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January 12, 1969

Charles E. Young
Chancellor
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Chuck:

Thanks very much for sending on the information on Mike Levett. I will be involved in the final selection of White House Fellows, and I am glad to have your evaluation of Mike. As a matter of fact, I completely agree with you. Obviously, at this point, I can't predict the outcome of the selection process, but I am sure he has a good chance.

Hope to see you soon.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman

bcc: J. Wilkinson (w/1tr)

HRH: ds
Mr. H. R. Haldeman  
465 S. Muirfield Road  
Los Angeles, California 90005  

Dear Bob:  

I have just completed and forwarded a recommendation for Michael Levett for a White House Fellowship. He is a third year law student and currently editor of the Daily Bruin and besides being one of the brightest and most articulate young men I have known in a long time, he has to be one of the most reasonable. He is a voice of sanity in what many people think is a completely insane world. Throughout the current series of campus crises across the country he has consistently and convincingly called for reason as opposed to confrontation. At the same time he is in no means a "tool of the administration" and keeps us all on our toes with his uncanny ability to zero in on administrative weak links, both people and policies.

In short, Mike is good and would both contribute much and gain much if he were to be granted a fellowship.

I don't know if you are going to participate in the selection, if you will have final say, or what have you, but I do want you to be aware of Mike's interest and my enthusiastic support of his candidacy. He's a live one, and one I don't think you would ever regret having on your team as a fellow.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Young  
Chancellor
January 13, 1969

Dr. William A. Yoell
1879 Crompond Road
Building D-2
Peekskill, New York 10566

Dear Dr. Yoell:

I have forwarded the material you provided to the appropriate people on the research staff of the President-elect. I am sure they will be interested in reviewing your comments and suggestions.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the President-elect

HRA/mc
cc Martin Anderson
January 3, 1963

Mr. William A. Yoell, Director
Behavior Research Institute
1879 Crompond Road
Building D-2
Peachskill, New York 10566

Dear Mr. Yoell:

Thank you very much for your interesting and informative study concerning voting behavior and patterns.

I have forwarded it to the appropriate members of our staff and I would imagine they would wish to meet with you some time in the future, to discuss in more detail what you have set forth.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman
Assistant to the
President-elect

cc Messrs. Ehrlichman
Keogh
Buchanan
Sears

For your attention. Please circulate.

HRH
December 9, 1968

Mr. Russell Ziegler  
Executive Director  
Business Advisory Committee for Nixon-Agnew  
530 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10036

Dear Russell:

Thank you very much for forwarding the final list of the Advisory Committee.

Needless to say, the committee was a tremendous asset to the campaign and will be a tremendous help in the talent search.

Best wishes.

Cordially,

H. R. Haldeman  
Assistant to the  
President-elect

HRH:co
Mr. Robert Haldeman  
Special Assistant to President-Elect Nixon  
Hotel Pierre  
5th Avenue - 61st St.  
New York, N.Y.

Dear Bob:

Attached is our final list on the Advisory Committee for Nixon-Agnew for your files. We are currently helping with the talent search. If I can be of any help, please call me.

Sincerely yours,

Russell Ziegler

RZ:MP  
Enc
January 7, 1969
MEMORANDUM
TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

As you read the attached memorandum which I have sent to Keogh, I would like for you to ask each Cabinet officer to assign one of their closest and most trusted associates within their Department to prepare a paper for each Department on what they inherited from the outgoing Administration.

The problem we are confronted with here is that unless we develop these facts now we will not have a yardstick to measure our own performance, and also will not be able to prepare the political comments which must inevitably be made as we go into 1970 and 1972.

I do not want you to send a memorandum on this. I think it can best be handled by a personal telephone call to each.

Memoranda should not be sent on political matters since one of them is undoubtedly likely to get out and appear in the newspaper. I want you to see to it that all of the members of the White House staff have the good judgment not to write memoranda on strictly political matters. Use the telephone or personal conversation.

Perhaps Ellsworth could make a study in this respect with regard to the independent agencies.
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Keogh

FROM: RN

cc: Bob Haldeman

I would like to have the research team, under your direction, develop a paper for me which we may later decide can be made available to some of our political figures, on what we inherit as we take over from Johnson in terms of VietNam and other failures in foreign policy abroad, as well as problems at home.

Perhaps one way to get at this is to compare the situation today with what it was when Eisenhower left office in 1960.
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman/John Ehrlichman
FROM: RN

One point that should be made to all Cabinet officials (I imagine that most of them have already taken this into consideration) is that they get the best possible evaluation of the career people in their departments.

All of the recommendations of our reorganization task force lean hard on this point. The tendency, naturally, is to think almost exclusively at this time of the appointees we will be naming, but the quality of the career people and where they are placed will make or break the Cabinet official.

Don't write a memorandum on this. I think that a telephone call to each Cabinet official, reminding them of this, might be in order.

It will not be necessary, incidentally, to call Rogers or Laird. I know both of them have already moved in this direction-

The other Cabinet officials, however, I think could well use this kind of a reminder.
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

Before the end of the week I would like a report on the correspondence and statement specialists you are trying to find for me.

I would like for you to also give me a report as to what we are going to do with regard to the staff secretary position which Goodpaster filled for Eisenhower and in which he sat in on National Security Council meetings, and also some meetings in the President's office and followed up on decisions that the President made. This is not something which you can undertake with your administrative responsibilities which will keep you too busy to handle a great amount of detail as well.

I want you to have a talk with Goodpaster, as I indicated in a previous memo, see what is needed, and then give me a recommendation as to the man (I believe he should be a military man) for the position.
January 9, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

Ray Moley urged that Bob Finch find a place for Chuck Lichtenstein.

You can consider this, having in mind the fact that Bob may need three or four very loyal people close in who can help him on the research side.

I do not know whether he would consider Chuck Lichtenstein thus qualified, but Moley has a very high regard for him.
January 8, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

One area where we have missed the boat again is with regard to sending wires to the Governors as they were inaugurated. I suppose that we have covered the base to an extent by having sent notes or wires of congratulation, although those were sent so late that some of them may have been miffed.

At this point, I think a letter might well go to those Governors who were inaugurated and I would limit it to the Republican Governors.

"This is just a note to extend my warmest congratulations to you on the occasion of your inauguration as Governor of ________." (Now, where it is someone who is inaugurated for a 2nd or a 3rd term put that in -- Charlie can give you the information.)

"I shall look forward to working with you over the next four years, and I will appreciate your giving me the benefit of your counsel on issues which confront the nation during that period."

"With every good wish for the New Year,"
MEMORANDUM

TO: JOHN D. ERLICHMAN
FROM: EDWARD L. MORGAN
SUBJECT: ROY ASH - CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The following proposal is submitted as one under which Roy Ash could accept a position on Mr. Nixon's staff. It must be emphasized that this proposal does not presume to solve any or all of the appearance problems that could surround Mr. Ash's acceptance of such a position. In fact, the administration should be absolutely prepared to defend this decision.

1. Mr. Ash must make a full disclosure of any and all interests held by his wife and children as well as those he holds.

2. Resignation of his position with Litton Industries. This means a total severance of all business relations although pension funds or stock options may be retained. Any stock options should be placed in trust and their exercise placed in the sole discretion of the trustee.

3. All stocks held by Mr. & Mrs. Ash should be placed in a blind trust during his term with the President. The children's stock should be placed in a separate trust. No useful purpose will be served in attempting to rearrange any of Litton's businesses, besides it is totally impractical. It would be advisable that Mr. Ash contribute no articles or advice to the publication "Government Executive" during his tenure.

The administration must be fully aware of Litton's huge involvement in the defense industry, its numerous foreign plants, and the fact its subsidiaries are currently bidding on large government contracts. Further, Litton's machine tool interests are supplying, via subcontract, all of the machine tools for the Fiat plant currently under construction in Russia.

4. Mr. Ash's interest in the Litton stock partnership with Mr. Thornton should be placed in trust leaving all of the management and investment decisions to Mr. Thornton.

5. The Ash mutual fund investments may remain as they are.

6. There is no need to tinker with Mrs. Ash's interest in the J.J. Hagerty Co since no government contracts are involved.

7. Mr. Ash may remain in his land partnership with Mr. Thornton provided:
   a. No new land leases are negotiated during his tenure
   b. No land trades are negotiated with the Bureau of Land Mgmt
   c. Renewal of leases are executed in the ordinary course of business

Otherwise, it is recommended that Mr. Ash terminate the partnership.
January 4, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman

FROM: RN

See if someone on the staff can prepare a note of condolence to the Garland children. I think there may be only two. If there are only two, write a note to each. Possibly the best thing to do is to write to the oldest. But I would like to have someone prepare this note, since this is a good way to test the staff and see if we have somebody who can do this.
AHB68 (23) (14) LC150
L LSE586 LL214 LL214 PDB LOS ANGELES CALIF 27 NFT
WOODS, ROSE MARY
CARE HOTEL PIERRE FIFTH AVE AT 61 ST NYK
SADDENED TO INFORM YOU THAT MOTHER PASSED AWAY EARLY THIS
MORNING AFTER A BRIEF ILLNESS
QUEEN BABCOCK BILL GARLAND.

2675 E. California Blvd.
Pasadena, Calif.

11 AM Services Monday St. Andrew's Episcopal Church

American Cancer Society
instead of flowers
January 8, 1969

TO: HALDEMAN
FROM: RN

Since so many people are now in the act, I want you to coordinate the statement that Kennedy called me about last night which he wants me to issue with regard to Johnson's Budget. A copy of the statement has been sent to McCracken, Harlow and to Burns for their suggestions. Harlow, of course, will run it by the legislative leaders.

I simply don't have the time to see each of these people individually to get their views. The critical problem is the last paragraph of the statement (we are beyond the point of decision as to whether we make any statement at all. Kennedy has already agreed that we will make some kind of a statement and unless we do so Johnson will submit a budget without the surtax which will be absolutely impossible for us to cut or to work with. It is in our interest to have him submit a budget with the surtax extended but he will not do so unless we make some kind of a statement.)

With regard to the last paragraph, it should be changed along these lines...

"The Administration's projected budget for fiscal year 1970 is based on two assumptions: 1) that the war in Vietnam will continue and that war spending will be maintained at its present rate. 2) that domestic programs will be continued as
recommended and projected by the Johnson Administration.

If these two assumptions are accepted, the Congress would have no other choice except to extend the surtax in order to obtain a balanced budget. I would support such action under such circumstances.

It should be clearly understood two developments could make significant changes in the budget estimates which will be submitted by the new Administration:

1) Progress and Peace Talks in Paris could reduce the level of spending for military purposes.
2) Our Administration has a number of approaches to domestic problems as well as several recommendations for economies which we believe may reduce the spending level for domestic purposes.

In the event that significant progress is made on either of these two fronts, the new Administration will re-evaluate the question of whether the surtax should be continued at its present rate.

FURTHER MEMO TO HALDEMAN:

I am not wedded to this language but this is the substance of the thought that needs to get into this statement. Do what you can to see that the various people involved can work something out which will get by Johnson.

# # #
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Arthur Burns
    Dr. Paul McCracken
    Mr. Bryce Harlow

FROM: Rose Mary Woods

The President-Elect would like you to look
over the attached suggested statement which Secretary
designate Kennedy called in, and then be back in touch by
your
around noon tomorrow with/suggestions.

He particularly does not like the last sentence
as he thinks it is dangerous, but LBJ has been insisting
on this with Mr. Kennedy. In other words, RN would like
to have a little more running room and wants to be protected
on any statement on spending and the sur tax.
Statement by
President-Elect Richard Nixon

President Johnson today revealed his new 1970 budget figures showing expenditures of 195 billion; receipts of 198 billion and a budget surplus of 3 billion for the year beginning July 1, 1969. The incoming Administration did not participate in anyway in the formulation of that budget. As soon as details are available we will begin to examine it carefully program by program.

Thanks to the bi-partisan enactment last summer of the 10% surtax and accompanying expenditure control, the budget shows restraint in spending plane. As a result of this expression of fiscal responsibility, a deficit of more than 25 billion dollars last year is being followed by a projected budget surplus this year and next. I have repeatedly said that the 10% surtax should be reduced or removed as soon as the budget outlook and economic conditions permit. President Johnson has consistently taken the same position. He has now recommended a one year extension of the 10% surtax. He has also suggested that if the situation in Vietnam has improved sufficiently the Congress should consider reducing or eliminating the surtax on an earlier schedule.

This action of President Johnson preserves the options of my Administration. It protects us against a budget deficit should a solution of Vietnam prove difficult to achieve but it also indicates his determination and mine to move towards an end to the surtax at the earliest practicable date. Therefore, on the basis of the facts I now have I will support this action and urge my party to do the same.

# # # # #
January 8, 1969

Phoned in by Dr. McCracken. Bryce and he are skeptical. McC will talk to Kennedy within next 30 minutes.

In his budget message, President Johnson projects expenditures of $195 billion, receipts of $198 billion, and a surplus of $3 billion. Thanks to the bipartisan enactment last summer of expenditure controls and surtax, therefore, last year's deficit of more than $25 million is being followed by a projected surplus this year and next.

This elimination of a large deficit has been an important first step in regaining control of inflationary conditions -- a step urgently important at home and internationally. This fiscal restraint must continue.

The expenditures projected in the budget message are derived from the assumptions that spending for the Viet Nam war continues at essentially present levels. They also reflect projected costs of civilian programs recommended by the present administration. The incoming administration has not, of course, participated in programmed decisions reflected in President Johnson's budget, and we shall examine these item by item.

In the revenue side the message recommends that the surtax be continued in order that anticipated revenues will cover projected expenditures.

It remains my conviction that this tax should end as soon as the war, the budget outlook, and economic conditions permit. President Johnson, in effect, suggests the same -- that if the Viet Nam situation improves sufficiently, Congress should not consider an earlier reduction or elimination of the surtax.

If expenditures are approved in the levels projected in the message, extension of this tax would be a responsible fiscal action, and I would support it. If, however, expenditures can be held to lower levels through an early resolution of Viet Nam and reevaluation of the projected programs, the surtax could be reduced or eliminated.

It is the goal of this admin...
Suggested revised Draft --

From Bryce Harlow

(This has been read to Kennedy and McCracken -- both like it -- has been read to Dirksen who thinks it is alright).

---

President Johnson's new 1970 budget figures show expenditures of 195 billion; receipts of 198 billion; and a budget surplus of 3 billion for the year beginning July 1, 1969. The incoming Administration did not participate, of course, in the formulation of this budget. When details are available, we will examine it program by program.

Thanks to the bi-partisan enactment of expenditure controls and a 10% surtax last summer, last year's deficit of more than 25 billion dollars is being followed by a projected budget surplus this year and next. It remains my conviction that the surtax should end as soon as the war, the budget outlook and economic conditions permit. President Johnson, who states the same position, now recommends a tentative one year extension of this tax, also suggesting that if the Vietnam situation improves sufficiently, Congress should consider an earlier reduction or elimination of this tax.

In the present circumstances, I consider this a sensible proposal because it affords protection against a major budget deficit should a resolution of the Vietnam War be delayed, while also indicating our determination to remove this tax at the earliest practicable date.
January 8, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: THE PRESIDENT-ELECT
FROM: DR. ARTHUR BURNS

The suggested draft that you sent to me consists of three paragraphs. The first paragraph is fine. The third paragraph is awful from your viewpoint; you should take none of it. The second paragraph needs amendment. I do not think that you should say that "the Budget shows restraint in spending plans, nor do I think you should say as the third and fourth sentences of the paragraph in effect do say that your position and Lyndon Johnson's are the same.

I definitely believe that you should reserve your options with regard to the surcharge as long as possible. You have until about April 15th for a decision. By that time you will have reviewed the Johnson Budget. By that time also you will have decided upon some actions to take with regard to our balance of payments. On or about April 15th, you will be able to take account responsibly of the state of the budget, the state of the economy, the state of the balance of payments and our international political position and then you can make the definite recommendation with regard to the surcharge in the light of these factors.
January 4, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

The enclosed article from the January 2 Los Angeles Times is a pretty good analysis of Hickel's strengths and weaknesses.

Would you give a copy of this to Harlow and also to Mitchell. I again suggest that some effort should be made to put a good strong PR type who knows Washington with him at the earliest possible time. He can be an asset if he gets some good advice.
Storm Front Follows Hickel to Washington

BY STANTON H. PATTY

SEATTLE — A storm front from Alaska named Walter Joseph Hickel will blow into Washington, D.C., this month to be the new secretary of Interior. He could well turn out to be the most controversial appointment in President-elect Nixon's Cabinet.

One thing for sure: the status quo in many parts of the big Interior Department is going to take a beating. Hickel, as governor of Alaska, has pumped up interior agencies ranging from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

But already, trouble-some opposition is developing against Senate confirmation of Hickel. This includes forces in conservation, Indian organizations and the commercial fishing industry. It will come into the open when the Senate Interior Committee holds hearings on Hickel's appointment.

Expects to Win

But Hickel (who never entertains a negative thought) expects to win confirmation. He told a news conference in Anchorage the other day that he "anticipates no great difficulty."

Hickel, 49, is completing the first half of a four-year term as Alaska's second governor since statehood. He won that 1966 election by a margin of only 1,080 votes over the then-incumbent governor, Democrat William A. Egan.

But ever since taking office, the impatient, often brusque governor has been performing as if it were a mandate.

He believes in making waves — and that the wave of the future for America is Alaska, with its treasure box of resources.

Hickel has fought with national and foreign leaders alike and yet has won increased federal attention for Alaska and has helped to wield an important economic union between Japan and the 49th state.

Some Alaskans are delighted with Hickel. Others despise him.

Walter J. Hickel is energetic, imaginative and enthusiastic. He also can be arrogant, narrow and cold.

"Things don't just happen," he says. "Men make them happen."

Hickel, a Golden Gloves welterweight boxing champion back in his native Kansas, is a hard-punching fighter in public life.

Once, during a private conversation in the governor's office in Juneau, he said this about a powerful figure who had opposed one of his programs: "That guy has a tough little s.o.b. on his back now I wouldn't want on mine — me."

Perhaps his hardiness and single-mindedness can be traced in part to his beginnings. Hickel was the son of a tenant farmer near Clatlin, Kan., one of 10 children. Times were rugged.

Hickel, still a teenager, struck out for California with the intention of going on to Australia.

However, he encountered passport and visa problems and decided instead to "punch" his way to Alaska. He had only enough money for a steerage-class ticket on an Alaska-bound steamship.

Borrowed Fare

So, in October, 1940, Hickel stepped onto the pier at Seward, Alaska, with 37 cents in his pockets. He borrowed $10 from a fellow traveler and took the train to Anchorage.

"I knew exactly what I was going to do, and I knew I was going to do it," he called later.

Hickel washed dishes in a Seward restaurant. He then turned to carpentry.

Soon he was building and selling homes in Anchorage, first one and then several at a time.

This was the start of the construction enterprise that now includes motels, housing developments, apartment houses, shopping centers and the posh 150-room Captain Cook Hotel in Anchorage.

— Became Millionaire

Hickel, they say, was a millionaire by the time he decided to challenge Egan for the governor's job.

"There is a better way," was his campaign theme. He would find mixed feelings about the "better way" today in Alaska. But Hickel, an action guy, does have many things in motion.

Hickel's first wife, Jane Cannon, died in Au-
between U.S. ports. The ferry operates, primarily between Alaska and British Columbia. In buying the ferry, he also stepped hard on the sensitive toes of President W. A. C. Bennett of neighboring British Columbia.

Or when he began prodding the federal government to expand its Alaska Railroad into the vast, unpeopled Arctic.

Hickel can inspire incredible loyalty among those closest to him. But he also discards, without pity, those who work for him faithfully but fail to match his tempo and dreams.

"Wally Hickel is a man in a helluva hurry," one associate said.

"Wally Hickel hates to lose," another commented. Delays irritate him. Criticism hurts and sometimes infuriates him. He is a dapper dresser who enjoys elegance but can turn on the vocabulary of an Alaskan miner when the occasion is right.

More often than not, despite his impatience and lack of tact, Hickel lands on his feet.

Switches to Nixon
Witness the recent presidential race. Hickel was an early supporter of New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. But when Rockefeller withdrew from the contest, Hickel threw himself at full speed into Nixon's camp.

He traveled hard for Nixon, appearing all over the country as a surrogate (stand-in) speaker for the then GOP nominee. Then on Dec. 11 Nixon named Hickel as his choice for interior secretary.

As governor, Hickel has made some controversial appointments.

Probably the one that ranks among Alaskans most was the naming of Thomas E. Kelly as state commissioner of natural resources. That department includes regulation of Alaska's booming oil industry.

At the time of his appointment, Kelly, 39, was general manager of Alaska operations for the Texas-based Halbouty Alaska Oil Co. He is a foster son of Michael T. Halbouty, a wealthy Texan who was one of the first independent oil-gas operators to recognize Alaska's oil-producing potential.

One Alaska newspaper said at the time that Kelly's selection was like "putting a fox in charge of the hen house."

Soon in Controversy
Hickel's blunt views put him in hot water soon after Nixon tapped him to be interior secretary.

The governor, who has carried on a running feud with the man he is slated to succeed, Stewart L. Udall, was asked what he would do about a Udall order temporarily preventing Alaska from acquiring the balance of more than 100 million acres of federal land alloted to it under the 1958 Statehood Act.

The order involves controversial land claims that have been filed by native groups—Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts. The claims cover vast areas of Alaska, including mineral-rich territory, and thus the issue is the most sensitive political question in Alaska.

"What Udall can do by executive order, I can undo," Hickel replied.

The Seattle chapter of the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the Arctic Slope Native Assn. in Alaska swiftly condemned Hickel for that position. Other native groups, which believe that Hickel wants a fair settlement of the claims, have adopted a wait-and-see stance. Hickel favors a fair settlement for the natives and maintains that the Udall land freeze has held back Alaska's economic development.

Conservation Fees
Hickel also quickly antagonized powerful conservation groups by announcing that he would open more federal land to the public for recreation. The conservationists now are wondering if a man dedicated to economic development and extraction of resources will be able to work for conservation, too.

Then early one morning recently at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, while he was returning to Alaska from Washington, D.C., Hickel was asked by reporters about a statement by Rep. Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash.), who had expressed skepticism about Hickel's appointment.

"Who is Julia Butler Hansen?" Hickel replied. "Mrs. Hansen, a master of the legislative process, is chairman of the Interior subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Hickel, if confirmed as interior secretary, will have to appear before Mrs. Hansen's subcommittee to defend his department's budget requests.

Hickel since has moderated and modified some of his public views. He said he even has apprised himself about the formidable Mrs. Hansen and is looking forward to meeting and working with her.

Most Alaskans, whatever their personal feelings about Hickel, are proud to have an Alaskan in the Cabinet for the first time.

They also are mindful of some past interior secretaries, such as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Harold L. Ickes and Dwight D. Eisenhower's Douglas MacKay, who they feel treated Alaska like a colonial fief in territorial days.

Hickel, if he will learn the art of diplomacy and the technique of "patronage" in Washington, D.C. too confusing, is in a position to do important things for Alaska—and the rest of the states he will be obliged to serve.

In speeches outside Alaska as governor, he has used the phrase "49 states and a country" to illustrate Alaska's unique problems and needs.

Now he will have to be an important member of the interior for all 50 states. This will not be easy to do.

Whatever happens, it won't be dull.
January 4, 1969
MEMORANDUM
TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

I am not going to assume any responsibility for preparing the bread and butter letters to the head of the Rose Bowl and whoever was responsible for the Anaheim rally -- or for any of the other events where such letters will be expected from me.

This is a good test of our general staff. I want letters prepared for my signature and put on my desk sometime this next week.

The number of letters of this type that we can now write will have to be sharply curtailed. If, for example, letters are to go to the security types just let me see a form and I will have them signed by auto pen. On the other hand, Asa Call, who put on the luncheon for Finch, should have a personal letter prepared for my signature.

Will you assign somebody to this job and test them out until we find the right person to assume this responsibility in the future?
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: RMW
FROM: RN

Dick Ogilvie wants a picture — one of the larger ones for framing.

Would you send one in to me for an autograph.
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Rogers

FROM: RN

cc: Henry Kissinger

At the beginning of a new Administration I believe that an analysis of the qualifications of all of our Ambassadors abroad, career as well as non-career, should be made. While the great majority of career men will probably be retained in their present posts, the beginning of a new Administration is a good time to move some of the dead wood out and to move some of the unqualified men from one post to a less sensitive one.

In my travels abroad I have, of course, seen the usual number of political appointees who weren't qualified for the job they held, but I have also seen a number of career men who were pretty inadequate and who should be replaced.

I think a very hard-head analysis should be made just as soon as we take over on January 20 so that any changes can be made within the first two or three months that we are in office. If we delay beyond that point we will be subject to the charge of being vindictive, personal or political. Changes at this time, of course, will be expected.
January 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: RMW
FROM: RN

The next time you get a request for a favorite hymn, you might give them the name of one that is not well-known, but which I often played on the piano, with my own arrangement.

The title is, "He Will Hold Me Fast."
January 3, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman

FROM: RN

SUBJECT: Jeff Donfeld

Tricia has spoken to John Ehrlichman with regard to Jeff Donfeld's desire to be considered for a White House staff position. My recollection is that he got pretty high marks as an advance man. More importantly, he has the additional attributes of having passed the bar in California, has been President of the student body at UCLA, and has a Jewish background.

In view of the fact that there has been considerable grumbling to the effect that too many of our 20 to 30 year old White House staffers were from J. Walter Thompson it might be well to consider him for a position, either on the Counsel staff or in another area where he would be qualified. Since this is the only position in which Tricia has indicated some interest, I would like for you and Ehrlichman to discuss it and come up with a recommendation.

If the White House staff should not be the appropriate place, perhaps John Mitchell might consider him for Justice. Or Bob Finch might want him on his Counsel staff over at HEW. Incidentally, he might be a good man to work with Bud Wilkinson.
December 9, 1968

TO: Richard M. Nixon
FROM: Maurice H. Stans

I had a visit last week from J. Howard Pew, who has asked that I convey to you personally the subject of the discussion.

It is his opinion that there has been a great amount of graft and corruption during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He believes that the proportions eclipse anything in modern times and involve billions of dollars. It is his opinion that you ought to set up a structure to investigate all such matters, very early in your administration, so that the responsibility can be pinned upon your predecessors.

In his discussion, he referred particularly to welfare programs and to foreign aid in both of which he thinks waste and dishonesty have been of high proportions.

He proposes that you set up a special group somewhere in the government to collect leads, make investigations and develop facts. Such knowledge could then be the basis of assignment of requests to the Comptroller General, to Congress, or to agencies for full investigations. He went so far as to indicate that if it were necessary to get outside funds for these purposes, he would assist in raising money for the investigations.

My own thought is that there may be something important to what he says, and I would recommend that you consider the following two steps:

1. Issuing a call to all government employees for the highest honesty and integrity in fulfilling their stewardship, beyond any questions of conflict of interest.

2. Creating a small special group to monitor and direct the pursuit of all indications of previous dishonesty, graft or corruption.

M.H.S.