

**The original documents are located in Box C33, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 1/6/1976” of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

**MEETING WITH  
SENATOR MATHIAS**

**Tuesday, January 6, 1976**

**12:30 P. M.**

**THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.....**

---

Jim -

I plan to keep this here

Trudy

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN...  
January 5, 1976

MEETING WITH SENATOR MATHIAS

Tuesday, January 6, 1976

12:30 p.m. (10 minutes)

The Oval Office

Thru: Max L. Friedersdorf

From: William T. Kendall *WTK*

I. PURPOSE

To discuss, at the Senator's request, the Massachusetts Primary and two other topics.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS & PRESS PLAN

A. Background: Senator Mathias, on October 30, 1975, made a speech at the National Press Club in which he hinted that he might enter some primaries if the President faltered in New Hampshire and other early primaries. (See speech and press clips at Tab A.) The gist of Mathias' speech and subsequent press stories was that the President was making concessions to the Republican "Right Wing" which was driving moderates and "centrists" out of the party. This, he claimed, would result in a weakened GOP, a possible party split, and the emergence of a third political party -- what he called a "centrist" party.

Subsequently, Mathias, in a press interview, said he might not run in the primaries but instead, run as a third party "centrist" candidate.

Kendall has spoken directly with Mathias regarding the Senator's intentions. Immediately after the October speech, Senator Mathias requested a meeting with the President to explain his speech and the attendant publicity.

Last week Mathias again called Kendall to renew his request for a meeting. He wants to talk about three subjects:

1. The general state of the Republican Party (See Tab A)

2. The Massachusetts Primary. During Kendall's conversation with the Senator he said the following: He has been told by some political people in Massachusetts that he would do well in that primary, but that he is not looking for an "ego trip". He also said he is not interested in "helping Reagan" by staying in the Primary. He has a deadline of Friday, January 9, 1976 for withdrawal.

Kendall asked the Senator directly what he thought would be the result of the meeting with the President. Mathias answered that he would consider withdrawing from the Massachusetts Primary if the President asked him to do so.

Kendall believes that Mathias is probably out on a limb and would like an excuse to get out of the primary. In spite of the fact that he claims he would do well he would need funds, which he does not have. Another factor is that Mathias' father-in-law is former Republican Governor Bradford of Massachusetts. If Mathias goes into the state he would have to do well or suffer a certain amount of embarrassment.

3. George Bush. Senator Mathias also indicated he would like to talk about George Bush and his anticipated confirmation as Director of the C. I. A.

B. Participants: The President, Senator Mathias, and William T. Kendall

C. Press Plan: Not to be announced. White House photo only.

### III. TALKING POINTS

1. Hello, Mac. I am pleased that you wanted to come in for a talk. I am disappointed that I have not had your support thus far for the nomination. I have read your press club speech and I do not agree with you that I have been overly concerned with the views of the conservatives. My door has always been open to listen to all shades of opinion and I think it is becoming obvious that there are significant differences between myself and Reagan.

2. In my mind, I am a moderate and I feel that I can attract the majority of voters, not only in the primaries but in the November election.
3. Mac, I understand that last year you also faced a threat from the so-called right wing. I am sure you did not emphasize your progressive record in the face of Helen Bentley's well-known desire to run against you. What would your advice be in the face of Reagan's challenge?
4. Mac, I think neither of us would like to see a Reagan candidacy. We can best beat back this challenge by uniting rather than splitting the party. I know you are facing a deadline on Friday in Massachusetts. I believe the state will be one of my strong ones but I can use your help there. I hope that you will consider withdrawing in my favor.
5. I understand you want to discuss George Bush. Why don't you go ahead, Mac.



## Liberals See GOP Heading for Disaster

# Mathias Hints at Challenge to Ford

Associated Press

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. of Maryland says that the Republicans may be headed for disaster in 1976 and indicated he or another GOP liberal might enter the presidential race if President Ford falters in the New Hampshire primary.

Speaking at the National Press Club yesterday, Mathias expressed the view which is shared by some fellow GOP liberals that Ford is trying to appear as conservative as his expected rival, Ronald Reagan. He said Ford "is driving more and more moderates and centrists out of the party," making a Reagan nomination more likely.

A Reagan nomination, Mathias said, would have a "serious effect" on an already-weakened national Republican party, possibly leading to a party split and the emergence of a new national political party.

"I THINK a third party is becoming a very real possibility," the 53-year-old Mathias said, noting that while other recent third parties have



SEN. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS  
Concerned for party's future.

been built around political figures, a new party now might be "the centrists party" leaving the Republicans

on the right fringe of American politics.

Unless the GOP broadens its base and makes clear it welcomes broad participation, Mathias said, "we'll become the Whigs of 1976," a reference to the long-defunct party of the 1800s.

When asked if he would consider running for president, Mathias called that "a step which any American would be proud to take if he felt he could credibly present a new and fresh point of view." He added "circumstances would have to change" before he would consider running.

"WE'LL HAVE TO wait and see how things unfold," Mathias said. Asked if circumstances might change after the Feb. 24 New Hampshire primary, he replied, "Yes. They did for Lyndon Johnson."

Johnson dropped out of the 1968 presidential race after he narrowly defeated the antiwar challenge of Sen. Eugene McCarthy in New Hampshire and appeared headed for a substantial defeat in the Wisconsin primary.

OCT 31-76

# Ford 'Drift to Right' Alarms GOP Center

By David S. Broder

Washington Post Staff Writer

Progressive Republicans, alarmed by what they see as a "drift to the right" by President Ford in response to Ronald Reagan's challenge, are considering running a candidate of their own in next year's presidential primaries.

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.), one of those involved in the discussions, is expected to express his "deep concern" over Mr. Ford's becoming "a captive of the Reagan right" when he speaks at the National Press Club this noon.

Mathias reportedly was considering including a call for a challenger to Mr. Ford from the progressive side of the party in his talk, but has discarded it as "premature" at this time.

But Mathias and others among the dozen Republican senators who last month urged Mr. Ford to take a less conservative course in his campaign are privately alarmed at what they see as signs of a continuing rightward turn in his rhetoric.

The President's speech yesterday, bristling with criticism of New York City's "mismanagement," was the latest evidence of "Reagan-like rhetoric," in the eyes of the progressive Republicans. Mathias contended that "the President threw out an anchor to New York when they needed a lifeline."

The same concern was expressed last week by a prominent California Republican and former Washington official who asked a reporter, "Does Ford really think he can outdo Ronald Reagan in bidding for the anti-government vote?"

Since the defeat at the 1964 Republican convention, progressive Republicans have had increasing difficulty maintaining their influence on national GOP policy.

Many of them now express the fear that if the only challenge to Mr. Ford comes from Reagan, who is expected to announce his bid next month, they will be excluded from any voice on the party platform and ticket.

It is that belief that has provoked the discussion of entering a candidate from the progressive wing in New Hampshire and other early primary states, so that "we cover 180 degrees of the Republican spectrum, not just 20 degrees," as one official put it.

So far, that strategy has been blocked by advice from Vice President Rockefeller and others that the progressives "should not rock the boat."

But some of them fear that even if Mr. Ford turns back the Reagan challenge, the positions he is adopting in order to counter Reagan will jeopardize his chances in the general election and reduce

the base of support for Republican candidates up and down the line.

An even greater concern to some of the progressives is the "vacuum" that would exist if Reagan should defeat Mr. Ford in the early primaries in New Hampshire and Florida.

Former Secretary of the Treasury John B. Connally, who will speak in New Hampshire on Monday, is reported by associates to be poised to jump into the Republican race against Reagan under those circumstances. But Connally is no more acceptable to the progressives in the GOP than is the former California governor.

Without a progressive candidate in the field or prepared to run, the progressives fear they would again find themselves blocked from any leverage on the national party ticket.

ar  
no  
ca  
an  
Gu  
ch  
ne  
S

RELEASE: 12 NOON THURSDAY  
OCTOBER 30, 1975

SPEECH BY SEN. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS JR.  
(R-Md.)

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONTACT: Alan Dessooff/Jim Young  
224-4654

OCTOBER 30, 1975

The press has long been revered as an American institution. In 1787 Thomas Jefferson wrote " . . . were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

This, of course, was written before Jefferson had held a high elective office. After he had assumed the Presidency, his views were somewhat modified. In 1807 he wrote to John Norvell that "nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle." He added that "the man who never looks into a newspaper is much better informed than he who reads them."

It is unfortunate that Jefferson was not exposed to the creative genius of daytime television so that we could have his views on that as well.

We meet today in the shadow of a momentous occasion in the life of the republic. 1976 marks the Bicentennial of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and, 1976, is also a Presidential election year. These two events serve as touchstone for my comments today.

On the one hand there is the Declaration of Independence, a glorious statement of the humane principles that underlie the republic. Both as a reminder of that which is best in our traditions and as a check list of unfulfilled aspirations, it acts as a needle on a compass directing us on a course of action that is true to the finest of our ideals.

The coincidence of a Presidential election during the Bicentennial, on the other hand, focuses our attention to the machinery of government on the means for accomplishing the goals articulated in the Declaration. How adequate are our institutions as a vehicle for turning the promises of 1776 into reality for the generation of 1976?

The answer, I would argue, is mixed at best. There is much to be proud of as we move into our Bicentennial. We are strong, we are at least relatively well off, and the aftermath of Watergate allows us to assert that we are capable of self-correction.

But, there is also the negative side. Our people, I believe, do not sense a purpose or direction to our national life. There has been a failure of leadership for which all of us in public life - including you in the media - must take some responsibility. Throughout the nation there is a call for leadership that must be -- but is not being -- met. In particular, we must articulate the tough issues of our day in ways that can translate into public dialogue. This is not taking place and all of us share the blame.

I should like to focus today on the political parties for I believe they have singularly failed -- both internally and in competition with each other -- to raise and define many of the crucial issues facing us. Let us look at but some of these issues.

They have failed on the issue of crime. Major crime rose 143% under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Under President Nixon's administration, criminal activity was not only on the rise in the White House, but in the school house. While crime increased an additional 30% on the streets of America, assaults on students in schools rose 83% and drug and alcohol abuse in school rose 37.5%.

No-knock raids by Narcs in the night are not the answer. We not only have made no significant effort in combatting crime, but we have not even begun to understand what causes it. It has been years since political parties seriously asked why America's prisons have been allowed to remain graduate schools in the criminal arts instead of providing industrial type employment within prison facilities so that workers can learn meaningful jobs and support their families while they are in prison?

Our political parties have failed on the issue of jobs. The promise of the Employment Act of 1946 is unfulfilled. Eight million Americans today are unemployed and looking for work, and neither party has come up with the only viable answer, a job for every

American ready, willing and able to work.

America's political parties have failed on the issue of welfare reform. From 1964 to 1975, Federal, State and local welfare expenditures rose from \$5.6 billion to more than \$37.7 billion. Today one person in every six in New York City is on welfare. The present welfare system has wasted money. But it also has wasted human lives. It has created a cycle of dependency that feeds people and keeps them alive. But it gives them no hope for a better tomorrow.

Our political parties have failed on the issue of tax reform. If you earn \$8,000 a year working in a steel mill, you pay the full tax. If you earn \$8,000 a year buying and selling General Motors stock, you pay only half as much tax; and, if you earn your living busily clipping coupons from municipal bonds, you may pay no tax at all. Both parties give lip service to tax reform -- but no real tax reform has been enacted. My colleague, Senator Hatfield, has proposed a simplified tax system with no loopholes. It has been given thoughtful consideration and a decent bipartisan burial. I believe that such a tax plan could be modified to incorporate a negative income tax sufficient to permit a dismantling of much of the present welfare system. For all willing to work, we should guarantee jobs. For those unable to work, a negative income tax would treat poverty for what it is -- an economic disability, rather than a social disease.

Despite all of the rhetoric, our parties have failed to surmount bureaucratic red tape. Businessmen are confronted with more than 50,000 pages of federal regulations which appear each year in the Federal Register. I am told that the ICC has more than 43 trillion railroad rates on file without an index. Professor Moore has calculated that the ICC has cost consumers up to \$7 billion a year in excess freight rates. Its delays in the Rock Island merger unquestionably contributed to the bankruptcy of that railroad. And what do you think they are doing now? They are asking Congress for more regulatory authority. Unfortunately, regulatory reform is at the bottom of the political shopping list. The tragic fact is that both parties know that you can get more attention playing garbage

- 4 -

man for a day than you can by wading into the complex and tedious area of regulatory reform, even though in the long run it could save America's consumers billions of dollars.

Our parties have tragically failed to deal with the problem of race relations in America. Race relations today may very well be worse than they were a decade ago. South Boston may only be a more visible aspect of that problem. The problem of race relations has been allowed to fester by the lack of creative thinking in the political processes. Everything is over simplified with code words and slogans. You are either for busing or you are against it; you are either for racial quotas or you are against them. While tied up in such simplistic approaches, our political parties have failed to explore the use of new tools to promote equal opportunity, such as civil damages which have been effective in the antitrust area. Worse yet, there are important questions which neither party is even willing to ask. We must consider, for example, whether the EEOC has inadvertently provided a disincentive to locate manufacturing plants in the inner cities thereby compounding the employment problems of the very people it was designed to help.

Our political parties have failed on the issue of health. If the Republicans have a health program, I don't know what it is. As for the Democrats, repudiations are stamping out ideas faster than they can sprout. We are making a grand campaign issue of health while thousands of Americans continue to live in counties with no doctors at all, and other Americans suffer from tragic illnesses because they cannot afford proper medical care.

Our parties have failed to improve the quality of life in urban America. Urban renewal has torn up neighborhoods and repackaged the slums in glass and concrete cages where a man cannot get his shoes fixed or buy a beer. If technocrats of the future have us living with artificial grass under giant domes, there may be air conditioning and all the amenities of modern living. But without trees, grass, wind and rain, without buildings on a human scale, life will not be

enriched. Chickens may thrive in automated hen houses, but man will not.

Every weekend, our highways are filled with people trying to escape the sterile life of the city and renew their communion with nature. Our goal should be to develop cities so that they will be suitable for the full expression of human potential.

While regional planning and metropolitan government provide certain economies of scale, they are often too remote and unreachble. They make people feel powerless and frustrated. Parks, recreation, zoning and other matters of neighborhood concern can be left to neighborhood control-- an important first step if we are to turn service areas into communities.

But the greatest failure of our political parties is the failure to improve the significance of human life. American youth are protesting the dehumanization of society. Their sisters are on drugs and their mothers are on valium. They live in look-alike houses, eat artificial food, and often end up in meaningless jobs. There is a loss of community, a loss of self-reliance and a loss of purpose. Microbiologist Rene Dubos has stated:

Cultural homogenization and social regimentation resulting from the creeping monotony of overorganized and overtechnicized life, of standardized patterns of education, mass communication, and entertainment, will make it progressively more difficult to exploit fully the biological richness of our species and may handicap the further development of civilization.

The failure of our political parties has been accompanied by a rise in the number of persons who register as Independents. In 1964, 22% of the registered voters were Independents. Today this has grown to 32%. More interestingly, the percentage of Independents increases with education. Among Americans with only a grade school education, 21% are Independents, while 38% of college graduates are Independents. The percentage of Independents is also higher among the upper income groups and among young people. For those under 30, 45% are Independents as opposed to 40% Democrats and 15% Republicans.

Being an Independent today may not so much reflect apathy, as a disgust with the alternatives. Independents may be like Jefferson

who said, "If I could not go to Heaven but with a party, I would not go there at all." Bill Moyers has added that "of course there will be no partisanship in Heaven: no Democrats, no Republicans, no socialists, no libertarians, no conservatives, no liberals, no radicals. Just us Baptists."

Not only are most Independents disaffected with our political parties, but millions of Americans are only nominally registered as Republicans and Democrats. For them the parties are nothing more than flags of convenience.

I would warn both parties that there will be a major political realignment in 1976 if they do not respond now to the basic concerns of this country. I have been to the streets of Boston and the union halls of Baltimore and the people out there couldn't care less what party you belong to.

Americans are no longer willing to accept a political party as the lesser of evils. They are no longer willing to accept the old pol technique of never mentioning issues or moving so fast that issues don't arise and contradictions can't be spotted. Nor will people continue to accept thirty-second subliminal spots of daisies or giant saws cutting off the Eastern Seaboard. And they won't accept parties which have no vision for America. The pap that comes out of both National Committees is a fraud on their contributors. I have seldom been able to use any of it, and it would be a sad day if anyone was elected to high public office who did.

On the Democratic side there are nine candidates at last count. Several more wait in the wings.

As they push and shove from state to state, it might be expected that they would stumble onto the issues, but so far they seem to be stumbling over each other. No clear directions seem to emerge and no new confidence is being instilled in the political leadership of the country.

But on the Republican side it is harder and the outlook dimmer. It is not merely a matter of President Ford's fascination with a

very real threat on his right that is limiting debate among Republicans. It is time to recognize the attrition that has debilitated the Republican Party. In 1964 when Edward Bennett Williams left the Party and five or six years later when John Lindsay and Ogden Reid left the Party it was easy for the regulars to say "Good riddance -- those are just the rats leaving!"

But it wasn't only the restless, bright, liberal young men who were leaving. It was also thousands of thoughtful, serious, concerned and moderate women and men of every age and economic status. Many more didn't even bother to drop out -- they went into hibernation. And the trend continues. One straw in the wind is the new freshman class of 1980 at Goucher College -- with students who will admit to being Republicans down 7% from last year.

And so the intraparty debate grows more and more tepid, and less and less relevant. And so a great creative force is wasted and dissipated at a time it is most needed.

If the political parties are to survive, they must become more than election vehicles.

They must do more than follow public opinion polls.

In the last analysis they must begin to do what is right, to provide for the full development of the potential of every American.

We can provide jobs for all those willing to work -- and we must.

We can tax all income the same -- and we must.

We can become blind to race -- and we must.

We can rejuvenate our cities and schools --- and we must.

And we can improve the significance of life for each individual -- and we must.

As Americans, we have a unique capacity for regeneration. The Civil War, the riots in our cities and Watergate, rather than destroying us, were followed by a renewal of our institutions.

Yet, we also have the capacity for change. As a revolutionary people, we broke the bonds and traditions of the Old World. We have reached across the frontiers of time, space and knowledge. We have brought new ideas to the world in science, industry and democracy.

*\* Remember CM's bill to exempt  
tax on the Family Farm?*

Like young trees, we have been ready to shed old bark for new growth. Do we dare to be revolutionary still?

If our parties do not respond, there are precedents for what must happen. Republicans and Democrats, like Whigs and Federalists, will pass into history as others emerge who speak to modern man.

Long shadows are cast across the land -- there is too much decay in our cities --

Too much crime in our streets --

Too much cancer in our bodies --

And too much discontent in our hearts.

But if you listen in the quiet of the morning, or the stillness of the night, you can hear a sound -- it is the energy of the people.

The surging of hopes unfilled.

The striking of visions unreached.

The burning of desires unmet.

It is the sound of a great people. They are saying, with leadership we can reach across the valleys of fear, and build the bridges of hope. With leadership we can work together, dream together, and achieve together to make a better land.