

**The original documents are located in Box 12, folder “Hartmann, Robert - National Press Club Speech, 1975/01/16” of the Robert T. Hartmann Files 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Bob H.  
Very good;  
Thanks.



ADDRESS OF ROBERT T. HARTMANN  
COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT

National Press Club

Washington, D. C.  
January 16, 1975

Thank you, Ken.-- another of my old twelfth-floor neighbors, one floor below here. My office was right under the men's head, and sometimes the plumbing leaked, which is the reason I got out of this building.

I'm delighted that I was able to just get in under the wire in Ken's presidency here. I'm equally delighted that another old friend is taking over the reins and I know that Bill Broome at the tiller, ~~of~~ the Press Club's ~~of~~ course, will be as erratic as ever.

I want you to know this is the first time I've had a free meal at the Press Club in 20 years of dues-paying membership. But I think you've made it up to me today for the dues that I've been paying in recent years when I never got over here very much, and I figured that every time I bought a drink at the Press Club bar it cost me \$90.

The Press Club has been an important part of my years in Washington, and unless they raise the dues some more I'm going to continue to pay them.

Now I want you to know that this is a unique experience for all of us because you see before you the most unprepared speaker in the history of Press Club luncheons. I did not write this on the back of an envelope on the train from Gettysburg, but I did have some other speeches to work <sup>on</sup> ~~from~~ besides my own in the last two weeks. And so this is my speech, and I apologize in advance, and as the President said, "I don't

expect much, if any, applause."

I was billed in the beginning when we agreed upon this date to give you a preview of the state-of-the-union. That is true. I didn't say which year. And rather than give you a post-mortem of the one that was delivered yesterday, I decided, after reading the reviews, the one common theme that you find in the reaction to the President's two speeches on Monday and Wednesday dealing with the state of the union -- one to the people directly and the other to the Congress -- is that he has assumed the mantle of leadership and has asserted his Presidency in his own right.

So since the word "leadership" appears frequently in the reaction to the speech, aside from the details of it, I thought that I would talk a little in my speaking time today about the Ford style of leadership.

Every President has different style of leadership. All Presidents have a large measure of leadership before they arrive at the White House. And this President has his own style of leadership and I hope that I can give you some insight as to the nature of it.

Excuse me if I put on my eyes.

I want to start with the definition of the subject of politics. The old classic cliche, which I think was invented by Bismarck, is that politics is "the art of the possible." But Bismarck was, like Henry Kissinger, concerned with inter-

national politics, the politics of nations in the international arena. That definition, though frequently misapplied, does not really apply to our national politics, our internal politics.

I would like to suggest that we find a better definition of politics and politicians, because "the art of the possible," applied to our own domestic political scene, is too cynical and too short-sighted. Politicians, reflecting as they do the ideals and aspirations of those who send them there and take them <sup>away</sup> there, must have a longer view and a broader vision than simply "the art of the possible."

And the politics of individual politicians is something else again. In a sense, we're all politicians. We find politicians in every family. We find politics in every office, in every union, politicians in every corporation, and even in the National Press Club.

Now why are we all politicians? Fundamentally it is because we all want to get our own way. We all have egos. In some the ego drive is greater than it is in others. But we all fundamentally are born wanting to get our own way. And the primitive, instinctive way of doing this is by force, by violence, by superior strength.

In the kindergarten the one child pushes the other child out of the way.

As we grow up, and even after we've grown up in many

cases, we learn from many unsuccessful attempts to get our own way by force and violence that there are other ways, and that do not so often bloody the nose. And that is, that other way, the best of those other ways, the most civilized, is to persuade and to lead and to cajole other people so that they do what you want them to do thinking that it is what they want to do.

And so in the end, they're helping you get your own way instead of preventing you from getting your own way. And this, in fine, is the essence of political leadership.

So my definition of politics, in <sup>the</sup> American democratic context, is much more than "the art of the possible." It is the art -- and it is an "art," it is not a "science" -- it is the art of getting your own way without violence.

Now as distinguished from dictators and strongmen who in the end depend upon guns and secret police, politicians in our society have to resort to getting their own way without violence.

Why is it, then, that people get into politics? I think it's because they have driving egos, and thus, they are essentially competitors. They like to play the game, but they also like to win, and they like to get their own <sup>way</sup>. But they must, by the rules of our game, do it without violence, which is good.

Now there are two kinds of competition without violence

which are ~~g~~ part of our civilization. There are what you might call the "body-contact," "rough" kinds of competition, of which football is an example-- for a lighter example, let's take tennis -- in which all that really matters is to win. The spectators may not like an uneven game, but the players want to win, and they want to win by something to zero if they can. They want to take every point. They want to score all the touchdowns. They want to win and they want to win big.

There is the other kind of competition which might be compared to the parlor games of chess or bridge. In this competition, which you enjoy more for the game itself, you give some and you lose some. You take a trick and you lose a trick. You lose a piece and gain a piece, in order to wind up in the end the winner.

But both of these are competitive activities, and both of these are similar to politics, and the styles of politicians can roughly be divided into those two types: the ones that want to charge and win it all and win it quick and nail it down, and those who position themselves and who are willing to make trades in order in the end to come out on the successful side.

Now by using the example of games, I want to carry this one point further. In both the heavy, body-contact competition and in the more sophisticated competition, there is one

common denominator, which is good, and that is that when the game is over, it's over. Somebody has won, somebody has lost, and you go on to the next game without looking back and without bearing grudges or resentments. And this is what enables our political system to function as it does and to progress.

In short, I want to say that the President exercises a form of leadership which is fundamentally based on competition, this President.

Now all Presidents have different styles, as you know. And all Presidents have some measure of similarity with previous Presidents. And one of our indoor sports here -- in the National Press Club and the Washington Press Corps -- is to compare, whether consciously or not, each President with the other Presidents we have known.

Each President exercises leadership in his own way and there really is no clear comparison between any of them. But let us consider how recent Presidents -- I think there may be a few people here old enough to remember FDR, and we won't go back any farther than that -- exercised their qualities of leadership. In fact, let us say that certain Presidents fall into certain groups.

There are those who exercise leadership through what has recently come to be called "charisma." In earlier time it was called "charm." Basically it is an ability to commu-

nicate very well and directly with the American people.

Those are the qualities which FDR employed in his leadership.

Those were the qualities which John F. Kennedy employed.

Then leadership may also be exercised by being ~~A~~ sort of a father figure, one that is perceived to be a leader or expected to be a leader without really having to assert it.

PARTLY OR  
And this is mainly based on past reputation. We would put President Eisenhower in that category. But we would also have to put General Washington in that category.

Then leadership may be exercised by a powerful personal drive backed by intense personal loyalty on the part of subordinates. I think we would have to consign President Johnson and President Nixon to that category.

And finally, there is leadership that is exercised by being able to convey the impression of the common touch, of decency, doing his best, decisiveness when the chips were down, and finally, directness in, if not eloquence, in speaking. And this quality was best exhibited by President Truman.

Now President Ford has been compared recently, at least in many places I've seen, with President Truman. He is known to be a great admirer of President Truman. There have also been other comparisons with some of the aspects of President Eisenhower's Presidency. I've even seen a few comparing him with Herbert Hoover.

But I am here today to try and outline for you, if I may, out of what observation I have made over the years the distinctive and unique QUALITIES of the Ford style of leadership. What we have said about previous Presidents gives us some guidance, but it does not define the essential qualities of the Ford style of leadership.

Let me say first that a fundamental element of Gerald R. Ford's character is a belief in the virtue of competition. He really believes in competition. He believes in competition in politics. He believes in competition in the economy. He believes in competition in the field of sports. He believes in competition in his own staff. He believes in the two-party system. He believes in the operation of the free market. He believes in the fact that competition of all forces brings out the best in the individual and in the team.

Based on this premise -- and this comes right out of his own personal experience for the whole of his adult life, based on his being the member of a team in football in high school and college, not the star but the captain of the team; on his being <sup>4</sup> football coach during his law-school years at Yale, when incidentally among his pupils were Senator Proxmire and Senator Taft, who have done reasonably well, not necessarily due to their coaching but it must have had some effect on them; and during his nine years as Minority Leader of the House of Representatives -- his leadership is based

on the leadership of one's peers. A member of a football team or the leader of a legislative body does not really have any power to hire or fire, or greatly to punish or greatly to reward the other members of the team. He simply leads by the qualities of leadership and by inspiring those on his team to do their best, not for him but in competition with one another to see who may do the best. And he applies this same principle, and it's a very strong principle, to his own staff, both when it was small on the Hill and now that it is large.

There is a certain amount of redundancy and duplication in this. You get two or three people doing the same thing. But if they know they are in competition with one another they will do it better, and he has the option of selecting the best, or of making a combination of the better elements of each of these things. So that when you hear about two strong men in his Cabinet or on his staff who are alleged to be in competition, this is deliberate, and this produces, I think, for the President a better result and a better choice of ways to go. It is not chaos, as some have reported. It is calculated, and if produces in the end the best possible choices for the President and prevents him from being isolated and being given, really, only one option served up maybe with a couple of impossible alternatives by one source.

Now to conclude, I want to say that the President of the United States, for whom I have great admiration and am not an unbiased witness, but whom I hope I can observe objectively, does have extraordinary qualities of leadership. We have been slow to recognize them, the public has. Those who have worked closely here in Washington, especially on the Hill, have detected this some time ago. <sup>✓</sup> He do not get chosen the leader in the parliamentary body by a couple of hundred sovereign, independent prima donnas unless you have the qualities of leadership. And he not only accomplished that but he sustained it for a very long period of 10 years. And he managed to bring that minority, which grew and fell and grew during the period, into a position where they exercised a considerable degree of control over events of the actions of the Congress. Now to make a minority significant is a far larger achievement than to make a majority significant. And the President was able to do that.

He now faces two years with a Congress by almost 2 to 1 in the hands of the other political party. These talents which he has practiced and honed over the past will stand him in good stead: the talents, to coin a phrase, of conciliation, co-operation, communication and compromise.

The President's style of leadership depends not only upon this principle of competition which the pointy-head intellectuals would call "creative tension" or something

like that, but also upon the assets of personality which he possesses which are roughly similar to those of Presidents Eisenhower and Truman. To some extent he is a father figure. To some extent he has a previous reputation, at least in town here, as being reasonable and able to compromise and a leader in the area of legislation. He has established his decency and personal integrity. He is direct. He is decisive when the need comes for ~~a~~ decision. He certainly established that over the last few days. And he does have the qualities which were one or another embodied in these very different Presidents, Eisenhower and Truman.

-- HE DOES NOT HAVE  
He does not have the assets of charisma, ready communication that were possessed by President Roosevelt and President Kennedy. Nor does he have, I might add, the assets of President Johnson and President Nixon.

So I appeal to you, those of you <sup>U.S.A."</sup> members of the working press and those of you who are just concerned citizens, not to measure President Gerald R. Ford against his predecessors or against an ideal model, but to judge him not by style so much as by substance. He is far more involved and far more interested in substance than is generally believed. The message of yesterday began in his Vice Presidency, in his recognition of the growing concern about the American economy which had been neglected in the general climate of Watergate.

The economic summit, his first economic program and everything else contributed to the definite economic plan that he laid out Monday and yesterday.

He is concerned with substance, and he is deeply involved in substance.

Now add to the competitive spirit, which is his concept of leadership, and the assets of decency and directness and decisiveness, which he has already demonstrated, two additional virtues which, I think, are very important in understanding this President, and probably most people do not quite grasp: One is the virtue of homework and the virtue of hard work. He has been criticised for skiing too much. My complaint is that he doesn't ski enough. He has given up his swimming pool and he rides a stationary bicycle. He should have his swimming pool back, whatever it costs. He needs more rest and relaxation than he is getting. He works approximately 14 hours a day and I don't know how late into the night after he takes his briefcase home. We finished at 4 o'clock yesterday morning the final draft of the state-of-the-union message, and he insisted upon sitting there to the very end with everybody else. This was a product of many minds, but it was in the end his own product. And he does not demand that anybody work any harder than he does himself, and nobody does.

In summary, he has asked for six months to a year to prove

himself and his own Presidency, which he came into under circumstances unprecedented in our history. He is very much aware -- and I think the public should also be aware -- that the recession, the energy crisis that we face, are not going to be cured by speeches nor by style, neither the President's nor that of his critics. They are going to be cured by action, and that action must start soon.

There is only one program for action, there are many goals. Since we have only one program, we must -- and I think the congressional leaders whom he met with at breakfast today would agree -- start to work on this program as the vehicle for getting down to cases. It will be changed, it will be altered. But we must get the public debate on these matters started. Public debate should be conducted out in the open without rancor. There should be, as the Senate has learned, some limit to debate. And by roughly his deadline of April 1, the debate should be over and the votes should be in, because whatever we do -- whether it's what the President asks or what the Democratic program envisions in broad terms or some intermediate course or compromise course -- we must start to do it now.

Speaker Tom Reed, about 90 years ago, was remembered not so much for anything else as a saying which goes like this: "If human progress had been merely a matter of leadership, we would all be in utopia today." Begging to differ slightly

with Dave Broder in his excellent column yesterday about the lack of leadership in this city, we have an abundance of leadership. But whenever I hear a call for leadership, I am reminded that in all the past crises of our history, leadership has been joined by a generous measure of followership. An army cannot be all generals, nor can a government, nor can a political party.

The President has laid forth his plan of leadership, and that, whether it good or bad or indifferent, should be the basis on which we should now begin to move rather than talk. And I have talked too long, so I'll subside.

Thank you.

(END ADDRESS)

Q AND A OF ROBERT T. HARTMAN  
COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT

National Press Club

January 16, 1975

Q What can the President do if Congress rejects his proposals, as it appears Congress will do?

A I disagree with the premise of the question. I don't believe it appears that Congress will do. I believe that the Congress will accept his goals and in large measure some of his proposals to attain those goals.

In other cases they will devise other ways of reaching those goals, which he may accept or reject. His inclination is to accept any reasonably -- any way of reaching those goals which appears to be reasonable and does not contain within it the seeds of greater difficulties in the future. So I can't answer the question because I don't agree that Congress is going to reject his proposals. And I say that, not just as a Pollyanna, but as a result of having sat at breakfast with the bipartisan leadership and listened to them express their private views.

Q What label would you like to see applied to the Ford Administration? The questioner mentions the "great frontier," the New Deal and so on.

A Well, I guess I have fought diligently -- in spite of Joe Kraft's comment this morning that the image-makers are back at work -- against any labels or slogans for the Ford Administration. The image that I would like to see projected to the American people is the man himself, because I happen to believe in that man and I think that he couldn't change

himself if he wanted to. So it's no use for us to try.

I'm against a slogan. I don't want a slogan. The label that should be attached to the Ford Administration is probably the one ~~the immigrant~~ <sup>THAT WHO,</sup> back in the last century, was being given the test for citizenship, And they asked him, "Who was Abraham Lincoln?"

"Well, he was President of the United States."

"What did Abraham Lincoln do?"

"Well, he done the best he can."

Q As an old-line conservative reporter, how do you feel personally about the President's budget-busting program?

A Well, I feel personally that a great deal of thought and work has gone into it and that it is a program. And until I see a better one, I think it's the best one we have. And I don't know, ~~any~~more than you do, whether it will do the things that we hope it will do. But we don't have any other and we got to have something, so I'm for it.

Q How come you write so much better now than you did as a newsman?

A Well, as the old girl said to the young one, "There's no substitute for experience."

Q House votes on Committee chairmanship indicate there is a revolution against the "Establishment" in the House. As a former part of the old Establishment in the House, how will the President attempt to use this movement to his ad-

vantage?

A You have to remember that the President was not only a part of the old Establishment, he was also a part of the rebellion against the old Establishment which occurred 10 years ago.

I think he's very well aware of the motives and methodology of both the Establishment and those who want to overthrow the Establishment, since, after all, he is -- at least on the Republican side -- the latest champion of that practice.

How will the President attempt to use it? I don't think the President is going to get within a country mile of it. He is appealing to the members of this new Congress to take a new look and to make a new start. He is a believer in competition, but competition within the Democratic Party is their problem. And he is going to -- as I think he himself said recently -- look for a floating coalition. The old coalition, which was composed of "conservative" Republicans and "conservative" mostly Southern Democrats, which stuck together on certain matters -- civil rights, States' rights, fiscal responsibility, and so forth -- is a thing of the past.

Today, and as a matter of fact for the last five or six years, he, as minority leader, has depended on coalitions which differed with each roll call. And the fact that he

has been able to prevail, or to sustain vetoes as often as he was when he was on the Hill, is due to the fact that he takes his allies where he finds them. And I think he will continue to do that without regard to the internal differences within the majority party.

Q Some other names in the news, Bob: There have been rumors Secretary Weinberger will soon leave. Any truth to this? Is Treasury Simon in or out? When will President Ford announce the really important Cabinet and White House staff appointments?

A Well, starting at the end of the question, I think he has announced the really important White House staff appointments, and I endeavored to get as many of them here today as I could.

The Cabinet, as you have observed, is slowly changing. And I'm not in a position to answer, and I don't want to answer, the order or who will stay and who will go. This is an ongoing process of testing those who are in the Cabinet when he got there and of looking for those who might be able to give a fresh look to these problems. And it really has nothing to do with the competence of the present Cabinet or a desire to create the facade of a new Administration without any real change in substance. He does not believe that people are damaged goods because they were part of the Nixon Cabinet. Those who have done a good job, who continue

to do a good job, he has already regarded as part of his own Cabinet. If he decides that the country would benefit by a new face, new ideas, fresh blood from the outside -- as normally occurs in a change of Administrations -- then he will make that decision. But I can't announce any particular individuals. You'll have to ask them. And besides, Bill Simon's got his spy here.

Q Now that you're on the inside, would you say the media obtains 10, 25, 50 or more per cent of the whole story?

A It's much better than 50 per cent.

Q Is Mr. Ford easier or more difficult to work for now that he is President?

A About the same, as far as I'm concerned. I detected no great change in him as a person. His time is much more valuable to others and to himself. And I don't spend the time that I used to just shooting the breeze. But as far as the difficulty of working with him, he's never been difficult to work with and he isn't now.

Q Under the announced Administration economic plans, will inflation lessen in 1975 or increase? And by how much?

A My department, as you know, is speechwriting and politics, and not economics. And I have spent the last month, roughly, trying to translate economics into English and to reconcile the views of very high-spirited and talented economic advisors -- professional and amateur -- which the President

has at his disposal. And I would really not deal in this crystal-ball question. Economists love crystal-ball questions because they have enough 'whereas's' and 'if's' and 'if not' that they can never be caught.

I think the answer to the question is that nobody knows what will happen in the rest of this year until one knows what the Congress and the public -- not to mention forces outside of the United States, over which we have no control -- are going to do. We have before the country now a program, a plan, a blueprint. But we don't have, we are not embarked on a change of course. And until we embark on that change of course, there's no way to calculate where it's going to take us or how fast.

Q Speaking of competition: Does the White House have an enemies list of people outside the White House? Second, Ron Ziegler doesn't seem to care for the way you people are running the White House -- are you going to consult him?

A Well, again to start with the second part of the question: The answer is "No."

The first part of the question -- do we have an enemies list -- the answer again is "No."

Q In view of the energy shortage, do you think President Ford should stop using an electric toaster?

A We are working on converting one to coal.

Q The President has indicated there will be no new funding

for anything but energy. Can we expect a lot of recisions and deferrals, and if so, in what areas?

A Now, I'm glad we got a serious question. First of all, I want to try and make clear what he meant by "no new spending programs." He did not mean ~~than~~ there would be no increases in any category in existing federal programs. He did mean that there would be no brand-new programs which do not exist now. He will ask for cuts in some programs, he will probably ask for increases in other programs. But he does not want -- he will not propose and he does not want -- Congress to undertake any new programs which involve brand-new commitments to spend tax money. And this proposal, of course, is for a one-year moratorium on this idea.

So ~~that~~ it's not that he is going to be against any new spending or any additional spending, but that he is going to be against any spending for entirely new purposes, other than in the development of energy.

Q Speaking of messages: Will the President issue another "State of the World Message?" If so, when?

A The President will deal more exhaustively with the subject of international affairs in a future message to the Congress. He will go much deeper into the international and foreign-policy field than he did yesterday. As to when, I can't really answer that question. I don't know.

Q Does the President's belief in competition mean we can

expect more vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws?

A Yes. Not only more vigorous enforcement, which he already proposed last year when he first became President, in his first economic message, but also much more deterrent penalties, which he proposed in his first economic message -- taking it up to what, a million dollars a year? I mean, a million-dollar maximum fine. So, yes, there is going to be an effort to increase competition by a realistic and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Q On confirmation of Mr. Levi as Attorney General: What are the prospects? Is the so-called conservative opposition serious?

A I probably ought to call on Jack to answer that, since he knows more about what's going on on the Hill now than I do. I have not conducted any nose count in the Senate, but I guess I can reflect the President's thinking when he feels that his nominee will be confirmed, because if he hadn't felt that, I suppose he wouldn't have set it up.

Q Do you personally expect Gerald Ford to seek re-election in 1976?

A Yes.

Q Who was responsible for the collapse of the U.S.-Russian trade deal? Was it Congress, the Russians, Secretary Kissinger?

A The immediate and obvious answer to that is the Russians.

They're the ones that announced that they were cancelling it. To go beyond that answer is to point a finger, and I don't think that is our purpose.

I think that one of the great strengths that President Ford has in his new Presidency is that he doesn't have to look back and point fingers at who's to blame for what and what and what. We're trying to get the emphasis concentrated on looking forward, and I don't think it would do any good for me to try -- even if I knew -- to tell you who was responsible. Most things that go wrong, there's always more than one side responsible.

Q Just a couple ~~of~~ more questions, Bob: One of them is, did you write the line, "My fellow Americans, our national nightmare is over"?

A I think, you know, that falls in the category of a trade secret which a counselor is entitled to keep his own counsel.

(END Q&A)

WASHINIGTON (UPI) -- "AN ARMY CANNOT BE ALL GENERALS; NOR CAN A GOVERNMENT." SAID PRESIDENTIAL COUNSELOR ROBERT HARTMANN THURSDAY IN CALLING ON CONGRESS TO BEGIN IMMEDIATE DEBATE ON PRESIDENT FORD'S ECONOMIC AND ENERGY PLANS.

"THE PRESIDENT IS WILLING TO ACCEPT REASONABLE CHANGES; OTHER WAYS OF REACHING HIS GOALS," THE CABINET MEMBER SAID. "BUT WORK MUST BEGIN ON HIS BLUEPRINT NOW TO MAKE CHANGES AND RESOLVE ANYTHING."

IN A PHILOSOPHICAL SPEECH AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, FORD'S CLOSE POLITICAL ADVISER COMPARED THE PRESIDENT TO HARRY S. TRUMAN AND DWIGHT EISENHOWER. HE SAID FORD "DOES NOT HAVE THE CHARISMA"; BUT IS AN EXTREMELY HARD WORKER.

HARTMANN SAID HE DID NOT FEEL CONGRESS WOULD TOTALLY REJECT FORD'S PROPOSALS FOR AN EXTRA TAX ON CRUDE PETROLEUM AND AN INCOME TAX REBATE SIMPLY BECAUSE THE DEMOCRATS HAVE ANNOUNCED THEIR OWN PLANS FOR BATTLING RECESSION AND THE ENERGY PROBLEM.

HE ALSO SAID, IN A QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION FOLLOWING THE SPEECH THAT FORD DID NOT MEAN TO INDICATE IN WEDNESDAY'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE THAT HE WOULD VETO ALL NEW FEDERAL SPENDING THIS YEAR.

"WHAT HE MEANT IS THAT HE DOES NOT WANT CONGRESS TO PASS ANY TOTALLY NEW FEDERAL SPENDING PROGRAMS -- WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ENERGY -- FOR ONE YEAR. BUT HE WILL PROBABLY ASK FOR INCREASES; AND SOME CUTS, IN EXISTING PROGRAMS."

HARTMANN, A FORD SPEECHWRITER AND CONSIDERED ONE OF THE PRESIDENT'S CLOSEST POLITICAL ADVISERS, COMPARED FORD TO FORMER PRESIDENTS TRUMAN AND EISENHOWER IN HIS "DECENCY, DIRECTNESS AND LACK OF ELOQUENCE."

"HE DOES NOT HAVE THE CHARISMA OF A FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT OR A JACK KENNEDY," SAID HARTMANN.

"SO I APPEAL TO YOU, THE WORKING PRESS AND INTERESTED CITIZENS, NOT TO JUDGE GERALD FORD BY STYLE; BUT BY SUBSTANCE. HE IS, AS NOTED WEDNESDAY, CONCERNED WITH SUBSTANCE."

HARTMANN SAID FORD WORKS 14 HOURS AT LEAST 14 HOURS A DAY AND HE STRUCK BACK AT CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT'S CHRISTMAS SKIING HOLIDAY IN VAIL, COLO.

"HE DOESN'T GET ENOUGH REST AND RELAXATION AS IT IS. HE RIDES A STATIONARY BICYCLE AND HAS GIVEN UP HIS POOL."

"HE BELIEVES IN HARD WORK AND HOMEWORK."

UPI 01-16 03:20 PES