

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>
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Agriculture" tab. Remarks at the 38th Annual Convention, Pacific Dairy and Poultry Association. 3 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Welfare and Fiscal Responsibility" tab. Remarks before the California Republican Assembly. 2 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Industry and Taxes" tab. Remarks from Peninsula Manufacturers Association. 7 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Medical Care for the Aged" tab. Remarks by Nixon Before the San Fernando Valley Chapter of the LA County Medical Association. 3 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Education" tab. Includes remarks on state financial obligations, local control, etc. 10 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Crime" tab. Includes Crime remarks of Richard Nixon and Vice Laws copy of Telegram from Nixon. 3 pages.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Civil Defense" tab. Civil Defense remarks of Richard Nixon, October 26, 1961 - Republican Fund-Raising Dinner, San Diego, Ca. 2 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Senate Reapportionment" tab. March 28, 1962. 4 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "State Loyalty Oath" tab. March 10, 1962. 2 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Right to Work Legislation" tab. March 23, 1962. 2 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Council on Foreign Relations" tab. March 10, 1962. 2 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "Communism" tab. "How to Combat Reds at Home" from a Nationally Syndicated Column by Richard Nixon, April 3, 1962. 5 pages.
64	11	04/1962	Report	Nixon For Governor Speakers' Manual, 1962. Nixon for Governor State Campaign Headquarters; "John Birch Society" tab. Statement of Nixon-Speaking to the CA Republican Assembly Concerning Robert Welch and John Birch Society. 4 pages.

AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURE

REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON
38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
PACIFIC DAIRY AND POULTRY ASSOCIATION
BILTMORE BOWL, LOS ANGELES
MARCH 17, 1962--12 Noon

The people of California have a right to expect from Governor Brown a straight answer to a direct question. Does he favor the proposed Kennedy-Freeman program of marketing order for poultry and dairy products?

There is one thing to be said for these proposals: they are such blatant grabs for power by the U. S. Secretary of Agriculture that there can be no doubt about the consequences for the freedom of California's farmers, processors, and distributors, and--most of all--its consuming public. No one should be fooled by the effort to pit so-called farm interest against so-called consumer interests. You cannot separate farm prices and market prices and the family food budget. When you prop one, you push up the other. Whoever controls the marketplace, calls the turns down at the corner food store.

If the Freeman farm program is adopted, it will inevitably bring higher prices in the grocery stores and at the meat counters for every consumer in California and the nation and more controls and less income for California's farmers.

California needs and wants federal marketing and production controls about as much as ducks need raincoats. Our farmers and processors have been running their own show for a long time now. California is a pioneer in state marketing orders, arrived at cooperatively, which maintain orderly free exchange and stable prices precisely because they are state orders--drawn up in terms of conditions and needs, supply-and-demand, right here in California.

We don't need and we don't want bureaucratic dictation from Washington, D. C. We neither need nor want the Secretary of Agriculture telling us how many turkeys should go to market, how much milk to produce, how many eggs to hatch. Sitting back in Washington, worrying about the votes of turkey farmers in Minnesota and feed merchants in North Dakota, the Secretary of Agriculture can only get in the way of what we in California want most of all--the freedom to produce, to buy and sell, at the lowest possible price consistent with fair competition. All we want is a fair shake for everyone--producer, processor, and consumer--and the preservation of our State's biggest and one of its most efficient industries.

AGRICULTURE

REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
12:00 Noon, FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1962
COMBINED EXCHANGE CLUBS
NATIONAL ORANGE SHOW
SAN BERNARDINO FAIR GROUNDS

We are in the habit of calling agriculture a 3 billion dollar industry--biggest in the State--with half-a-million workers--8 per cent of the labor force. But this, literally, is not the half of it. For every hundred workers down on the farm, there are 263 others who are directly dependent on agriculture--in processing, wholesaling and retailing, and all the services of transport and supply. For every hundred dollars in gross farm income, \$280 worth of goods-and-services are added annually to the State's total economic product. And this means that California agriculture is more nearly a 12 than a 3 billion dollar industry, that it involves more like 25 than 8 per cent of the labor force.

There is no need to spell out the consequences for all of us in helping to maintain a prosperous and a growing agriculture here in California.

Not everything is rosy. There are problems galore, tough problems involving wage scales and migrant workers, water and land use, stable commodity markets--and these are just a few among many.

The point is not that they are unsolvable. Every one of them can and must be solved, but only if tackled in a spirit of mutual understanding and common concern, by all groups and interests and organizations. These are all super-partisan problems, too, which ought to be handled by citizen groups and professional experts rather than political re-treads and free-loaders on the patronage gravy-train. The real problems of California agriculture will not be solved by creating some new super-grade bureaucrats.

A spirit of harmony and trust and cooperative effort must be restored to California agriculture, if all of us are to reap the rewards of sustained prosperity and greater productivity. That is the spirit - on the farm, in business and industry - that creative leadership can restore.

**WELFARE AND FISCAL
RESPONSIBILITY**

WELFARE AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 3, 1961

California faces fiscal chaos. It receives more money from state taxes and spends more than any other state in the Union. We now spend more than \$500 million annually on social welfare, highest by far in both total amount as well as average benefits of any state in the United States. New laws in this field were requested and signed by Brown this past year, and these expenditures will probably cost the state an additional \$150 million a year beginning in 1963--a 40 percent increase over the previous fiscal year. At a time when other states and even the federal government are deeply concerned with rising and uncontrolled welfare costs, the Brown Administration increased the welfare program. At a time when numerous California counties have held Grand Jury investigations into welfare costs, expressing anything but apathy about their state government, Brown and his machine chose to ignore their concerns and stepped up the hand-outs. All he has done is to appoint another impotent commission to study the welfare program.

INDUSTRY AND TAXES

NEW INDUSTRY AND TAXES

REMARKS BY
RICHARD NIXON
PENINSULA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
SAN MATEO--FEBRUARY 26, 1962

California's tax bills run about 25% to 30% higher than most mid-western and eastern states. We cannot begin to match the tax advantages of the South and Southwest. In the past 18 years, California tax collections have increased 444%. General obligation bonds have increased more than 900%--but our population increase, with which the administration usually excuses tax and budget increases, has risen only 109%.

It costs modern industry upwards of \$16,000 to create just one job--but that job will not be created unless the industry can clearly see a fair return on its investment. If it cannot receive a fair return in California, it will look elsewhere. There are other states willing and anxious to provide climates which will support additional jobs and a growing economy.

If California is to keep pace with the challenges presented by its phenomenal growth, our state government must adopt an attitude which will inspire confidence in those who are considering investment here. We cannot afford near-sighted budget policies which in effect say "tax and spend what the traffic will bear" without regard to the effect these policies will have on future economic growth and on jobs for everyone.

NEW INDUSTRY AND TAXES

REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 2, 1961

Already many firms are bypassing California as a site for new and expanding plants. They find added taxes burdensome and a dangerous drain on the margin of profits necessary for new investments and new jobs.

California manufacturers, in competition with plants in other states, find themselves at a real disadvantage when measuring their tax assessments with those levied in competing states. One firm, in the growing electronics field (which has been so important in the continuing growth of California industry in recent years), has shown that out of five states where the firm does business, its California plant, with only 33 percent of the total assets, pays 59 percent of the total property taxes. Armco Steel Corporation last week released figures which showed California ranking second to only one other state. Taxes paid per \$1,000 of Inventory and Assets were 4.2 percent as compared to 1 percent in 42 other states of the nation, including those in the most heavily industrialized part of the nation. For example, two industrial giants, Pennsylvania and Ohio, required this company to pay taxes that were only 1.3 and 1.1 percent respectively.

NEW INDUSTRY AND TAXES

REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
AT THE 17TH ANNUAL INSTALLATION BANQUET
OF THE PERSONNEL AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
JANUARY 24, 1962

California is now in competition with the rest of the nation to attract the new industry we need to provide the hundreds of thousands of additional jobs required by our growing population each year. The time when our fine climate and our abundant natural and human resources were enough to assure our success in this competition is gone. The industrial states of the East and Midwest, in particular, as well as those that are beginning to industrialize in the South, are developing increasingly attractive programs to lure new investment into their areas. Among the factors which have great weight in effecting a decision to invest in new business in a state are the tax policies and the labor-management climate which exist in that state. As far as tax and spending policies are concerned, we must convince potential investors that our guideline is not to spend "all that the traffic will bear" but only the amount necessary for efficient operation of essential state services. Our labor management policies must maintain a balance between the bargaining power of management on the one side and labor on the other. Once that balance swings too far one way or the other the result is labor management strife which will drive away rather than attract new business investment.

HEAVY CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

REMARKS BY
RICHARD NIXON
AT THE
ENGINEERING AND GRADING CONTRACTORS CONFERENCE
SACRAMENTO
FEBRUARY 15, 1962

I need hardly point out the stake the heavy construction industry has in the future course of our native California. This industry--excluding home building--represents fully 13 per cent of the state economy. Twenty per cent of all state expenditures in 1962-63 is earmarked for highway construction and allied fields. That is second only to education on the call for state money. On the other side of the budget, 21 per cent of the state's income is expected to come from highway and highway-user taxes.

The construction business in California will prosper only as our state prospers; it will feel the pinch when the state is pinched.

We must always remember that the measure of California's growth and prosperity is not how much the state government spends and takes in. It is how much free and private enterprise invests and expands over the course of the next decade. The state government influences the business climate but the health of our economy depends upon the people.

The state government must preserve and extend the dynamic principle of our huge productive economic system--the principle of free enterprise. It cannot do this by taking upon itself the authority to make all key economic decisions. Such super master planning not only drains off more and more of the people's income in higher and higher taxes, but it drains off initiative and imagination at the working levels and it denies the principle of "the people know best." But, neither can the state adopt a complete hands-off policy of laissez-faire.

What is needed in California is a dynamic partnership of government with private business and private enterprise. We can call it creative cooperation or any other name. The label is not important. The philosophy is. And, that philosophy is that the people know best. You in the heavy construction industry know best how to solve your problems, cure your ills, advance your course and how to prosper. You are closest to the scene. This is true of the farmer, of the laborer, and each and every specialized group.

The proper role of government is to sit in where need be and to help you and each and every specialized group working in an area of public interest. The point is neither the federal nor the state nor the local government should dictate solutions. They should sit in on the decision-making process, help and advise, lend their good offices, and always represent the public at large.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR
REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
AT THE 17TH ANNUAL INSTALLATION BANQUET
OF THE PERSONNEL AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
JANUARY 24, 1962

There is one important area in which we have an insurmountable advantage over the Communist nations. In the Soviet Union, for example, there is a great gulf between the elite managerial class and the workers. In a so-called 'peoples' republic' there is virtually no communication between the people and their rulers.

On the other hand, one of the most encouraging and exciting developments in our 20th Century capitalistic economy in the United States is that under the leadership of men like those who make up this organization, ever closer communications have been developed on a personal basis between management and labor. The difference is inherent in the fundamental differences between our two systems. The Communist factory manager treats man as a machine, a statistic, a faceless puppet. You and your colleagues in management in the United States base your policies on the recognition of the individual dignity of every person employed in your organizations. By constantly putting this principle into practice in your organizations you are rendering a great service to the cause of freedom.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

STATEMENT BY
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY CHAPTER
OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WOODLAND HILLS COUNTRY CLUB
FEBRUARY 22, 1962

President Kennedy declared February 21 at his press conference that he "would be inclined to approve" a proposal to award defense contracts in the future on the basis of areas of unemployment rather than merit.

Defense contracts would go to the areas of unemployment in the East rather than the well-established plants in California.

This is playing politics with defense and it is inexcusable.

Everyone naturally sympathizes with the problem of unemployment and the plight of the unemployed. But unemployment should not get priority over national defense.

The American people deserve the best defense for the least amount of money. The best defense is paramount.

The Defense Department's present system of awarding contracts is on the basis of low bid and high performance. This policy was established during the administration of General Eisenhower and our nation cannot afford to change it.

The ultimate result of giving priority to unemployment over performance in awarding defense contracts would be disastrous. It would lead to political jockeying. The states would compete for defense contracts on the basis of which one had the worst unemployment rather than where the best job could be done.

It would be indefensible to see contracts important to our national security being given to small, inefficient plants while our own giant defense industry begins laying off workers to prove that California too has people unemployed.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

REMARKS BY
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY CHAPTER
OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WOODLAND HILLS COUNTRY CLUB
FEBRUARY 22, 1962 - 8 p.m.

The doctors of California and of the nation have been forced into politics because the spread of federal government control is about to engulf you. As doctors and experts in the field of medicine, you know that the King-Anderson bill, which proposes that medical aid to the aged be controlled by the federal social security system, is not the solution to the problem of adequate medical care for the aged. But your problem is: How do we get this across to the American people?

The proponents of this measure have sold a great part of the public a rosy bill of goods: that medical aid under social security will take care of all the legitimate medical needs of the aged. It has been good politics but it is not true.

The way to fight this bill, in the American tradition, is to tell the American people the facts of the case, what the bill really proposes, and--most important--what a better alternative would be.

We must all recognize that there is a need for medical care for the aged.

First we must look at the true need. We find that more than 50 percent of our people over 65 do have some form of private health insurance. We find that in the next three years some 70 percent of our aged will be covered by private health insurance. So, in reality, this social security approach again would set up a bureaucracy to offer a minimum hospital plan to 100 percent of the people when less than 30 percent need any and when that 30 percent needs more than is being offered.

Furthermore, we already have legislation to cover the medical care for our elderly people in need. That is the Kerr-Mills Act, passed in 1960, which I suspect very few people outside the medical profession know about. It is a new law but it is already in operation in California.

That law provides medical and hospital care for those who are medically indigent. It is set up in the proper way. The initiative for the plan is left to the individual states; it is buttressed by federal aid

but controlled by the state. The Kerr-Mills Act deserves a fair chance to operate before it is condemned out-of-hand.

The King-Anderson bill smacks of the compulsory, big government approach, it undermines the traditional doctor-patient relationship, and it would do more harm than good. For the doctors to know this is not enough. We must get the facts to the American people, for public opinion is truly the foundation of our political affairs.

I would point out to the people of California that the King-Anderson bill would not provide the aged with home calls by the physician. It does not even include office or hospital care by the personal physician. As the bill now stands, it does not include surgery, dental care, or drugs and medicines outside the hospital or nursing home. It is not really a medical plan at all. It is a hospital care plan and an inadequate one at that.

Nor is it entirely free. It calls for a deductible fee of \$10 a day for the first nine days of hospital care. For diagnostic care, the first \$20 of cost is paid by the patient.

Of course, the proponents of the Administration bill do not emphasize these factors. Indeed, they hardly mention them. And, I think most of those who are clamoring for that particular piece of legislation do not realize its shortcomings.

Medical care is too important for quackery of any kind--even the political variety. The answer to political quackery is education and self-discipline. The people must be informed to steer clear of the patent medicine approach and to rely upon their doctors.

EDUCATION

STATE FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS TO EDUCATION
REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON
SONOMA COUNTY TEACHERS COUNCIL
SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE, SANTA ROSA
THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1962

The state has not hesitated to impose new and expensive responsibilities on the local schools and school boards of California. But at the same time, it has been backing away more and more from its traditional role in financing public education. Many local areas are caught squarely in the middle.

Historically, the state has supported about 50 per cent of all educational costs. But during recent years there has been slippage until, today, its share adds up only to about 38 per cent of the total educational bill.

This problem of balancing responsibilities, costs, and support is a vital one. It is by no means as simple as it might seem.

The state government devises specially-designed programs to deal with obvious problems. Many of these programs are eminently worthwhile -- for example, special classes for the physically handicapped or the mentally retarded, or classes in driver training.

But the state does not then follow through in all cases. It does not make special funds available to the local school districts to meet additional costs. The local school districts are themselves forced to raise the money to pay for these new programs.

This situation is symptomatic of many problems arising from the division of responsibility for public education between the state and local districts. As time goes on, and as the school-age population steadily mounts, the problem will become more acute and not less. The state of California cannot afford to continue on the road of fiscal chaos, least of all in the field of education.

The state government must face up to one of two basic solutions in meeting its financial obligations to education. On the one hand it can boost its support from the present 38 per cent back up to the traditional level of 50 per cent. Or, on the other hand, it can re-examine its entire tax structure, to make more sources of revenue available to the localities. The real-property tax--from which the overwhelming bulk of all local revenue is presently drawn--has been pushed just about to the breaking-point as it is.

Whatever formula is arrived at for splitting the costs of education, however, we must be sure of one thing. Detailed control of our schools and school budgets, and of the curriculum, must remain in the hands of the local board. General guidance and broad standards

from Sacramento--day-to-day control at the local level--this should remain the fundamental principle governing public education in California.

There is an urgent matter of public policy involved here, and it calls for a clear-cut decision. As Governor, I would meet the problem head-on. I would call for an immediate and thorough re-examination of the financial structure on which our public education system is based. And for every special program legislated by the state, I would insist on parallel legislation to meet the burden of additional costs.

LOCAL CONTROL OF PUBLIC EDUCATION
REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON
SANTA CLARA COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1962

There are certain principles so vital to the preservation of American freedom that, literally, they can never be too often reiterated. At the very top of the list is local control of our public educational system.

We cannot tinker and compromise with this principle. We cannot go along halfway. To put it bluntly, we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. Local control of public education is a full-time, hundred per cent matter -- and any retreat represents an opening wedge that may pull down, ultimately, our whole free way of life.

But we must also recognize this fact: whoever pays the bills calls the tune. If we turn to Washington for financial assistance, and if we sit back and wait for the federal government to assume the ever-mounting burden of educational costs, then we are inviting control of our local schools by the federal bureaucracy. We are leaving ourselves wide-open to being told who shall teach, what shall be taught, and how it shall be taught. This is the inescapable price of accepting handouts from Washington.

To maintain the diversity of our schools, which in turn nurtures both freedom and true self-government, each local district must assume the responsibility for meeting the costs. Just as local control is a full-time principle, so too is the parallel principle of local responsibility.

It is easy enough to state these principles. But it is by no means easy or automatic to follow through. Many local districts have their backs to the fiscal wall. Many local districts have already put more of a burden on available sources of revenue than the traffic will bear. And because this is the case, there is an urgent need to re-examine our entire tax and revenue system -- nationally, statewide, and locally -- to make sure that responsibilities and resources are kept in a fair balance.

There is no single field of public policy in which dynamic and imaginative leadership is more urgently needed or where the challenge and the opportunity are greater. As the nation's number one state, California should provide such leadership. As Governor of California, my overriding goal would be to do just that.

EDUCATION
RICHARD NIXON
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA

The state of California must make a basic decision about the principle of support for public education. Traditionally, the state has accepted 50% of the cost. Today that share has slipped to 38%, yet the state continued to enact programs requiring added expenditures by the local school districts. Earmarked funds should accompany every legislative act placing additional burdens upon local school districts. If the state is not to reassume its 50% share of education costs, I would call for a thorough re-examination of tax sources so that greater revenues would be available to local school districts.

EDUCATION
REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 3, 1961

Brown ordered cuts of \$1.2 million in 1961 and \$2 million in 1962 in the budgets of the state colleges. Cynics may suggest it is a matter of "where do votes come from?" I say it is a matter of goals and values. One of my major objectives as Governor of this state will be to see that the education of our young people will receive first priority above any other state expenditure so that education is never short-changed.

EDUCATION
REMARKS BY
RICHARD NIXON
CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION MEETING
GLENDALE COLLEGE
8:00 pm, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1962

California's 62 public junior colleges are at present neither fish-nor-fowl. They are trapped between the administrative controls of local school districts and future plans for growth and functions as outlined in the Master Plan for Higher Education.

For instance, the local school district, which controls the budget, teachers' salaries and student curriculum, treat the junior college like the 13th or 14th grade of the public high school.

On the other hand, the Master Plan for Higher Education envisions the junior college as preparatory school for college or university or as an adult center for teaching specific skills in business or industry.

The result is a lack of any central direction or overall supervision and guidance.

Under such a pattern of confusion, these vital educational institutions will never achieve their tremendous potential. And by 1975, the Master Plan envisages that fully 38 per cent of all full-time college and university students will be enrolled in junior colleges.

What is needed--now, and not ten years from now when the problem is on our front-door-step--is a new chapter in the Education Code which specifically defines the status of our junior colleges, which spotlights their unique function as a bridge between the public high school and the college and university, and which balances fairly their privileges and responsibilities.

The junior colleges should be treated separately and distinctly, in terms of their own problems and prospects and obligations, apart from merely being lumped for some purposes among all public schools (elementary and secondary) and for other purposes among institutions of higher education (as in the Master Plan's future growth projections.)

Lacking this clarification, the junior colleges will never reach their potential, and will never make their maximum contribution to the State's overall educational system.

This calls for leadership by the Governor and the State Board of Education--then the necessary legislation--and finally, follow-through by the Department of Public Instruction and the local boards and districts.

California has always been the nation's leader in the junior or community college movement. We have the most and, up to now, the best. We can maintain that record and continue to provide the unique community services of a flexible junior college system--if our state government provides the necessary leadership in defining the guidelines.

TEACHING ANTI-COMMUNISM
REMARKS BY RICHARD M. NIXON
BEFORE THE NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE STUDENT CONGRESS
AT CERRITOS (JR.) COLLEGE, NORWALK, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 31, 1962

Unless we know the enemy and all his wiles, we are disarmed in advance. We cannot fight back effectively. We cannot take the offensive in support of freedom. The first priority is full knowledge. And the place to start is in our schools. Teaching Communism -- or perhaps we should call it teaching anti-Communism -- must be done in context of our own system. Only when our children understand the principles and the operation of our own free way of life, based on our political philosophy of individual liberty, can they truly understand the shortcomings and failures of Communism.

We must teach our teachers, so they in turn can "teach Communism" and so that every future citizen is prepared to deal with the realities of the world he will face -- and continue to face -- for generations to come.

This is a job -- and there is none more urgent -- for every local school board in California and for citizen groups and service organizations in every community. Veterans organizations, our church federations, the service clubs, the PTA -- these are the voluntary groups to which we must look for leadership. And we can take due local pride that the Pasadena Unified School District will be first in the nation to use the authoritative high school text prepared by Dr. Rodger Swearingen -- "The World of Communism." It is one of the first practical products of the Institute on Communist Strategy and Propaganda, established here at U.S.C. through the generosity of Mr. Henry Salvatori, to provide national leadership for the training of teachers for their central role in this process of "education in Communism."

EDUCATION ABOUT COMMUNISM
FROM REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, CALIFORNIA
AMERICAN LEGION
7:30 PM, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1962
VENTURA AMERICAN LEGION HALL

We need in every community a broad adult education program to keep our citizens alert to the aims, the strategy, and the tactics of the communists -- alert to the nature of the communist menace both at home and worldwide. Schools on communism properly staffed and responsibly led can serve a useful role in this respect.

We must train our teachers especially, so that they in turn can instruct our young people in the true nature of the cold war and the present menace to our way of life.

We must see to it that the people demand of their public officials, at every level, vigorous enforcement of the laws and administrative orders designed to contain communist subversion and to expose communist-front organizations.

CRIME

CRIME
REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 3, 1961

In 1959, a Rackets Subcommittee of the Assembly and the Joint Judiciary Committee on the Administration of Justice both warned of increasing criminal activity within the state. The Joint Committee said "there is every indication that an advance guard of eastern hoodlums and Mafia members--men who know how to organize the narcotics traffic, and bookmaking, prostitution and rackets--is here seeking a foothold." They filed their report with the Legislature.

Brown labeled the rackets report "irresponsible" and a "waste of the taxpayers' money." How "irresponsible" the report was may be judged by the fact that in California the crime rate has nearly doubled in six years, and among states in its population class California stands first by a wide margin.

The FBI interprets the 1960 California figures as an increase over 1959 of 21 percent...against a national increase of 14.2 percent.

Putting aside all other comparisons, California has experienced a 90.3 percent increase in major crime during the last six years. I disagree with those who attempt to throw the blame on local law enforcement officials. Leadership on the state level through state laws and state court decisions, as well as the attitude of the Governor of this state on what I believe is an absolutely necessary deterrent to crime--capital punishment--has an undeniable effect on the problem of law enforcement. If the criminal elements get the idea that the State Administration is soft on crime, the inevitable result is to encourage those elements rather than to deter them.

VICE LAWS
COPY OF TELEGRAM
FROM RICHARD NIXON

December 29, 1961

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Governor of California
Sacramento, California

I urge that you add to the next session of the State Legislature a special call for enactment of laws which would clarify the present confusion with respect to the regulation of criminal aspects of sexual activity and prostitution as well as the other implications of the decision in the Lane case.

Local law enforcement officials, particularly in our larger metropolitan areas, must be empowered to act with certainty and confidence in this field. My recommendation would be that we strengthen home rule in cities and counties by making it clear that necessary ordinances can be adopted by localities appropriate to their particular problems in this vital enforcement area. In view of the State Supreme Court Decision, only appropriate action by the Legislature under your call can achieve this result.

SM-58

CIVIL DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE
REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
OCTOBER 26, 1961
REPUBLICAN FUND-RAISING DINNER
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

I say that no governor on a matter of this importance and urgency should stand by and wait to be told what to do by the federal government. He should not duck responsibility but should make a decision as to what the state government can and should do to meet this problem. Vacillation and indecision in the Chessman case was one thing; vacillation and indecision in the survival of 16 million Californians is another.

The main reason California cannot wait for a federal survival program is that this state has problems unique to California alone. It requires a special program to protect our industrial and defense capacity--a special program to protect our large urban centers.

SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT

SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 28, 1962

More representation in the State Senate for the growing metropolitan areas of California is a matter of simple justice.

Reapportionment of our State Senate is an important, serious, difficult and controversial matter. But the future well-being of our metropolitan areas and of our state as a whole is involved. I am convinced that the State Senate will be reapportioned.

The solution, whenever it comes, must be based on sound principle, one which will serve our growing state for at least until 1970. Changing the make-up of the Senate must not be decided upon political expedience.

The problem before the people of California is how to give our urban areas a more equitable voice in their government without usurping the influence of the less populous areas of our state.

We must maintain our traditional system of balances between urban and rural areas of our state, and this can only be accomplished through a bicameral legislature. This is the principle for which we must strive.

It is painfully obvious that the Brown reapportionment plan, drawn from his own blue-ribbon commission after two years of delay, was a gross affront to the expectations of the people. He offered 3 more senators to Los Angeles as a sop and a tranquillizer. It was no reapportionment plan at all. Lacking even a shred of principle, the Brown plan already has gone down the drain.

The surprise amendment to the Brown plan, submitted by Jesse Unruh, the Assembly Majority Leader, would provide the same 3 additional senators for Los Angeles and give one additional senator each to San Diego, Orange, San Francisco, Alameda and Santa Clara counties.

The scheme, devised in a day or so, although better than that of his protege (Governor Brown), still suffers from the mark of political expedience. Mr. Unruh does not hesitate to juggle his figures to fit his plan: he asks that four populous counties have 700,000 citizens for an extra senator but that Los Angeles must have 1,200,000 for an added representative in the Senate.

I have studied the various reapportionment plans and weighed the pros and cons of each. One stands out as the best, giving fair representation to both our urban and more rural areas. It is a carefully considered plan, already in operation elsewhere, which will stand the test of time and principle. This is the modified Colorado Plan.

As applied to California, the Colorado Plan would add ten new members to our Senate: one each for San Francisco, Santa Clara, San Diego and Orange and five for Los Angeles.

The Senate then would have 50 members: 20 representing the heavily populated areas and 30 for the balance of the state. It would work out so that the 20 urban Senators would be evenly divided between north and south -- ten representing the seven Bay area counties and ten for the Los Angeles-Orange-San Diego area.

This 20-30 division meets the standard of fair representation. The nine urban counties of our state (Los Angeles, San Diego, Alameda, San Francisco, Orange, Santa Clara, Sacramento, San Mateo and Contra Costa), which now have 73% of the state's population and only 22.5% of the Senate representation, would have 20 Senators or 40%. But they would not dominate the upper house in that the rest of the state would have 30 Senators.

The six leading urban counties, receiving the ten new Senators would then have 16 votes in the Senate, or 32% of the total vote. This is only just. Today they have only 15% of the total vote in the Senate-- although the people in these six counties pay some 80% of the state taxes.

The formula of the Colorado Plan, as modified to fit California's need, is as follows:

- (1) Counties with a population of 600,000 or more would be divided into two or more senatorial districts on the following basis:
 - (a) counties with a population of 600,000 but less than 1,200,000 as revealed by the 1960 census: two senatorial districts
 - (b) counties with a population of 1,200,000 or more as of the 1960 census: two senators plus one additional senator for each 1,200,000 over the first 1,200,000
- (2) In a senate of 50 senators, no county can have more than six senators.
- (3) The present limit of no more than three counties to a senatorial district would be retained.
- (4) The constitutional restriction that no county may contain more than one senatorial district would be eliminated.
- (5) The ratios of senators to population may be changed after each decennial census.

I truly believe the voters from all parts of our state and their elected representatives can be persuaded to act in the best interests of

California. We have urgent urban problems to meet, such as traffic congestion, rapid transit, air pollution and others, and important work to do in our state legislature. Our urban areas need and deserve adequate representation.

California is a constantly growing state and progress cannot be stopped. The Senate will be reapportioned one day and it should be reapportioned with justice, wisdom and a sense of principle.

Having studied this problem, I am proud to pledge that, if elected Governor, I will seek to lead the forces of progress in California in effecting the enactment of a reapportionment plan as I have outlined here.

STATE LOYALTY OATH

STATE LOYALTY OATH
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 10, 1962

I support the California state loyalty oath. I believe it should be applied with its full legislative intent. Public employment is a privilege as opposed to a right and we have every reason to require public employees to take the loyalty oath.

SM-63

RIGHT TO WORK LEGISLATION

RIGHT TO WORK LEGISLATION
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 23, 1962

As one who helped to draft the Taft-Hartley Law and who supported the Landrum-Griffin Act, I recognize that labor legislation is not only complex but also far-reaching. Right-to-work legislation on the other hand, in the states where it has become law, has not been effective as a labor reform device.

I oppose a right-to-work law in California because we need a more selective method of dealing with corrupt and dictatorial labor and management practices, one that avoids penalizing the good along with the bad. The application on the state level of the principles of the Landrum-Griffin Act would be one means of achieving the ends we seek. This bill has been well characterized as a "Bill of Rights" for the worker -- a charter of self-government for every responsible organization. I think that is the goal we should seek.

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
RICHARD NIXON
MARCH 10, 1962

In response to your question, I am indeed a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. I believe that there is some confusion between the Foreign Policy Association and the Council on Foreign Relations--they are, in fact, altogether separate. I share membership in the Council with General Eisenhower, former President Herbert Hoover and a host of other distinguished Americans. The late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was throughout his life an active member.

There may also be some confusion as to the purpose of the Council on Foreign Relations. It is purely and simply a group which supports independent research in world affairs. It takes no positions. It is not a policy-making body. It advocates nothing but sound research on foreign affairs--to which findings, in any case, the individual member is in no way bound--as a contribution to public opinion.

SM-65

COMMUNISM

HOW TO COMBAT REDS AT HOME
FROM A NATIONALLY SYNDICATED COLUMN BY
RICHARD NIXON
APRIL 3, 1962

Because of the irresponsible antics of some self-styled experts on anti-communism, national attention for months has been directed to the subject of how not to fight communism in the United States. It is time now to direct attention to the even more critical problem of how to fight communism at home. Because if there is one thing that is more harmful to the national interest than exaggerating the internal Communist danger, it is ignoring it or downgrading it.

I will suggest here a program of how to mount a responsible attack upon communism and Communist influence within the United States.

First, we must recognize that there is a danger. As Cardinal Cushing of Boston pointed out recently, there seems to be "a concerted campaign to establish the conclusion that there is no internal threat from communism in the United States.

"The idea that there is no internal danger from communism contradicts the records of the congressional committees. It rests on the absurd premise that the United States, the prime target, is alone among the nations of the world exempt from concerted Soviet subversion and infiltration."

What is the magnitude of the danger?

J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, stated in a recent speech: I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared--that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so...From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworld, strong enemies--deadly enemies--continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God...The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within.

The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning defiant and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

On the other hand, Atty. Gen. Kennedy in a Los Angeles press conference on March 24 pointed out that the Communist Party had only 10,000 members and characterized it as a "political organization of no danger in the United States."

And the California Federation of Young Democrats reflected their estimate of the internal Communist threat when they recently passed

resolutions calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and repeal of the state law requiring state employees to sign loyalty oaths.

Which of these estimates of the threat of communism in the United States is most accurate?

The weight of evidence overwhelmingly supports Mr. Hoover's conclusion.

To say that the Communist Party, because of its small membership, is of no danger in the United States is more than a misinterpretation of members; it is a misinterpretation of history.

Have we learned no lesson from the Hiss and Rosenberg cases, from the espionage activities of Klaus Fuchs in Great Britain, from the spy ring in Canada or from Robert Coblen and Irving Scarbeck most recently in the United States? The Communists do not need great numbers to steal state secrets.

Equally important, if not as dramatic as spying, is the alarming success of U.S. Communists in planting and spreading ideas that have affected U.S. policy. For example, Communist dupes sold the idea of Mao-Tse-tung as an "agrarian reformer"--a propaganda line which considerably influenced our China policy with disastrous effects.

To ignore 10,000 American Communists, in short, would be as foolhardy as to underestimate the Communist guerrillas in South VietNam because they are only a few thousand. Communists around the world operate as an elite corps, not as an infantry division.

The fight against communism within our borders should be joined by every thinking American, regardless of political party. It should not be left by default to those who overestimate or underestimate the danger.

As a minimum program for dealing with communism in the United States, I would suggest the following:

1. The establishment of a privately financed national foundation, headed by men of great prestige and experience, which would be equipped to extend a "seal of approval" to responsible groups and organizations fighting communism, after a thorough examination of their personnel, programs and financial records. The private citizen today is in need of some trustworthy guidance in this area. This foundation should be completely nonpartisan. This is not a matter in which Americans should divide as Republicans or Democrats. Too many groups today are confusing the fight against communism with a variety of extraneous political, economic and social issues.

2. Education at the school age and adult level on Communist tactics, aims and purposes--including high school courses on the contrasts between communism and the principles of free societies, implemented first by the selection of authoritative text books and the training of teachers. The great problem in America today is not too much patriotism or too little patriotism but too little knowledge--knowledge about communism and about our own way of life.
3. A similar educational program made available to all Americans traveling or living abroad (privately or in government service) so that they could better serve as ambassadors of freedom throughout the world.
4. Vigorous and strict enforcement of the Subversive Activities Control Act, which requires all Communists to register with the Attorney General, so that they may be labeled properly for what they are.
5. Public support of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in the investigation of the Communist activities. Those from the far left who have made Hoover into their personal whipping boy will one day discover how scrupulously his methods have upheld civil liberties while doing a superb investigating job.
6. Public support of investigations by legislative committees in this complex field, including those of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee and the investigating committees of state legislatures. Legislative investigative committees sometimes make mistakes; and when procedures are improper they should be corrected. But I would suggest that those who have been calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities may one day examine its procedures and discover them to be as fair or more fair than the procedures of other investigating committees which have had their support. The anti-Communist arms of our government deserve support and constructive suggestions from the press and public, not just carping criticism.
7. Public support of loyalty and security programs for federal, state and local employees whose government employment is a privilege, not a right.
8. Denial of the use of tax-supported schools and institutions for speeches by any individuals who have refused to testify before legally constituted grand juries or legislative investigating committees.

I have limited this article to a discussion aimed primarily at the subject of dealing with the danger of communism at home. In my next and last article in this series I shall discuss what I believe are the actions we should take to deal with communism abroad.

NIXON HITS MOVE TO ABOLISH UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES UNIT
TAKEN FROM
JOHN M. BERNIER BY-LINED STORY IN THE FRESNO BEE,
MARCH 7, 1962 DATELINED COALINGA (CALIFORNIA)

Nixon said there are right and wrong ways to fight Communism in the United States, and one of the wrong ways is the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as recommended in a resolution adopted at the California Federation of Young Democrats convention in Fresno last weekend.

"The right ways are through investigations by the FBI and vigorous prosecution of Communist Party members under the Subversive Activities Control Act," he declared.

"We also need an educational program in our schools taught by teachers who can inform the students as to the true nature of Communism at home and abroad."

Nixon said he also "completely disagrees" with the Young Democrats' resolution calling for abolition of loyalty oaths.

"One of the bad things which results from such groups as the Birch Society is that some people have gone to the other side, saying there is no danger from Communism," he added.

"I would say that those who are blind to the danger of Communism at home certainly render a disservice to their country the same as those who make a racket out of fighting Communism."

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Since February of 1961, Dick Nixon has spoken out strongly against Robert Welch and his John Birch Society

STATEMENT OF RICHARD NIXON
SPEAKING TO THE CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
CONCERNING ROBERT WELCH AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

It is clear that one of the major issues in this campaign will be which of the candidates for Governor will develop the most effective and responsible program for fighting Communism within California. I believe that on this issue I have a record and the experience to lead this state as it should be led in this fight. Without going into that record, I have learned through long experience how to fight Communism and how not to fight it. I have learned, for example, that no greater disservice can be done to the effort of combatting Communism than to demagogue and overstate or misrepresent the case you are making. I agree with the views J. Edgar Hoover has so often expressed in this regard.

In this discussion I am referring specifically to Robert Welch and the John Birch Society. Two Sundays ago I visited with the Republican President with whom it was my privilege to serve for eight years. Welch has described this great American as a "dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" and he has said that "treason" was the only word to describe Eisenhower's "purposes and his actions." No responsible candidate, member, or unit of the Republican Party can traffic with this viewpoint.

It is not a case of "right or left" or "extremism" which presents a problem in our society today.

Every American is entitled to have "extreme" feelings about his religion, his country, his political beliefs and the threat of Communism. Every American has a right to express his viewpoint.

However, responsible Republicanism abhors demagoguery and totalitarianism wherever and however it appears.

Any organization, creed, or "ism" which totally subordinates the individual citizen to the arbitrary dictatorship of any single person must be combatted, whatever label it carries.

The Blue Book of The John Birch Society specifically states that: "The men who join the John Birch Society during the next few months or few years are going to be doing so primarily because they believe in me (Robert Welch) and what I am doing and are willing to accept my leadership anyway... Those members who cease to feel the necessary degree of loyalty can either resign or will be put out before they build up any splintering following of their own inside the Society."

This statement leaves no doubt that every individual member of the Birch Society is obliged to approve and support the viewpoints of Robert Welch. Where they disagree with his views they have no choice but to resign from the society.

No republican organization can compromise with the demagoguery and the totalitarian views of Robert Welch.

(Excerpted from the question-and-answer period following RICHARD NIXON'S remarks before the San Fernando Valley Chapter of the Los Angeles County Medical Association, February 22, 1962)

Question: In the Los Angeles Times of last Sunday, there was an article which indicated that you were not supporting John Rousset and Edgar Hiestand. Many of their thoughts and their feelings and convictions are similar to many of ours, notwithstanding the membership in the John Birch Society. I wonder if you would comment on this and your reasons for your stand on it?

MR. NIXON: As a matter of fact, I have not taken any stand against any of them as individuals.

What I have said is this: I am a Republican, and I happen to believe that the election of Republican Congressmen, Republican Senators, Republican Legislators, a Republican Governor, etc. would be in the best interests of the state, as well as the nation. I begin with that proposition.

Now, here is the difficulty, looking specifically at the John Birch Society. I have no quarrel with a society that is anti-Communist--I have no quarrel with anybody who wants to take a so-called extreme position. After all, I may be extreme in some of mine. That's an American right.

But the quarrel is this--and I speak now as a Republican --I say that no Republican candidate for office should seek, or accept, the support of an organization whose acknowledged leader has said on several occasions that Dwight Eisenhower and Foster Dulles were conscious agents of the Communist conspiracy. This covers any Republican--it is not directed at any one of them. As far as I am concerned, men who accept or seek that support deliberately, and who don't repudiate that kind of thinking, are not going to serve their Party. As a matter of fact, they will insure their own defeat.

In my opinion, men who do have good strong convictions--and both of the men you have mentioned, for example, have, in many respects, fine records insofar as some of these basic economic and political issues we have been talking about are concerned--such individuals should, in their own interest and in the interest of their Party, either get the John Birch Society to repudiate the kind of leadership it has or they should get out of the organization, one or the other.