

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
White House Special Files Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Agenda. Unspecified period or place. 5pgs.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg
48	1	1958	Brochure	Nixon on Nixon. 8 pgs. Only cover scanned.
48	1	05/11/1959	Newspaper	U.S. News and World Report. Only cover scanned.
48	1	04/18/1959	Report	Remarks of Richard M. Nixon before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. 17 pgs.
48	1	n.d.	Newspaper	Photocopy of unspecified newspaper article, Nixon Concentrates on Issues, by William S. White. 1 pg. Not scanned.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
48	1	05/20/1959	Report	Press release from the Office of the Vice President concerning the appointment of Herbert Klein as a Special Assistant. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.
48	1	n.d.	Memo	Handwritten notes from Haldeman. 1 pg.

## AGENDA

### ORGANIZATIONAL

#### Presidential appointees activities

Contact

Intelligence

Communication of party line

#### Congressional Group Activities

Contact

Intelligence

Speech material

Polls

Newsletters

Congressional Record

#### Systematic Check of 1960 Attitudes

Key Party Officials

Elected Public Officials

#### Intelligence

Clippings

State Surveys

Key People

Lines to take on NR

as a Presidential candidate

as a Vice Presidential candidate

Pre-Convention Organization

Committees of 100 approach

Neighbors for Nixon

Youth for Nixon

Role and Merits of Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon people and organization

Planning for 1960 Convention

Committee on Arrangements

Planning on Convention Activities

Legal Research

Presidential preference primaries  
(mimeographed sheet in kit)

Delegate selection

Special contact work with following groups

Ethnic

Jewish

Negro

Labor

Farm

Religious

Educational

Veterans

Eggheads

**PUBLIC RELATIONS**

**Russian Trip**

**Suggestions for trip itself**

**Follow-up**

**Magazines, Books and Articles**

**Friendly**

**Hostile**

**About Others**

**Follow-up on Mase book**

**Acquisition of free space for friendly features on a planned basis**

**Human Interest Stories and Activities**

**Nixon Family**

**Manifestations of Genuine Interest in people**

**Mechanics for handling such items**

**Polls**

**Run-down on polls showing strength with voters**

**National polls**

**State, local and newspaper polls**

**Congressional polls**

**Privately-sponsored polls**

**Timing**

**Polls of special groups**

Media

Mechanics for more TV and radio appearances

Mechanics for more material in magazines

Film projects

for TV

for partisan rallies

for pre-convention use

for campaign use

TV film clips

Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth

Public relations factors

Special Research and Study

Stockpiling of material on subjects of

Inflation

Unemployment

Russia and Communism

Agriculture

Slogans and Theme for pre-convention and campaign periods

United Republican approach

Letters to the Editor

Assessment of project to date

Preparation of Mailing Lists

Approach and methods for improvement of position with following groups

Ethnic  
Jewish  
Negro  
Labor  
Farm  
Religious  
Educational  
Veterans  
Eggheads

Public Relations Themes to be Developed

Unique and practically unparalleled qualifications for Presidency

Spokesman for 13 Western States

A man who gets things done the right way

Spokesman for Mr. and Mrs. Average America (not a rich guy)

Capacity to unite America (Americans want this)

Advantages of Democratic disunity

Effective answers to the "I just don't like him" Set

(Here's what one of our friends had to say on this subject recently:

"As you so well know, there is a large group of people who say they don't like him. You ask them why and they have no real, basic reason. They say they just don't like him. It is here that the little research I've done has shown a rather remarkable tendency. These people still 'don't like' him but now they are beginning to say, 'Well, I don't like him very well but I think he is the only man who has the knowledge and ability to run the country in the present crisis in which we find ourselves.' It seems as though that even among this group, which would normally vote against him, there is growing a feeling that the Democrats have no one who could cope with the task of the Presidency, and that he is the only man in the country with the stamina, knowledge, and guts to do the job" )

long group -  
now have distilled list of key guys

→ complete mechanism of keeping logs on  
attitudes of key people  
- fictional post card poll  
set up org to conduct listening post

14 R gov - 10 for RN      Hatfield + Stratton <sup>no</sup> position

send in all clippings

Start listening procedure with advance contacts

committees of 100 or 1000  
Start in Calif. - mid fall  
need to prepare a blueprint  
fund raising  
maybe list 20 names

Yank for RN

set up college clubs - frat trav secys.

*Here, for example, is politician Nixon, talking about the role of the politician in our kind of society:*

“The function of a politician is, after all, to make a free society work. When I’ve been abroad, I’ve often been impressed by the way men with good intentions and high ideals but without political experience tend to fail when they try their hand at the practical business of government—take Indonesia, for example, or Burma. There’s a quotation that expresses what I mean exactly. A German—was it Bismarck? No, I don’t think so. [Editor’s note: It was Frederick the Great.] It goes something like this: ‘The way to punish a province is to allow it to be governed by philosophers.’

“You’ve got to be a politician before you can become a statesman—a lot of people have said that before me. In my own case, when I first came to Washington in 1946, I was a bit naïve about public service, I suppose, a kind of dragon slayer. Then when I got here, I was soon disillusioned. You know, you come to Washington, you have great ideas, and there you are in the committees or on the floor of the House, and you have an inability to implement your ideas. You see men who are—well, I don’t want to sound pious, but less well motivated, and who know how to play the game, and they accomplish what they want. Then there are the Don Quixotes, the idealists—like Jerry Voorhis, my first opponent, a man of very high ideals—who never accomplish anything much.

“You’ve got to learn how to play the game, if you’re going to implement your ideas, and you’ve got to fight it out. You find often you’ve got to take a half a loaf when you want the whole loaf. The best example of a combination of idealist and practical politician is Theodore



Richard Nixon and Stewart Alsop

# NIXON

# ON NIXON

On these two pages the Vice President of the United States reveals his aims and ideals with unprecedented candor. Post Editor Stewart Alsop interviewed Mr. Nixon at length when he was gathering material for the article that follows.

© 1958 The Curtis Publishing Company

Roosevelt. When he wanted to get something done, he would compromise all over the place, if necessary. Read the autobiography of Bob La Follette. La Follette throws off on T.R., says he's not a true liberal because he compromised too much. But who accomplished more, Roosevelt or La Follette?"

*Alsop said that what had impressed him most in his reporting for the article was the extraordinary drive and ambition Nixon had displayed from boyhood. One of Nixon's law-school classmates, for example, remembers Nixon as the hardest-working man he ever met. How did Nixon get that way? Quaker background, family, economic circumstances as a boy, or what?*

"Well, I suppose it was a mixture of all the factors you mention. There was always a tradition of hard work in our family. My grandmother on my mother's side was an extraordinary woman—she came all the way across the country in an old automobile at the age of eighty-eight to see me graduate—and she had a lot of influence on us. She wrote a lot of poetry, and in a sort of gentle Quaker way she was always trying to inspire us all to amount to something.

"My mother had a lot to do with my doing well at school too. She knew German and Latin, and it was because of her that I took Latin all through high school, and got straight A's. Then there was my father. He had a tough time as a boy, very tough. He had to leave school very early—fifth or sixth grade—and go to work. He was a fighter. He loved to argue with anybody about anything. He always instilled this competitive feeling in all of us—I guess I got my competitive instinct from him.

"Both my mother and my father instilled in us this desire to get going, to be good at not just one thing but at everything. We had a disciplined family too—always had to clean

**U.S. News  
& World Report**

The United States News ®

World Report ®

MAY 11, 1959

25 CENTS

**THAW AHEAD  
IN 'COLD WAR'?**

**The  
Changing Mood  
Of America**

**A Nation-Wide Report on What  
People Are Saying . . . Doing . . . Planning**

Remarks  
of  
HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
(and question-and-answer period following)  
before the  
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS  
Presidential Room, Statler Hotel  
Washington, D. C.  
Saturday, April 18, 1959

- - -

THE VICE PRESIDENT: President Healy, my fellow vice presidents, distinguished guests, and members and guests of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

It is a very great honor for me to have the opportunity to appear at this meeting tonight. There are a number of thoughts which have been running through my mind as I have been sitting here surrounded, as I have been, by the president and the newly elected first vice president of this organization.

I have often read, as you have, Mr. Truman's comments to the effect that the Republican press is always giving the Democrats a bad time. Well, I can tell you, as far as this meeting is concerned, it has been just the other way around.

For example, the prize of the evening, the Clapper Award, goes to a man that all of us respect as one of Washington's finest reporters, but it goes to him for writing a story that wasn't too complimentary to Republicans!

Second, I sit between two men, who are not Republican editors; they are Democrats and proud of it.

As a matter of fact, Turner Catledge said he never saw a Republican until he was 23 years of age.

(Laughter.)

He said his father took him into town to see him, telling him he was a rather strange fellow -- and "he was a strange fellow, too," so Mr. Catledge tells me.

But I must say that I have been very touched by the generous introduction by your president, who is a gentleman in the great tradition, not only of the South, but of New Orleans, one of the beautiful cities of the South.

I noted his comments about the Bloody Mary breakfast this morning, and if I may be permitted to say here what I thought there, I think it is a horrible custom to have a breakfast at 8:00 o'clock in the morning with Bloody Marys.

Be that as it may, it was an enjoyable affair, and I also noted his comments about the fact that the polls came out favorably as far as I was concerned with regard to 1960.

I particularly appreciated what he had to say about the success of the trips my wife and I have taken abroad -- to South America, and more recently to England, and I suppose that some of you might have related the success of those trips to which he referred, to the result of the poll.

I would like to think perhaps that they might have had some beneficial effect. But I am reminded of the fact that while I have had, due primarily to Mrs. Nixon being with me, considerable popularity in England and in some other parts of the world on our trips, a very distinguished man who was mentioned by Mr. Folliard, Adlai Stevenson, has also been very popular when he has gone abroad. I would imagine it is quite possible that both of us would get more votes abroad than we would here in the United States.

In any event, the meeting tonight will primarily be one in which we will have your questions, and in which you will determine what the leads will be by the preciseness and the provocative nature of the questions which you will have the opportunity to ask.

As far as the format is concerned, I have worked it out with your president. He has in hand some written questions which some of you were farsighted enough to submit in advance. But I recognize that when written questions are used, there is not the opportunity for the follow-up kind of questions which result in the cross-examination which sharpens an issue.

So, as I understand it, Mr. Healy will read a written question, he will then give the audience an opportunity to ask a question. Since there are no microphones in the audience, due to the fact that we didn't have time to remove the tables, I will try to repeat the question.

Incidentally, Mr. Healy paid me a very high compliment tonight: when we came in, I said "There's a very big crowd," and he said "You ought to be complimented, it's almost as big as the one we had yesterday for Dr. Castro."

(Laughter.)

Now, before we begin, if I could just say a word about two events of today -- two news events that I know will be covered by questions, and which I think you might like to have a comment upon at this point.

I mentioned Dr. Castro's visit, and I am looking forward to the opportunity of seeing him tomorrow at my office in the Capitol after he has appeared on Meet The Press.

I also think that it might be appropriate at this time to refer to some of the comments that he made on Cuban-American relations, and in referring to those comments I would say, first of all, that I am sure that his visit will serve one very useful purpose: No one can come to the United States, no one can talk to American audiences, no one can talk to the officials of our Government, as Dr. Castro will and has, without going back convinced that the United States Government and people share wholeheartedly the aspirations of the people of Latin America for peace with justice, for democratic freedom, for economic

progress, and for the strengthening of the institutions of representative government.

(Applause.)

It was almost a year ago that I returned from Latin America. And, during the year since I returned, we have been making steady progress toward these goals. We have seen some new avenues of economic cooperation opened through the discussions of the organization, American States Committee of Twenty-One, and here I think we should give due recognition to the initiative of President Kubitschek for suggesting this Operation Pan America.

In addition, as you have noted in your papers, and if you listen to television, you heard on television that the twenty-one American Republics have now signed the final act of the Inter-American Development Bank which, when placed in operation, will provide another source of capital for Latin American development needs. And which, very appropriately and importantly takes Latin America out of the category of the other areas of the world, the so-called underdeveloped nations, and properly gives it a special consideration which is what Latin America should have in view of the special problems which are theirs and ours because of the proximity and the other ties that we have with the Latin American nations.

These steps, along with measures that have been taken by many of the Latin American governments in cooperation with the international monetary funds to stabilize their internal financial situations, are a positive move designed to strengthen economies of the Western Hemisphere. I would not suggest that we could underestimate the seriousness of the economic problem still faced by Latin America, but there have been major solutions to those problems proposed, and we are making definite progress in those solutions at this time.

One other comment with regard to Dr. Castro that I think is worth making: He referred to the problem of intervention, and I would say on that score that the recent flare-ups of tension in the Caribbean area, with reports of activities in various countries designed to overthrow the governments of other nations, emphasizes the importance of this principle of non-intervention to which we are all dedicated in the Americas.

The Organization of American States has played an outstanding role in maintaining the peace and security of the area. Each country in the Americas must be assured of the right to develop its political life, free from outside intervention. That is why the United States announced at Montevideo, 26 years ago, its willingness to adhere to the principle of non-intervention. That is why, in the following year the Platt Amendment to which Dr. Castro referred yesterday was abrogated by agreement with the government leaders of Cuba.

I am confident that nothing has contributed more to the growth of freedom and democracy in this region than the steadfast devotion of the American public to the principle of non-intervention, and the United States will certainly continue to practice and preach that principle in its relations with our friends in the Americas.

And, one final comment on another piece of news which developed today:

You noted the selection by the President of a new Secretary of State, a selection which will affect the whole course of American foreign policy in years ahead.

I would like to say a word about the man who was selected, because I know him, and know him well, having served with him in the Congress and having served under him when I was a member of the Herter Committee which studied the Marshall Plan in Europe in 1947. On the basis of my knowledge of him, there are these comments I would like to make to this audience tonight.

He is a man, in my opinion, who by background, experience and temperament is eminently qualified to carry forward Secretary Dulles' policies and principles. And, those who have had the opportunity to know him, as I have, know him not only as one of America's foremost students of foreign affairs, but also as a tenacious and persuasive advocate of his views at the conference table. This means that the American people can be confident that the interests of this country will be vigorously and ably represented in any conference in which he participates.

Thank you.

MR. HEALY: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President.

The first question comes from Bradley Black of the Cincinnati Enquirer:

What value to the United States do you expect to be derived from your trip to Russia?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I think, as the President indicated in his statement when he announced that I was going to the Soviet Union, one of the major values of this kind of a trip is the opportunity it provides for better understanding between Government officials and between the peoples of the countries involved.

In this connection, for example, I shall have the opportunity to open the American exposition. I shall also have the opportunity, I trust, to meet people in all walks of life in the Soviet Union, as my wife and I have in fifty countries which we have visited up to this time.

There will probably be an opportunity as well to meet various officials of the Soviet Union.

I should emphasize that the purpose of this trip is not to negotiate settlements of differences between our two countries, but there will be certainly an opportunity to have a frank discussion of those differences and, wherever there is discussion, whenever there is the chance to meet face-to-face and lay the differences on the table, I believe that the interests of better understanding are served and that the possibilities of actions being taken by one country or another because of miscalculation as to the intentions of that country, are considerably reduced.

These are the values that I would primarily see as the result of this trip.

MR. HEALY: Mr. Vice President, we have two related questions which I believe I should ask before we ask for a related question from the audience:

Do you think there are areas of give-and-take between us and the Soviet Union in the interests of world peace?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: There are certainly areas of give-and-take wherever there are differences between nations at the conference table. But, I should distinguish the area of being flexible with regard to tactics and flexibility with regard to principle.

I know that Mr. Dulles, for example, has often been criticized because it is claimed that he has been inflexible, yet he has been one of the best negotiators at the conference table that this nation has ever had, as Secretary of State, and I would emphasize that as far as his inflexibility is concerned, that it was a position that he took in firm adherence to and advocacy of the principles of freedom and justice which not only we in the United States believe in, but in which people throughout the free world also believe. And, when you are inflexible with regard to advocacy of principles and standing on principles, I submit that this kind of inflexibility is what the United States should continue to want from its foreign policy leaders.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Here is a double question:

Donald Breed of the Freeport, Illinois Journal Standard writes, anticipating with full approval your visit to Moscow, I still wish to ask this naive question. What is to be our technique of dealing with an adversary whose code of morals frankly rejects the obligation to live up to engagements entered into and whose record is full of broken pledges?

Can you suggest some obligation which Russia will find self-interest in assuming and respecting?

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON: This, of course, is a very broad question and it would require analysis of each segment of the world and each conflict or each point of difference between the Soviet Union and the United States.

I would say that the question itself suggests the answer and the answer is that you must find that type of agreement in which the Soviet Union will find that self-interest requires that it live up to the obligation.

Now, this means that we have a long, hard road ahead of us because there is a record of broken treaties as we know and there are areas where we find that Soviet self-interest is such that the only kind of agreement that could be reached would be one which would weaken the position of the free world and strengthen the position of the Soviet world. But, this does not mean that we

should not continue to try, because there is no alternative to trying to negotiate which is acceptable either to us or, we would also hope, to them.

That is one of the reasons, for example, that I suggested on Monday of this week an approach which I think is worth exploring. This would not be an approach in which we would, as some have suggested, submit all the differences between nations to an international court of justice for decision, because being perfectly realistic, as someone has said, where nations are concerned you can arbitrate rights, but not interest.

On the other hand, there must be some areas where even now we could have a rule of law in place of a rule of force.

And so, if we are to move along this line, we could suggest that while a court could not decide what the agreement between parties should be -- we would not want that, neither would the Soviet Union -- once the parties do make an agreement, we realize that one of the major causes for disagreement after that is over the interpretation of the agreement, what the agreement means. That is why I have suggested that once the parties do agree, they might well write into the international agreement a provision to the effect that if there is any difference about interpretation, that difference would be decided by the international court of justice and that the parties would agree to be bound by the decision of the court.

Now, some have suggested that the Soviet Union will not accept such a provision, and others have contended that the United States should not move this far in that direction because of the risks involved as far as our interests are concerned.

But, I say tonight that though we must always be careful in any international agreements we make to see that the interests of the United States are protected, we have to realize that we must find acceptable alternatives to the use and the paramount position of force as the means of settling international disputes.

I do not suggest that this proposal I have made is a complete answer. There is no complete answer. There is no easy answer. We are going to have, as the President suggested, tension and disagreement for years and years ahead, but we must plow forward. We must continue on our part -- believing as we do in the rule of law in our own internal relations -- to make positive suggestions in this line and take the leadership. Only in that way will we have the opportunity, perhaps, to get the Soviet Union at some time to go along with us, even part of the way, and only in that way and this is also important, will we keep before the world the picture of the United States and the free world standing for, and practicing, the principles of freedom and justness under law, rather than totalitarianism and force.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Thank you very much, sir.

Are there any questions from the floor related to the Vice President's trip to Russia?

MR. MAHAFFEY: Mr Healy, I am James Mahaffey of the Texarkana Gazette. I would like to ask the Vice President exactly what he thinks Mr. Khrushchev meant when he said, "We will bury you."

MR. HEALY: Mr. J. Q. Mahaffey of Texarkana asks what Mr. Khrushchev meant when he said, "We will bury you."

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON: If I have the opportunity to see Mr. Khrushchev when I go to Moscow, I intend to ask him that as one question.

On second thought, though, I can put him on the stand as a witness right here tonight; Mr. Khrushchev said -- after his statement received large circulation throughout the United States and the free world -- that he did not mean that he intended to bury us by dropping atomic bombs on our world and risking them being dropped on his, but that he intended to bury us by winning the economic struggle for the world.

I think I can put it in another way by relating to you the attitude Mr. Mikoyan had when he was here.

I asked him how he thought communism would come to the United States. I asked him the question first before he started around the United States, and I asked it again after he had visited Detroit, Los Angeles, and other great production centers of this country -- after he had had an opportunity to see the conditions of our workers and the high living standards that we have.

In presenting the question to him, I said:

"In view of the standard of living of America's workers, in view of what our labor leaders told you when you were here, do you believe that communism will come to the United States in the usual Marxist pattern of the workers rising against the bourgeoisie, or the employers and establishing a government by the proletariat?"

And, his answer was very interesting bearing on this point. He said, "No, I will have to admit that the condition of your workers in the United States is such that we cannot rely on that method of bringing about communism, but of this I am sure: communism will eventually come to this country, and it will come in this way. It will come when the people of the United States will look at the Soviet Union and will see that our system is more productive, more efficient, and does more for people than yours. Then the people of the United States will at that time turn to communism in order to avoid becoming a second-class power, economically."

Mr. Khrushchev, of course, would support Mr. Mikoyan in that view, and I would say the lesson for us is this; not that they said it, but that they believe it.

Whatever we may think of communism, and we have our attitudes toward it, very well justified ones, in my opinion, but whatever we may think of it we must recognize that in Mr. Mikoyan, Mr. Khrushchev, and other leaders of the Communist world, we have men who are fanatically dedicated, dedicated in two senses:

One, that their system is superior; and two, believing that eventually it will prevail.

And, what is why in this country, recognizing that we are confronted with men who, whatever we may think of them, have faith in their system, we need a similar faith, a faith in the fact that this system in our country and in other parts of the free world, with all its faults, has still produced the greatest prosperity, the greatest freedom that men have ever known.

We must have faith that this is the wave of the future. And I might say, in concluding my answer to this question, that in the great struggle going on in the world today, we must recognize that whether it is in South America, the Near East, Asia, or Africa, there are millions of people who above everything else want a better way of life. They would prefer to have that better way of life and keep their freedom, but if they cannot get it with freedom, then without freedom. You can be sure that inevitably if there is no alternative they will accept a system which promises a better way of life, even if it denies freedom.

This, therefore, is the challenge to us. You cannot expect to meet and defeat a great force which is on the move, which is confident, which is aggressive -- you cannot expect to meet and defeat it with a force which is static, which is interested only in holding its own. That is why I have suggested in the past and I suggest again here tonight that we in the United States must not only see that our system works here but we must recognize that ours is the true revolution and we must convey that message more effectively than we have in the past to the peoples all over the world who want a better way of life. We must indicate to them by our example and by our interest in them, that they can have real progress economically but have it in a climate of freedom without having to turn to dictatorship to get it.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: We are ready to come closer to home now.

I have got to explain that this question was written before that very important meeting over at the National Press Club this morning.

The question comes from Felicia Patterson of Newsday:

If at the 1960 Republican Convention a situation were to arise where it would be in the best interest of party harmony for you to accept the Vice Presidential nomination again, would you be willing to seek an unprecedented third term as Vice President?

(Laughter.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I really ought not to give an off-the-cuff answer to that question, but I will.

I would only suggest that, as one who voted for the two-term amendment limiting the holding of the Presidency to two terms, I think it would be inconsistent for me to seek the Vice Presidency for a third term.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: There is one along the same line from Bill Ulston of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Would you accept Nelson Rockefeller as a running mate in 1960?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that question should be better put to him rather than to me.

Seriously speaking, of course, I recognize that there is a considerable interest in who will be the candidates on both the Republican and Democratic tickets in 1960.

I anticipated, as a matter of fact, the question tonight as to whether I might be a candidate in 1960. I intended to answer that question by saying that this was not the time to make such an announcement or such a decision, and since I, of course, have not made a decision myself as to 1960, that I am prepared to announce, it would not be appropriate for me to talk about who the running mate should be at this time.

May I just add this one point though with regard to Mr. Rockefeller: I think that the Republican Party is fortunate to have, as a governor of a major state, a man who has proved that he could get elected when many other Republicans were losing, and a man who, as Governor of the State, inherited some very difficult problems and has dealt with them courageously and ably.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Here is a triple-header from Bill McMorrow of Gainesville, Georgia, John O'Hallis from the Bismarck, North Dakota Tribune, and Louis L. Harris of the Augusta, Georgia Chronicle:

Do you feel that the Administration is relaxing its demand for immediate, total integration and if such a trend exists, do you approve?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The question, as I understand it, uses the words "immediate, total integration."

First of all, I should point out that the Administration's position has not been, is not now, and should not be immediate total integration.

We have to deal with the facts of life as they are. As far as the Administration's position is concerned, I believe that it is a sound position.

It is one which avoids both extremes, the extreme on the one hand which says, "We shall do nothing," which means there will be no progress; and the extreme on the other hand which indicates we will do too much, and which might result in losing ground rather than gaining it.

What we have tried to do is to take what is a firm position in behalf of progress in this field, recognizing that you can't change in one year, two years, even five years, customs, practices, that have developed over a period of almost a hundred years. And I think that as long as we go ahead on this line, this offers the best hope for eventual solution of what, to all Americans, is a very difficult and complicated problem.

I would just like to add one personal note with regard to the solution of this problem in which those in this room can play a part. I remember one of my professors in law school, a professor in Contracts, made a statement to this effect, the very first day of school:

"Gentlemen, there is only one rule or one principle you should remember, if you forget everything else you heard in this course. A contract is only as good as the will of the parties to keep it."

We could, I think, draw an analogy there and say that a law is only as good as the will of the people to obey it. But, this does not mean that you do not pass a law until all of the people are ready to obey it.

It does mean, however, that in enacting legislation in a field like this, you must recognize that it is the responsibility of public opinion leaders throughout the country to develop within the society the support for the law, which is essential if the law is to be effective; and that support must come from the hearts of the people. And it must come from the hearts of the people not only because they believe that to obey the law is right, but eventually it must come because they also believe that the law is right.

I would not suggest this is easy, as I have already indicated, and having as I do a little Southern background through attending school at Duke University for three years. But I do know, as I consider this problem, that from an economic standpoint the United States cannot afford to fail to deal effectively with problems which result in 17 million citizens in this country not having the opportunity to develop the skills and to make the ultimate maximum contribution that they can and should to our economic development.

I do know, too, that from a moral standpoint we recognize that there is a great cause involved in this problem, and finally from an international standpoint, I would add this last point:

My wife and I have traveled, as I have indicated, through many countries abroad. Mr Khrushchev refers to "burying us." The war that he refers to, or claims to refer to, has already begun and it is going on in Asia, in Africa, and the Near East. A billion people live there. They hold the balance of power in the world.

The question is: Which way will they go?

Economic policies will have a great deal to determine which way they go. Our diplomatic policies will have a great deal of impact on this question, but I can assure you, that as much as anything else will be this major factor:

The people who live in these countries are different in many ways, different religions, different clothing, different housing, customs and food. But they are alike in one way -- they are not white.

And, having traveled abroad and having spoken to these people in terms of the traditional beliefs of the United States of equality of opportunity, of recognizing the individual dignity of a man, regardless of his background, I can only say that it is most difficult for a representative of this country to talk one way abroad, and then to explain our practices at home.

Now, finally, I would add one other thought: I think there has been too much of a tendency to indicate that this whole problem of prejudice, call it what you will, depending on the point of view, is simply a Southern problem. It is a Northern problem as well. It exists in our great cities in the North. It exists in the South. And there are honest differences of opinion about it. But, I am convinced of this: Considering the interests of the United States alone, clearly apart from the interests of our Negro citizens, the best interests of the United States will be served by continuing with a program which produces steady progress in this field.

And those of you who are the opinion makers can play a great part in helping this progress to become a reality.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Is there a question from the floor on this subject?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Is there a question from the head table on that, I was going to ask?

MR. HEALY: No, sir.

Mr. Vice President, will you give us your evaluation, sir, of the importance of the so-called missile gap in the United States over the next several years as a factor in the present Soviet bullying attitude? Has it weakened the American negotiating position?

That is from Bob Easterbrook of the Washington Post.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I would say that, as far as the missile gap is concerned, if the Soviet leaders actually believe there is a gap -- a military gap as distinguished from missile gap -- this definitely would weaken our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union at the bargaining table.

I would say, second, however, that looking at the situation at present,

there is no question in the minds of our military leaders -- as Senator Johnson himself pointed out after recent hearings he had in this field -- there is no question but that the United States and the free world today have military strength which is great enough to meet and defeat any aggressor, if aggression is launched against the free world.

We believe we have the strength. I think the Soviet leaders probably believe we have it also. And as long as we have this strength this means that when our negotiators go to the Foreign Ministers Conference and when the President goes to a summit conference -- if the Foreign Ministers Conference develops along such lines that a summit conference will be held -- both the President and the Secretary of State and the other leaders of the free world can deal from a position of strength.

They will not have to submit to missile blackmail on the part of the Soviet Union.

Now, looking to the immediate future, what the missile gap refers to, of course, is the claim that three years from now, four years from now, if the intelligence estimates we have on the Soviet Union are accurate, they may have more intercontinental ballistic missiles than we have. Our answer to that is that three or four years from now while there may arise a situation where they may have more intercontinental ballistic missiles, as for example they now have more submarines than we have, the time will never arrive when our overall strength will not be sufficient that they could not risk an attack on us without bringing upon them damage that they would not voluntarily want to bring upon themselves.

And, I would say also in answer to this question then that if the determination of the American people, as reflected in the Congress of the United States and the Administration continues, and if our allies continue to take the strong stand that they do with us on this matter, that I do not see a time coming in the foreseeable future in which the United States will be in a military position, along with our allies, which is such that the Soviet Union will be able to blackmail us.

And I would say finally that the responsible leaders of this country, whether they are Democrat or Republican, I am sure will never allow that situation to come about. We shall do what is necessary to maintain the strength to deter aggression.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Are there any questions from the floor on this issue?

Mr. Joseph B. Farrell of the Macon, Georgia News asks if the United States believed there was a serious threat of communism in Cuba, would we do anything about it, and if so, what?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I would say first of all with regard to the threat of

communism in Cuba, and throughout the American hemisphere, that we are all aware that all of the countries in the hemisphere have an interest in seeing that that threat does not become so great that the Communists are able to dominate any government in the hemisphere. And I should point out, too, that this is traditional in the American republics, traditional since the time of the Monroe Doctrine. Because for communism to come to any one of the American republics is the very foreign intervention to which the Monroe Doctrine referred. This is the reason why we, in our discussions with the leaders of other countries and with the peoples of other countries in this hemisphere, can honestly say that we are speaking in their interest when we urge that they join with us in resisting any Communist infiltration which might result in control of a government.

Now, referring to Cuba, I visited Cuba three years ago. I, of course, did not have the opportunity on a visit as brief as those we must take, to see as many people in all walks of life as I might have liked, but I saw a great number.

I would say first of all that the great majority of the Cuban people, based not only on my visit but also on my study of Cuba and its problems, are not susceptible to the kind of appeal which the Communists might make.

Or, putting it another way, they might be susceptible to what the Communists might say in attempting to get power, but the Cuban people, the great majority of them certainly do not want a Communist government in Cuba.

And, I would say that, looking to the future, that I do not anticipate that the hypothesis suggested in this question would come about, and the reason I do not anticipate it is that the Cuban people themselves will not tolerate a Communist government or a Communist take-over.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Thank you.

Do I see anyone that wants to ask anything further on that?

Mr. H. P. Pickrell of the Albuquerque Journal:

Assuming there is a summit conference this year, do you expect to attend it along with President Eisenhower?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I have noticed conjecture in the papers with regard to the possible attendance of the Vice President at a summit conference, and I can only say that there has been no decision with regard to any attendance by the Vice President at a summit conference.

MR. HEALY: Here we get back to another tough one:

How far should we go in regulating big business?

How far should we go in regulating labor which has become big business?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I could, of course, spend a great deal of time in

answering that question, and I will spend a little because it is a broad question and I think since it is the first question on economics we have had tonight, you might be interested in my thinking on it.

Business is big in the United States, and labor is big, and government is big. And it seems to me that one of the primary functions of those of us in positions of responsibility is to find ways and means to see that these great power complexes -- whether they are business, labor or government -- do not work against the interests of the individual -- that they do not have the effect of cutting off and discouraging the inventiveness, the individuality which has been the reason for America's greatness and its progress in the past.

We now come to how you do it.

We have, of course as you know, antitrust laws to deal with the power complexes in business. To a certain extent they can be effective and in other areas they are not.

As far as labor is concerned, the Congress is presently debating that question. A bill is before the Senate, the Kennedy-Ervin bill. The bill has been amended in committee considerably, and substantially improved. In my opinion, however, it is a bill which should be further amended by the Senate itself, amended particularly in this respect: The bill as it presently is written deals almost exclusively with the internal operation of unions -- providing for union members certain principles of union democracy and providing control over the expenditures of their funds.

What is needed is legislation amending the Taft-Hartley Act, legislation amending it which will close two major loopholes, dealing not with the internal relationships and organizations of unions, but dealing with the relationship of unions with business and the general public.

And, I refer to provisions which should outlaw so-called blackmail and organizational picketing and which would strengthen the secondary boycott and/or hot cargo provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(Applause.)

It seems to me that it is vitally important for us to recognize that the function of government is to see that a proper balance is maintained between the power of business, on the one hand, and the power of labor, on the other. And the enactment of the Administration bill, I think is the least that should be done in this session of Congress in dealing with this particular problem.

Now, I could go one step further.

There has been a great deal of discussion about what the Government ought to do when these power complexes get so big that the decisions they make may affect adversely the public interest.

We hear, for example, a great deal of discussion these days with regard

to the wage price negotiations that are taking place in the steel industry. You have noted the President's comments with regard to the fact that the public has a stake in how these negotiations come out, as well as the parties at the contract table.

I would only say with regard to these negotiations that certainly there is a great public interest because whatever your theory about inflation -- whether you believe that the demand pull has been the primary factor in the inflation for the past 25 years, or the cost push which seems to have been the major factor in the last two years -- whatever your theory, there isn't much question but that when we have had periods of inflation they have generally been accompanied by periods in which wage increases have exceeded productivity and so we come to the key question: What should happen in steel?

What we have said up to this time is that the public interest will suffer if there is a wage increase in steel which is inflationary -- inflationary either by forcing up the price of steel or inflationary, assuming the price of steel remains stable, by its effect on other wage scales and thereby forcing up the price levels in other commodities.

Now, we come to the question which I know immediately will be on your minds. If the public does have an interest, if there should not be a wage price settlement in steel which is inflationary, what is the Government going to do about it?

There have been some very well-intentioned and thoughtful proposals as to what the Government ought to do.

Mr. Kefauver is having some hearings in which he is attempting to get at the bottom of this problem.

Others have suggested that before any major industry, like steel, raises its prices, the Congress should have hearings, and others have suggested that we need a system in these great, major industries of price controls, failing to recognize in some instances, that you cannot have price controls without also having wage controls.

I will say this with regard to the Administration's position at this time. We think it would be a mistake for the Administration to interfere in the steel wage-price negotiations because if we do interfere, we set a precedent, and once you interfere in a wage-price negotiation like this, then in all future times one party or the other, depending upon what they think they can get out of the Administration in power, instead of agreeing to settle at the bargaining table, will push the conflict upstairs. This would not be in the public interest.

Bringing this question to a close, may I just say that certainly all of those who are participating in the wage-price negotiations in steel must recognize that if a wage increase which is inflationary does come about, this will give tremendous impetus to the demand that either the Congress or the Administration, or both, take stronger steps.

May I also say in that connection the reasons why we in the Administration

believe that we should avoid Government intervention, avoid Government controls is, one, because we realize that in peacetime it would be very doubtful if they would work; and two, because it would mean that we would be suppressing the American economy at a time that we wanted it to expand.

I think a quote from Tolstoy is very appropriate on this point. It seems to me to point up the weakness of the position of those who say Government should control the economy in order to serve the people.

As I recall it, it goes something like this:

"I sit on a man's back choking him and making him carry me, and yet assure myself and others that I am very sorry for him and wish to ease his lot by all possible means -- except by getting off his back."

That is exactly the position the Government is in when it does too much; when you have Government controls trying to help the people where people better could help themselves if the Government would only get off their back.

(Applause.)

MR. HEALY: Mr. Vice President, I think you have been most generous in answering our questions.

Would you care to close with a brief closing statement, sir?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: May I say, Mr. Healy, that I do not want you to think that because I was submitted to a great deal of Southern influence tonight I intended to filibuster as long as I did on the last question. But I anticipated there might be some other questions on economic issues, and I do appreciate the opportunity that has been presented to comment as I did.

The hour is late. I can assure you, as one who has made appearances in many countries around the world as a representative of the President of the American people, it is a truly great honor to appear before one of the most influential audiences in all of the free world today.

I would just like to add a word with regard to a man whom I called on day before yesterday; a man who has sometimes appeared before this organization; one who has been criticized by some, commended by others, and written about by everyone in this organization -- the Secretary of State.

I had approximately an hour's chat with him day before yesterday. I can tell you that his spirit is magnificent, and his analysis and understanding of world problems is just as sharp as it ever was.

It happens, as you know from my public statements, that I am one of Mr. Dulles' supporters and one who admires him. I know too that in this audience, whether you have criticized or agreed with him, everyone respects him as a devoted, dedicated man who has, in a real sense, spent his whole life, lived for this great moment which, because of physical disability, he is unable to consummate at this time.

One little personal note I think might be of interest. I recall seeing the Secretary when he returned from his last trip to Europe. I think history will record that that trip not only was one of the most successful negotiating missions by a Secretary of State in history -- because bringing together the American or allied positions as he did by his conversations with Mr. Macmillan, with Mr. Adenauer, and with President deGaulle was indeed a superb accomplishment -- but it will also be recognized that it was a truly heroic performance by a dedicated American.

I can tell you that, having seen him when he immediately returned, I asked him, because I had known he had been ill when he left, how it had been. He said, "Well, I found that during the course of the negotiations each day that I never felt a bit of pain, but at the end of the day," he said, "then it would come down on me like a great wave."

And, during the entire course of that trip, approximately a week, the Secretary of State conducting these terribly important negotiations was not able to keep down a single meal.

And finally one little note, on the human side of a great man. That day it happened that we were having luncheon in the State Department. I had the usual chicken and creamed peas that was on the State Department menu, and Mr. Dulles, as was his custom, had a little scoop of cottage cheese and some fresh fruit, in this case this particular day I happened to note that the fresh fruit that he was having was fresh figs which had been flown in from California.

Just in passing, during the course of his discussing with me the situation, not only in Europe and in Asia as well, I mentioned that my wife, Pat, was very fond of fresh figs but they were rather difficult to get in Washington.

I went back to my office, came home that night, and at 6:00 o'clock the doorbell rang. Mr. Dulles' chauffeur was at the door, and he brought with him a little box, a box in which originally there were 12 figs. Three had been removed, and a handwritten note to my wife saying that he had heard at noon that she liked fresh figs and he hoped she enjoyed these from California.

I repeat this story, not because it affects what will happen in Berlin, not because it will have any bearing on editorials that may be written with regard to the Administration or on other great issues, but I repeat it because I wanted you to share with me the knowledge that this man, who is known primarily for his dogged determination, for his ability to work harder than almost any man in any Administration could be expected to work, also has a very sensitive and a very thoughtful human side which those of us who were close to him were privileged to know.

Thank you, and good night.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, at 10:45 o'clock p.m., the Press Conference was concluded.)

Herbert G. Klein has accepted an appointment as a Special Assistant on the staff of Vice President Nixon, it was announced today.

Klein, 41, has been granted a leave of absence from his present job as Editor of the San Diego Union by James S. Copley, Chairman of the corporation of Copley Press, Inc. Nixon said Klein will join his staff in June, assisting primarily in work with the press. His first major assignment will be in connection with the Vice President's July trip to Moscow.

Klein, a veteran newsman, has been a personal friend of the Vice President since 1946 when Nixon first ran for Congress.

Klein has been Editor of the San Diego Union since January. He previously served as Executive Editor, Associate Editor, and Editorial Page Editor of that newspaper.

The newsman earlier worked for the San Diego Evening Tribune, the Los Angeles Examiner, the Iron Age magazine, and the Alhambra (Calif.) Post Advocate. He met Nixon while serving as a reporter for the latter newspaper.

He has served the fifteen Copley newspapers on assignments both in this country and in the Pacific.

Klein holds a commission as a Commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He resides in La Jolla, California with his wife and two daughters. He was graduated from the University of Southern California in 1940.

He has been active in civic work and is an Elder in the La Jolla Presbyterian Church. He was an American delegate to the 1950 Congress of the International Junior Chamber in the Philippines.

Klein served as Assistant Press Secretary to Nixon in the 1956 campaign and as Press Secretary in the 1958 campaign. He directed the publicity for the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign in Southern California in 1952.

He has served as Chairman of national committees for Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism fraternity. He is a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Delta Chi Fraternity. In 1958 he assisted Paul Block, Publisher of The Toledo Blade, in conducting foreign editors from the International Press Institute on a tour of the United States.

J. push for more office space - wants to donate  
his - or rent some - answered

need to dramatize RN appeal among college  
students and young guys

build sale of Mayo book - and distribute

letters to look on article - bring out  
points that are good

RN returns from Moscow at time of gov. conf.  
how shld his report to people be handled?

Need simple means of transmitting  
incidental intelligence  
decided - call Lois

PR

Russian trip -

needs to explain why going -  
have formal press conf - w/ TV to explain  
on return shld have TV report

then Overseas Press Club - w/ TV  
invite Negro, labor, Deporters to go  
write magazine report

take stereo w/ longhair music - for  
Kruschev gift

take lists of Americans in prison  
in Russia - try to get release

ask why Jews not allowed free travel

Mayo book -

Sill Key as contact on what needs to be done  
to report back soon

Motivation study to determine RN profile

Nixon will throw away rule book  
might even take neighbor state  
for running mate

*Primaries*