eight years in office and
I would hope that the new Secretary of the Interior will be at least equally so oriented.

(2) It is extremely important that at least one White House staffer will be placed in charge of environmental matters and will perform a role similar to the one Lee White had under President Kennedy and Richard Goodwin had under President Johnson. I might add that Laurence Rockefeller is acquainted with lots of environmentally concerned persons who might be of assistance.

(3) The President's Advisory Council on Recreation and National Beauty should be strengthened as a Cabinet level coordinating device on environmental matters and it would seem desirable for the Vice President to continue to head the Council.

(4) At the earliest possible time some of the nation's best minds on environmental quality problems should be assembled for several brainstorming sessions on how the White House might best lead the nation in this regard.

(5) The nation's grassroot concern ought to be enlisted through an early White House Conference on the American Environment.

The community battles which have been raging with an ever increasing intensity throughout the land are a clear index of the growing anger over the vanishing beauty and livability of the nation. This anger need not be allowed to increase. At the same time the crisis offers a fine opportunity for broadening the support base of the national Republican party by making it more responsive to a larger portion of the population.

This opportunity was well illustrated in San Mateo County, California when bright young Republican Paul McCloskey ran for Congress a few years ago. McCloskey was well known for having championed several conservation causes and when he decided to run for Congress Republicans and Democrats joined together and worked hard to deliver him an overwhelming victory first over Shirley Temple in the primary and later over his Democratic opponent. The environmentalists are rapidly gaining political strength. Incidentally a person of McCloskey's caliber would make an excellent Secretary of the Interior as well as greatly add to the quality of the Cabinet.

If there is any way in which I might be of help to you in this area, I would be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

Frank J. Tysen

FJT/ls
January 3, 1969

Mr. Harold Lord Varney
President
Committee on Pan American Policy
60 East 42nd Street - Suite 1430
New York, New York 10017

Dear Mr. Varney:

Thank you very much for your letter and the accompanying issue of PAN AMERICAN HEADLINES.

I appreciate your taking the time to bring this to my attention and your interest in helping the new administration.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the
President-elect

HRH:ds
One of the truly harrowing tasks of your new administration will be to clean up the mess in Latin American policy.

You have inherited from your predecessors a Latin American policy which is in shambles. The giddy amateurism of the Kennedy “thousand days”, and the day-to-day improvisations of the Johnson five and a half years have reduced State Department policy to a mere holding operation.

It is your inescapable duty to restore direction and sane leadership in this vital but neglected area.

You will have the enthusiastic support of millions of informed Americans who have become heart-sick over the continuing Washington blunders. Foremost among these yearners for new and positive leadership will be the members of this Committee.

We have no illusions that your task will be easy. If you inaugurate a new day, you will find, pitted against you, a self-perpetuating bureaucracy of “Latin American experts” whose careers are intertwined with a perpetuation of the discredited past. They will surround you with their advice and their blandishments during the weeks before January 20th. They will counsel you, with their well stuffed briefcases and attache cases, not to make any abrupt changes. They will attempt to frighten you with “commitments” by your predecessors, which have to be honored. They will deluge you with slanted and meaningless statistics to prove that everything is going well.

If you heed this willful Latin American “Liberal” camarilla, you are lost.

Let us point out a few of the unresolved Latin American problems which will grow seriously worse unless they are promptly faced.

(1) The Alliance for Progress, which is daily becoming a bad joke on the United States, must be liquidated. In 7 years, after the squandering of $9 billion of tax-payers’ money, it has failed in its promised objectives. We can no longer continue to beat this dead horse, and pretend that it is a viable policy.

(2) We must rescue the promising idea of a Latin American common market from the hands of socialist-minded United Nations “experts” who would distort it to economic (and eventually) political integration. Instead, attention should be focused upon the real Latin American need—access for their primary products, on more favorable tariff or quota terms, to the markets of the U.S. and of Western Europe. We cannot impose a common market upon Latin America and yet disdainfully stay out of it ourselves. The common market aim is too good an idea to be left to the “One World” muddlers.

(3) We must reface the problem of Cuba. The permanent presence of a fortified Russian army and naval base only 90 miles from our frontier makes a joke of our whole hemispheric defense status. It nullifies the Monroe Doctrine. The Nixon administration should demand that all secret agreements made by President Kennedy with Castro and Khrushchev in 1962 be published. This should include the unknown agreements which Castro revealed in his PLAYBOY interview. After they are disclosed, and subjected to public discussion and scrutiny, a terminal date should be announced by the administration when all these so-called agreements should lapse.

(4) We must scrap the three proposed new Panama treaties, drafted by President Johnson’s negotiators in 1967, and reassert our status in the Isthmus under the Treaty of 1903, as amended under the Eisenhower Administration. We have over $4 billion invested in the Canal Zone on military installations, to protect the hemisphere, in accordance with our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine. We cannot place our security establishment in jeopardy, by a treaty which would make our presence in the Isthmus dependent upon the permission of such a politically unstable government as that of the Republic of Panama.

(5) We must discontinue the policy, inaugurated in 1961 by President Kennedy, of propping up and favoring governments in Latin America which meet the specifications of “social revolution”, defined by American “Liberals”. This policy exploded in our faces under Kennedy. It should be buried. In place of this purely ideological approach, we should establish close working relations with strong anti-Communist governments, such as those of President Ongania in Argentina and President Costa e Silva in Brazil, to evolve a security system for Latin America which will protect it against Communist infiltration, either from Russia’s Kosygin or China’s Mao.

These are some of the most pressing “musts” for a workable, sane hemispheric policy. Will you give us the leadership to make them possible?

Harold Lord Varney, President
One of the inevitable deadfalls for a new administration is the selection of its advisers.

Latin American policy, throughout the last three administrations, has been the closed monopoly of a mutual admiration circle of Latin American "experts", mostly academic. Since they have a vested interest in all the mistakes of the past, they will join ranks to continue them.

President Nixon will find himself the sitting duck target of a cluster of organizations in the Latin American field which will furiously endeavor to guide and control his appointments. These organizations are almost identical in their outlook. They enthusiastically approve all the State Department boo boos of the last ten years, and they will continue to repeat them.

Among the organizations which will give him gratuitous and uniformly bad advice are:

1. The Council on Foreign Relations. This organization has seen eye-to-eye with all the mistaken State Department policies since the Roosevelt administration. It will be profuse in its recommendations of personnel.

2. The Ford Foundation. This power-hungry organization maintains a Latin American division, with staff members in most Latin American countries. Its policies are those of the over-rated McGeorge Bundy. It will know just the right man for every State Department and Foreign Service post.

3. Center for Inter-American Relations. This new entrant in the field is headed by William D. Rogers, law partner of Abe Fortas, and Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress under Kennedy.

However, there is a rich field of Latin American talent and experience which will never be mentioned by these organizations. It comprises men who were not consulted during the Kennedy-Johnson years, and who had no part in past mistakes. We submit a partial list of such names. We have not consulted any of these distinguished men before listing. They are our own suggestions of men who could be extremely useful to President-elect Nixon, either as counselors, or appointees.

They include:

- Spruille Braden (former Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State)
- Ellis O. Briggs (former Ambassador)
- Dr. Donald C. Dozer (Prof., Univ. of Cal.)
- Walter Harnischfeger (industrialist)
- Frederick E. Hasler (financier)
- Robert C. Hill (former Ambassador)
- J. Kenneth Hyatt
- James S. Kemper (former Ambassador)
- Admiral Ben Moreell
- Jefferson Patterson
- William D. Pawley (former Ambassador)
- Harold Ramsburg (industrialist)
- Philip A. Ray (former Undersecretary of Commerce)
- R. Douglas Stuart (former Ambassador)
- Dudley Swin (industrialist)
- John L. Tappin (former Ambassador)
- Fletcher Warren (former Ambassador)
- Richard H. Whitehead

Also, we suggest, from the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the name of Thomas C. Mann. His record, as Undersecretary of State, and in other posts, was inspiring.

Four years ago, Eduardo Frei Montalva, newly elected President of Chile, was the hero of all the confused intellectuals who believe that the way to beat Communism is to embrace democratic Socialism.

Frei had defeated Salvador Allende, joint Socialist-Communist candidate for President in the elections. Although Frei's own record was spotted with collaboration with the Chilean Communists, he suddenly loomed as the great alternative to Communism, bucking the Aprista Rómulo Betancourt off the admission stage. Frei even fooled some hitherto knowledgeable anti-Communists. After his election, one of the top anti-Communist organizations in the U. S. came out in its organ with a banner headline, "We Win in Chile!"

Unhappily, "we" didn't win. Frei started with a publicity bang. He was going to beat inflation, which was corroding the Chilean economy. He was going to "Chileanize" the U. S.-owned copper mines—a mouthful which seemed to take the wind out of the sails of Allende, with his "nationalization", but which turned out to be the same thing except that it was done with gradualism.

He won an early flurry of headlines by visiting Europe and securing Russian financing of some of Chile's economic difficulties. He joined with Raúl Prebisch, Jose Mayobre (the Venezuelan Communist) and U Thant in a highly publicized drive for "economic integration" of South America, a program which is still buried in its verbosity.

But Frei didn't seem to get anywhere in solving the night-marish economic problems of Chile. Formerly, Chile had been bailed out by U. S. foreign aid hand-outs ($983 million from 1945 through 1964). Frei came back to Washington for more, and, by June 30, 1968, he had increased this grand total to $1,242 billion. At first, his alibi for failure was that the Communists and Conservatives had a controlling majority in the Chilean Congress and were blocking him. But in 1965, in the Congressional election, he secured a Frei majority in the lower House, and he was on his own.

His record since 1965 has been one of almost continuous failure. His Christian Democratic Party was captured by a Leftist majority who wanted to go even further into Socialism, than Frei. By a supreme effort, he regained the leadership but it left him a captive to his Left Wing.

The Chilean economy was next rocked by a series of paralyzing strikes launched by the Central Workers Federation (CUT), controlled by the Socialist-Communists. To Frei's consternation, the labor department of his own Christian Democratic Party, which was set up to build a non-Communist labor movement, took this occasion to desert Frei and call upon all Christian Democratic unions to unite with the CUT.

Although in his "Chileanization" coup, the American copper companies gave Chile the immensely valuable 51% ownership of the major copper mine properties for a pittance, Frei's regime has been a lukewarm supporter of the U. S.-owned copper mines—a mouthful which seemed to take the wind out of the sails of Allende, with his "nationalization", but which turned out to be the same thing except that it was done with gradualism.

But in 1965, in the Congressional election, he secured a Frei majority in the lower House, and he was on his own.
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THE PRESIDENTS' MEN. By Patrick Anderson. Double­

day, New York. 420 pp? $6.95.

Richelieu had his Father Joseph, Louis XI had his Oliver,
Don Quixote had his Sancho Panza. In the modern manner,
these parasites of the mighty would be called "Presidential
advisers". The story of these shadowy men, who manipulate
the levers of power, is the real story of many of our admin­
istrations.

Patrick Anderson, a back-stage member of the Kennedy
administration, tells part of this tale. His book is a chatty,
gossipy reprise of much of the material which we look for
pruriently in the "now it can be told" columns of Drew
Pearson and Evans and Novack.

Where do these "advisers" come from, before they emerge
in the white Presidential light? Most of them are sycophants
who have shrewdly attached themselves to their Presidents
in the early stages of their ascent. Such odd characters as
Louis M. Howe, or Sherman Adams, would never have risen
from obscurity if they had not gotten in at the right time.
Every public man has yes men trailing him. Even Harold
Stassen has such hopefuls, revolving around his orbit. The
trick is to pick a winner.

General Harry Vaughan had the good fortune to know
Harry S. Truman while he was a captain of artillery in World
War I. Not even, in the wildest flight of the imagination,
could he have dreamed that this casual friendship would
lead to the White House, but Vaughan held on through the
years. Richard N. Goodwin, in the Kennedy regime, first
cultivated Ted Sorensen, and then wormed his way into
the good graces of the then Senator Kennedy, behind Soren­
sen's back. Of course, as the author points out, Ted didn't
like it. Emmett J. Hughes, with a Luce TIME-FORTUNE
background behind him, insinuated himself into the Eisen­
hower household by doing speech-writing chores in the 1952
campaign. He later cashed in his inside information and
joined the Left.

Mr. Anderson has his heroes. First, among his crushes
is Clark Clifford, whom he characterizes as "the golden
boy". Second, is McGeorge Bundy whom he describes with
awe as a man of all talents. However, there is a credibility gap
here. He expatiates on the extraordinary influence which
Bundy exercised over Kennedy in foreign policy decisions.
He fails to point out that foreign policy was Kennedy's
least a failure. Moreover, he was not the mastermind, but
bundied us into some pretty smelly situations, both in his
service under Kennedy and under Johnson.

This is a book which is strong on characterization, but
often woefully weak on interpretation. But it explores a little
known field.

Haiti is the most abysmally impoverished nation in the
Americas. The average yearly income of its 4,500,000
people is $70— the lowest in the hemisphere. But, for
questionable political reasons, Haiti has been virtually cut
off from U.S. aid since 1962. Last year, its only help from
the U.S. was $2 million for malaria control (a United
Nations project), and $1.3 million in surplus food. During
the last 7 years, the U.S. has poured out to other Latin
American countries, in Alliance for Progress give-aways
alone, $9 billion.

Haiti's troubles go back to President Kennedy who started
out in 1961 to "reform" Latin American nations under
dictatorship. To get rid of President Duvalier became a
top project. When Johnson became President, he softened
the policy in most countries, but made little change in Haiti.

President Duvalier's rule is disliked by many Americans,
but there is no reason to believe that Haiti would secure a
better President if he fell. On the plus side, it must be remem­
bered that Duvalier rejected a Russian offer of development
aid, when he found that it had political strings. He is an anti­
Communist shield against Castro’s Cuba, of which he is the
nearest neighbor.

Certainly, non-approval of Duvalier should not be used
as an excuse for penalizing the needy poor of Haiti. Such
penalization is happening now.

A little noted instance of Johnson administration flabbi­
ness in the face of Leftist protest was the shelving of Project
Camelot last year, by Presidential order.

The Department of Defense, deeply concerned over the
Castro-supported guerrilla activities in Colombia, Guate­
mala and other vulnerable countries, came up in 1967 with
the proposal that there should be an authoritative on-the-
ground study by recognized sociologists of how to cope with
guerrillas—a study which would be helpful to American
officials.

Before the program could get underway, it was greeted
with a snarling and apparently planned attack by U. S.
Leftists and their counterparts in Latin America. Even in
such a remote spot as the annual meeting of the American
Sociological Association, a group of Marxist-minded young­
er sociologists raised the demand that their colleagues
should boycott the project. The loudest outcry in South
America was in Chile. Ralph A. Dungan, a Kennedy pro­
tegé, was then U. S. Ambassador to Chile. Supporting
the clamor, he enlisted support in the State Department. To still
the protests, President Johnson, instead of backing his own
Defense Department, complacently ordered the termination
of Project Camelot. Apparently, the Leftists were afraid of
some of the truths which a searching inquiry into guerrilla­
ism might bring to light.

The incident prompts the conjecture how many other
worthwhile anti-Communist efforts are quietly smothered
in Washington, when the Leftists and their backers put in
the needle.
PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GIVE-AWAY PANAMA TREATIES are in real trouble. Nobody can predict the attitude of the two-man Military Junta which seized the government from President Arias's jittery hands on October 11th. Arias's fall was Johnson's loss. It is now clear that Arias was ready to sign the Johnson treaties, as his reward to Washington for aiding him to be certified as President. As a part of the plan, General Bolivar Vallarino, long-time Commander of the National Guard, resigned his command and was slated to be Arias's envoy to Washington to negotiate the ratification of the treaties. All these plans went up in the air when Col. Jose M. Pinilla and Col. Bolivar Urrutia deposed Arias in a 1-hour bloodless revolt. Arias and 128 of his followers fled to the Canal Zone, thence Arias later went to Washington. The incompetence of the U.S. staff in Panama is shown by the fact that they were taken completely off guard by the revolt.

Nobody takes seriously Arias's charge that the Junta is Communist-infiltrated. Arias made a ludicrous spectacle of himself in Washington, calling upon the U.S. to intervene militarily in Panama "just as it did in the Dominican Republic". His plea was treated with cold indifference.

So far, a large number of the Latin American governments, and Spain, have recognized the Pinilla government. Our own State Department grimly fell into line on Nov. 14th.

NIXON'S CAMPAIGN DEMAND FOR "TRADE INSTEAD OF AID" sent cold chills down the backs of the Alliance for Progress bureaucracy. Already dismayed by the Congress cut of Alliance appropriations for next year from $625 million to $270 million, the Latin American "experts", who have no other program for the Americas except U.S. handouts, are a demoralized crowd. They are afraid that the day of reckoning is not far ahead.

WHEN PUERTO RICO LIQUIDATED the 28-year-old Munoz Marin regime in its gubernatorial election, the last survivor of the Kennedy "social revolutionary" coterie in Latin America disappeared from the scene. Munoz Marin began his career as the leader of the Puerto Rican Socialists and an advocate of independence from the U.S. He made many shifts and turns during his long reign, but he was always a master politician.

This year he split his own party by refusing to renominate Governor Sanchez, and Louis C. Ferre, his long rival, won the Governorship. Ferre, one of the richest men in Puerto Rico, is a responsible supporter of free enterprise, and a proven friend of the U.S. Puerto Rico has taken a decisive step forward.

McNAMARA. If any Americans were under the illusion that we were going to get rid of old 'Edsel car' McNamara by shifting him to the Presidency of the World Bank, they had better change their thinking. McNamara is all set for the job of bossing the economy of the world. He is going to make loans to countries at the rate of $2 billion a year. Latin America will be getting between $700 and $800 million a year, as contrasted with a present $350 million. This money will go into development, on McNamara specifications. McNamara has taken time off to engage in an acrimonious debate with President Ongania of Argentina, over birth control. He proposes to make loans for "population control." This may have some validity for overpopulated nations like India. But in the thinly populated countries of Latin America it all sounds rather pointless. There are vast undeveloped interiors in most Latin American countries. What Latin America needs, more than birth control, is a back-to-the-land movement such as the U.S. experienced after the Civil War. They need to get the desamparados out of the cities. Increased welfare for the desamparados isn't going to do this.

THE FORD FOUNDATION is getting ready to build bridges to Castro's Cuba. It has already allocated $125,000 to send U. S. scholars to Cuba for "research". It has authorized Richard Adams, Texas University sociology professor, to contact the State Department and Cuba's Capt. Antonio Nunez Jimenez to launch such a program. In promoting this plan, the Ford Foundation is cooperating with the Latin American Studies Association, which got a Ford grant of $100,000 in 1968. The project looks harmless at this stage, but it is the thin opening wedge to further cooperation with Castro. Why doesn't Bundy try to find cooperating Cuban intellectuals among the 200,000 anti-Castro exiles in Miami? The cream of the Cuban intelligentsia is not in Cuba but in the United States.

A GREAT LOSS TO THE U. S. is the retirement from Congress of Armistead L. Selden Jr. of Alabama. For ten years, Selden has headed the House Foreign Affairs Sub-committee on Inter-American Affairs. In his final report to Congress, Mr. Selden issued a timely warning against the increased volume of Communist subversive activities in Mexico City. The only nation in Latin America still recognizing Castro's Cuban Regime, Mr. Selden disclosed that Mexico City has become a "vital transfer point" for both Cuban and Soviet agents who come and go to the various Latin American countries on the 70 daily international airflights to and from Mexico City. The Soviet Embassy in Mexico is overstuffed with 100 attaches who, it is suspected, are mostly engaged in subversive work.

---

AMERICA'S CRACK-UP IN PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single copies</td>
<td>$ .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 copies</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 copies</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 copies</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF IN PANAMA?

(A longer booklet, giving the backgrounds of the present situation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single copies</td>
<td>$ .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 copies</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 copies</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 copies</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 2, 1960

Mr. Vincent J. Velella
Triboro Republican Club, Inc.
247 East 116th Street
New York 29, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Velella:

It was a pleasure to receive your letter telling us of the fine work that the Triboro Republican Club, Inc. carried out during the recent campaign. We value the great effort and dedication to our cause put forth by you and your colleagues.

Needless to say, the challenge of the next four years looms large, but fortunately we finally have a President who will be able to meet it.

Mr. Nixon has been apprised of your letter, and has asked that we extend to you and your fellow members his appreciation of your fine work.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President-elect

HRH/mc
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ANNA ACCARDO
RALPH ABROGIANO
RICHARD BAIR
CARRIE BENEDUCE
DR. ROBERT BAIRD
ED. BERARD
LUCY BRADSHAW
FRANK CALANDRO
NICK CASSIERI
JOSEPH CHIARCHIO
FRED P. CINCOTTI
RICHARD COLLURA
ANDREA E. COPPOLA
PASQUALE CRUZ
NANCY CRUZ
JOHN CURCIO
DANIEL DE PETRIS
RAYMON TORRES FIGUEROA
CARMELO TORRES FIGUEROA
VICTOR TORRES FIGUEROA
MARY FIGUEROA
AMERICO GONZALEZ
JOSEPHINE GUAPIO
INRI KADJI
LLOYD JOSEPH
ALEX LEPORI
HARRY LIFRIERI
MICHAEL MAGLIANO
CARLO J. MARANO
DR. CARMEN MARRERO
JOSEFINA MATOS
AGNES MASON
CARLOS MORALES
RAMIRO MOURE
ANGELO NIGRO
MARGARET PALUMBO
FELICE PELLERINO
LUCA PEPE
JOHN PERROTTA
MINNIE PUGLIESE
MARY PUGLIESE
ANTHONY RAIMONE
ESPERANZA SEMEDDE
GLADYS SEMEDDE
PINKIE SMITH
MICHAEL STONA
PAUL TANTILLO
FANNIE TESTA
CARMEN TORRES
JAMES TESTA
FRANK TRINCHESE
GAETANO TUDISCO
ARTHUR VOLPE
GUY VELELLA

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

REGALADA TORRES       VINCENT J. VELELLA

December 4, 1968

Hon. H.R. Halderman
Pierre Hotel
Fifth Avenue & 61st Street
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Halderman,

As is the custom at the conclusion of each election, I report on the activities conducted on behalf of our organization.

Among the usual chores of canvassing in person and by telephone, addressing social, fraternal and veteran organization, we sent out a direct mail appeal to all the voters in our assembly district.

Altho our district is 90% Negro and Puerto Rican, and finding extremely strong resistance to our ticket, we continued a constant stream of campaigning in attempts to soften the resistance.

Our campaign to the white voters was geared towards convincing them that a vote for the Third Party candidate was a wasted vote and really a vote for the opposition.

I personally sent out 7500 letters throughout New York State to groups with whom I am active such as clients, veterans and various Italo American groups, asking for their vote as a Presidential Elector. Being active in the aforementioned groups, I was able to channel volunteers to various local campaign committees.
I am enclosing photograph of the very First sign that was erected for our candidates. (Local Newspapers reported that this sign was the First in the Nation as it was erected 3 days after the Nixon nomination.)

It is my considered opinion from 35 years experience in politics that our activities were largely responsible for holding down the opposition vote in our district and reducing the usual Democratic plurality.

Respectfully Submitted

Vincent J. Velella
November 14, 1968

Dear Sir,

You may perhaps recall the telephone conversation which we had prior to my departure from our home in Florida during the convention period, with regard to my contact with General Hickey in furtherance of Mr. Nixon's candidacy abroad. No doubt you received my letter of Oct 24, 1968 from Germany.

May I take this opportunity on behalf of Mrs. Vyner and myself to extend our heartiest congratulations on the well earned and gratifying successful campaign and victory and also upon your selection by Mr. Nixon for the important tasks ahead.

The trust and confidence, as expressed by the President-elect upon your recent appointment as Chief of the White House staff, bespeaks the ability, leadership and confidence in you, so vital to a successful and inspiring administration.

My personal observation during the past several years indicates how much can be done to improve the American image abroad. I would be pleased to offer, if you so desire, certain specific comments and suggestions in this regard.

Please feel free to request such help as may be rendered in any capacity in which we may be privileged to serve.

Respectfully,

LOUIS W. VYNER
PRESIDENT
January 14, 1969

Mr. Lloyd B. Waring
Kidder, Peabody & Co.
75 Federal Street
Boston 1, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Waring:

Rose Woods passed to me your note and Mr. Brad Washburn's comments concerning his proposal that the President-elect institute a series of TV chats with the people of the nation.

I am taking the liberty of passing this correspondence on to Bud Wilkinson, Special Assistant to the President-elect, for his perusal. I am sure Mr. Washburn will hear further from Mr. Wilkinson's office in the near future.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President-elect

HRH:ds

cc: Rose Woods
    Bud Wilkinson (w/correspondence)
January 7, 1969

Dear Miss Wood:

I have today received the enclosed from Brad Washburn, head of the Museum of Science, Boston.

It seems to me to contain some constructive thoughts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Enclosure:
Since the era of F.D.R., no president has managed to establish close personal rapport with a large proportion of the electorate. Ike was loved and respected by many --- but a great many of his strong supporters still were not very excited about his ability as an administrator and his grasp of that aspect of the presidency.

Roosevelt's fireside chats could be repeated, but such a move would instantly draw all sorts of Democratic backfire. They also were indeed chatty, never involved anyone else but F.D.R. and didn't give in-depth feel of the ability of the key people in the administration, the president's respect for them and his understanding of their jobs.

Everyone (even many who voted for Dick Nixon) now wonders how the new president will perform in office. This is not only a challenge to Dick Nixon and his team, but a unique opportunity as well.

In order to establish the new president's likeable and trustworthy personality, to fortify the public's opinion of him as an administrator (as well as of those to whom he is now delegating so much authority) I'd suggest that he inaugurate a brand-new series of TV chats with the people of the USA --- quarterly at the start, more if they appear to be successful.

Some meetings would be held at the White House. Others might be held at other key offices in Washington --- or indeed at exciting points of focus in the operation of the government: as at an Apollo launch, a government laboratory where thrilling work was being done, etc.
The President would open each session alone with a brief resume of who were his guests and the importance of their work in the whole national perspective --- and how important this work is to you, the citizen. He would then introduce his principal guest and, supported by maps, graphs, or even movies in the field, he would present the vital work in which he and his departments are involved --- with appropriate remarks from time to time by the President. Occasionally, other experts could be brought in to fill in exciting detail. This should present our government as a team of competent human, people --- people of quality, ability and dedication, doing a complex and important job. They should show why it is important, reveal exciting accomplishments, difficult problems, hopes and occasionally describe a failure to emphasize that this is all a human business. Behind the scenes at the State Department, Defense, Education, Agriculture, etc. could be fascinating.

No president since F.D.R. could possibly have done this until now, as it requires an MC (the President) who is completely relaxed and able to ad lib effectively and convincingly on TV. Dick Nixon has shown that he can be superb at this. The professional Democrats hate him because he is good at it.

Everyone (except possibly Ken Galbraith!) will come to trust him and respect him if he shows how our government is being run and who is running it. In departments which don't have convincing TV personalities at the top, the focus of the show could be borne more heavily by the President or speedily switched to people further down the line who are tops --- and a top executive is always judged by the public's respect and confidence in those to whom he
is delegating the work. Every department in the federal government has plenty of exciting people in it and lots of understandable and, indeed, thrilling material for a show of this sort.

This country is in critical need of confidence in and enthusiasm for those at the top. This show might do more to reduce the cynicism of youth than anything else that could be done at this time. It could also point out the important opportunities in the federal government of which few citizens are aware. Few have had much faith, respect and confidence in those aloft in the USA for quite a while. It must be reestablished mighty fast and mighty firmly or we will be in for serious trouble.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Henry Loomis
FROM: Bob Haldeman
RE: Letter from J.J. Wuerthner, Jr. of January 6, 1969 concerning Hoover-type Commission in natural resources areas January 13, 1969

Do you have any thoughts on this one?

HRH/mc
encl.
bbc;
Ken Cole (W/LTR)
Mr. Abbott Washburn
4622 Broad Branch Road
Washington, D.C.

Dear Abbott:

The proper direction for the original of the Duhl letter is to Ray Price, with copies to Henry Loomis and Bob Haldeman.

Keep up the good work, and very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Thomas W. Evans

TWE/jb
November 19, 1968

Dear Ray,

Len Duhl sent this to me primarily, I judge, because we are good friends and he was our neighbor here before moving to Berkeley.

The idea is a good one, don't you think? But probably somewhat premature. Certainly the new Administration, in due course, will have to establish a dialogue with the academic community.

Yours,

Abbott Washburn

Mr. Raymond K. Price, Jr.
Office of the President-Elect
450 Park Avenue
New York City, N. Y.
10022
Mr. Abbott Washburn
4622 Broad Branch Road, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Dear Abbott:

I have been empowered by the Committee on Lectures at the University of California to begin to explore with you the possibility of a series of public lectures on the evolving National policies of the Nixon Administration.

What we would hope—dependent on today's results—is that we could have four or five major statements of public policy on:

---international,
---domestic,
---urban, health, housing, etc.,
---economic policy.

Feeling that the new administration would want both a public forum and an opportunity for interaction with the academic community, we would hope that you could give this a top priority.

Surely much of this has come out in position papers for the campaign. However, once the campaign is over, a clarification of direction, goals and immediate priorities would be important, both for the nation, and to the administration itself.

Cordially,

Leonard J. Duhl, M.D.
Professor of Public Health and Urban Social Policies

LJD:

cc: Professor William B. Fretter