

**The original documents are located in Box 18, folder “U.S. News and World Report Interview - Hartmann, Marsh, and Buchen (1)” 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

# U.S. News & World Report

WASHINGTON

2300 N STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037

September 10, 1974

Mr. Robert T. Hartmann  
Counselor to the President  
The White House  
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Bob:

Enclosed is the transcript of our interview with you, Mr. Marsh and Mr. Buchen as we have edited it for size and plan to use it. It is important that you make only necessary alterations and that you preserve the conversational language.


As Paul Martin has explained, because of our press requirements it is absolutely essential that we have the approved interview returned by the close of business today. I have asked John Mashek to keep in touch with you and to pick up the manuscript from you as quickly as it is ready.

It is essential that all corrections be made to this master copy of the manuscript, which will become the approved original. Thus, any corrections which Mr. Marsh and Mr. Buchen wish to make must be incorporated in this copy.

We would prefer that no mention be made to the press or others that we plan the interview.

Sincere thanks to the three of you for some candid views and for the time you gave us. I know the interview will command wide attention.

Sincerely,

  
Marvin L. Stone  
Executive Editor

INTERVIEW WITH  
ROBERT T. HARTMANN, COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT  
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT  
PHILIP W. BUCHEN, CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL

← Phil note  
TO THE PRESIDENT

Washington, D. C.  
September 9, 1974

"U.S. News & World Report"

Q Gentlemen, President Ford's decision to grant full pardon to former President Nixon was both sudden and dramatic.

Does it generally reflect the way Mr. Ford runs the White House?

Mr. Buchen: In some ways, yes, and in others, no. It does reflect a boldness of decision, a willingness to appraise the situation and let the consequences take care of themselves.

Mr. Ford realized that a move as sudden and dramatic as that one would have mixed consequences which could not have been evaluated, however long he studied the problem. This was one decision where he had to reflect more in his own mind than consult other people, as he usually does. But it does reflect his willingness to make bold decisions.

Q In the case of the Nixon pardon, did the President ask his top staff members for advice on what to do?

Mr. Hartmann: We were first made aware of the issue when

the President said, in effect, "Here is the problem. I am tending in this direction. But I need to have some additional information, and I would appreciate your views." It was not a case of saying, "Here is the problem, what should I do about it?"

Mr. Marsh: When the President brought the subject up, there was a free and frank exchange of views. Different aspects of it were discussed that would give him reason to think and reflect. There was a solicitation and opportunity for staff to make an input face to face.

Q Did anyone object to the decision?

Mr. Hartmann: I wouldn't call it so much objecting to it as pointing out certain pitfalls, certain consequences that

- more -

might flow from it which might be adverse to his political interests. But he really didn't seem very concerned about that.

Q Mr. Ford was essentially a "loner" in making the final decision --

Mr. Marsh: It was a lonely type of decision for him to have to make, but I don't think the decision was out of character.

Q Would it be correct to say that Mr. Ford had made up his mind to pardon Nixon whatever the courts did, so he just decided to get it out of the way without going through an empty criminal process?

Mr. Buchen: I'm certain that was in his mind. He assumed that inevitably some clemency had to be shown. The question is, if you know a man is about to walk a plank, when do you decide to save him? When he first steps upon the plank or when he gets to the middle or when he gets near the end or

when he plunges over and you dive after him to save him from drowning? It's a question of the most humane timing.

Q Was Mr. Ford's main consideration the extent of the suffering that Nixon had already gone through?

Mr. Buchen: Not so much the Nixon suffering but what the country would go through as they watched this man go step by step toward the brink.

Mr. Hartmann: The President's inclination was clear. It was his intention, from the beginning that as soon as he had reached a firm decision in his own mind he wanted to state that decision without any further delay.

Q Does the President's decision on the Nixon pardon suggest he has a tendency to make up his mind first on important issues and then ask for supporting material?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't think this particular decision is at all typical of the norm in his decision-making process. This was a particularly personal decision -- one that was a mat-

ter of his own conscience and his own feelings. Decisions which have to do with such things as legislation or policies are handled in quite a different way.

Q How would you describe Mr. Ford's normal way of operating?

Mr. Hartmann: The normal way is to get ~~as~~ many people out collecting the facts, and then, having been given the facts and the dimensions of the problem, to consult with a considerable number of people both in and outside the Government -- the individuals depending on what the problem is.

We have no way of knowing in <sup>most</sup> ~~many of these~~ instances how many people he calls on the telephone, how many people he talks to while he's playing golf or while he's riding in an airplane or on various other occasions. He draws on a wide circle of friends both here in Washington and all over the country.

Q Does he make much direct contact on his own with old contacts in Congress?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes, I can't think of a matter that's come up in this first month, and also during the time he was Vice President, where he didn't make at least a half a dozen phone calls, in addition to ones he had other people make.

Q It sounds as if he is not very highly staff-oriented, as some past Presidents have been --

Mr. Hartmann: He's very much a <sup>very</sup> ~~personal~~ individual operator in terms of getting confidential counsel. He likes to get it firsthand and without a lot of other people in the circuit and without a lot of other people in the room <sup>or, he gets it himself</sup> ~~or~~ on the telephone.

Q How is he going to continue to find the time to do all of these things, make the personal contacts, make the decisions? Is it going to be a problem?

Mr. Marsh: I think the President is a decisive man, but he's also a careful and a very deliberate man. He seeks opposing views, but he does not equivocate about making a



*a selection between*  
decision when presented with/opposing views. He will draw  
on and rely on staff assistance, but will not <sup>bind</sup> ~~bind~~ himself  
to that. He's extremely wide-read from the standpoint of  
current events -- the press, news digests.

Another thing: He's not given to long philosophical discussions with individuals. He likes things laid out very rapidly. <sup>it's best if</sup> Very frequently, <sup>a</sup> you can carry on <sup>a</sup> short conversations with him <sup>and</sup> ~~if you can~~ do it succinctly and summarize.

In this manner he may draw on a large cross section of ~~not~~ <sup>reach his decision and to</sup> views to support the action that he wants to take. <sup>I</sup>  
<sup>might add, I've never known anyone who uses their</sup>  
<sup>time more effectively.</sup>  
Q Would he rather hear advice than see memos?

Mr. Marsh: My experience has been that you had better never  
give Mr. Ford a paper if you don't expect him to read it.

<sup>put</sup>  
If you <sup>get</sup> things on paper, he likes to have short summaries,  
<sup>precise and</sup>  
~~objective,~~ laid out with the various courses of action.

<sup>what he prefers is an</sup>  
~~Really, though, he likes best the~~ oral presentation, where  
it's presented in an objective way.

Mr. Buchen: He's got an oral mind rather than a visual mind.

Q Is he a speed reader?

Mr. Hartmann: He reads about twice as fast as I do. He gets through newspapers and magazines a lot faster than most people do. He's the most efficient man in the use of his time that I've ever worked around.

Q In running the Administration, will the President appoint an economic "czar," or men with broad powers in any other field?

Mr. Hartmann: My feeling is that we are not going to have very many "czars." We're just going to have a President.

Q Why is that?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, the President operates on the principle of competition, both of men and ideas. I don't want to carry the football team analogy too far, but he is a great

- more -

believer in competition. He uses the principle of competition in getting the best out of people, both on his staff and those whose allegiance is only voluntary, perhaps transitory.

When he took over the leadership of the House, he followed two Minority Leaders who were pretty much one-man shows.

He immediately broadened the formal leadership of the minority party of the House to about nine people, who were representative of the geographical <sup>and ideological</sup> spread of the party. They

were all trying their best to make a good impression on their new <sup>leader</sup> ~~boss~~ and be the one who was closest to his ear.

He used them in competition against one another to get the job done, <sup>although</sup> ~~where~~ he had really no coercive power over any of them.

The same thing is true on his staff now. He never has a single individual who does everything, knows everything and who is the straw boss for everybody else. He will have

areas of responsibility, somewhat hazily defined sometimes, but he will give one person this responsibility and one of them <sup>another</sup> ~~this~~ one. Sometimes he'll give them both the same <sup>job</sup>, to see who comes out best.

The end result is that he can either take the best of the two or he can combine the best features of the two and have a better result. He also gets quicker results that way.

Q Is it a good idea to have duplication of effort and overlapping functions?

Mr. Buchen: If there's a duplication of effort, a certain redundancy is always good because you're going to get a better product. Some people may feel there is a danger in that, with divided responsibility, important matters may fall between two stools, and not get acted upon quickly enough. I disagree, because the general tendency of anybody working on a project is to move in wherever he thinks it is necessary to bring the thing to a head. When the respon-

sibility is located in one man, he's not going to let anything fall between the stools. He's going to clear it with those who are concerned.

Mr. Marsh: I think a safeguard against any decision slipping between the cracks is the active interest in Government that's demonstrated by the press. Issues that are important are constantly being brought to the attention of the President and his staff simply because of the intense interest that you have from the press, who every day ask about most of those issues.

Q General Alexander Haig now has the title of Chief of Staff in the White House. Is he working at the same level as he did in the previous Administration? Is his role changing?

Mr. Hartmann: There have been so many crash matters in the past few weeks that one or more of the three of us here have had to undertake, that we're very happy that General Haig

has been carrying out the routine functions of the staff, which are enormous, complicated and have in some respects a life of their own.

To answer your specific questions, General Haig is operating at the same level as he did in the past. But if you mean is he the only one who goes into the Oval Office and gets out the answers, then my answer is "No."

Q If General Haig should leave in the next few weeks or months, as has been reported, would he be replaced by somebody else who would serve as Chief of Staff?

Mr. Hartmann: The President has not yet indicated. But any Chief of Staff for this President, if he is indeed to wear that title, would not be an all-powerful Colonel House or a Sherman Adams. He would be more like an administrative assistant on the Hill who runs the office work. *But, his counsel would also be important and would be sought.*

Q The White House staff you're describing sounds like a more loosely-knit organization than, say, Presidents Nixon

or Eisenhower employed. Is that an accurate description?

Mr. Hartmann: ~~It's not a general staff~~. It's not a military general staff, or a corporate pyramid. It's more on the pattern of a congressional or senatorial staff operation, in which you have lines of responsibility going from the center out to various people and coming back the same way.

Q Who on the White House staff has the most direct and frequent access to the President?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, there are the three of us. There's

Dr.  
General Haig, there's ~~Henry~~ Kissinger, there's the Press Secretary. Then there are Bill Timmons, in charge of con-

gressional liaison, Dean Burch, <sup>one of his</sup> a political adviser<sup>s</sup>, and

another <sup>Of course there's Mildred Leonard</sup> Anne Armstrong, <sup>And there are</sup> a counselor. <sup>ever</sup> others with direct access when they need it, like Bill Seidman and <sup>more</sup> Alan Greenspan and some I'm sure I've overlooked.

and Dorothy Downtown (his personal Assistant and Secretary.)

Q Who decides who sees the President?

Mr. Hartmann: The President himself does.

Q Does the President have an appointments secretary who controls his day?

Mr. Hartmann: There is an appointments secretary -- Warren Rustand -- but he doesn't control the President's day. The President controls his own day. The appointments secretary simply keeps track of the President's schedule.

Someone who wants to see the President might call him directly, or call the appointments secretary, or one of us here, or several other people. There is no single channel to the President. Sooner or later, the word gets through to Mr. Ford and he'll <sup>decide</sup> ~~ask me~~ whether he wants to see or talk to the caller, and when x

Q The President has said his door is always open. But given the size of the job and the number of hours in a day,



won't you have to start getting tough on regulating access to the President?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, I don't know how that particular problem is going to change very much, except maybe get a little easier. He's not going to have to receive every ambassador anew every year, as he's doing now. A lot of things that have gone on in recent weeks won't have to be repeated.

*courtesy*  
They're ~~one~~-visit callers.

Q There have been reports of friction between the people

Mr. Ford is appointing to the White House staff and the holdovers from the Nixon White House --

Mr. Hartmann: I think the frictions are basically not so much personal as it is the exasperation which people who have worked with *President* ~~Mr.~~ Ford for a long time feel over the fact *others don't immediately* that ~~the Nixon staff does not seem to~~ understand the ways *We are impatient,* in which Gerald R. Ford likes to operate. *This is frustrating*

ing and exasperating to us, because we feel that Mr. Ford

~~is not being~~ <sup>cannot be</sup> well served by those who are trying to do it  
another way.

But I think that in time ~~they~~ <sup>everyone</sup> will learn his ways and  
~~they~~ will adapt to them.

Q Then you don't see any great housecleaning?

Mr. Hartmann: Not in the sense of a real Stalin-type purge,  
no.

Everybody is trying to treat the old White House staff  
with great generosity and courtesy. They're all trying to  
do the best they can. However, there is this innate inabil-  
ity of an institution to change suddenly. And the machin-  
ery that serves one kind of a President isn't <sup>necessarily</sup> ~~going to be~~  
<sup>the best to</sup> ~~will~~ serve another kind. These two men <sup>Presidents</sup> -- Ford and Nixon --

are very different as individuals. This has caused some  
friction and some trouble because, as I say, it's a little  
<sup>think we</sup>  
exasperating to us who <sup>^</sup> know what he wants and the other  
<sup>also</sup>  
people who think they do.  
<sup>^</sup>

Those who are unable to adapt will be uncomfortable.

There are some people who obviously don't fit in. If they haven't left already they doubtless will. But there are not ~~too~~ many people of that character.

Mr. Marsh: The best evidence that there is not major friction is the manner in which the offices function, and the smoothness with which the transition was accomplished. I think it was accomplished smoothly.

If you take two small business corporations and put their two staffs together, you're going to have some differences as you make institutional adjustments. There were institutional adjustments that had to be made by those of us who were with <sup>President</sup> Mr. Ford as Vice President and there were adjustments that had to be made by the people with whom we've come to work.

But I think that was accomplished smoothly, with a minimum of rough spots. The Government was able to respond, and

I think that the President was able to move in the manner

in which he <sup>did</sup> moved because of the assistance that he was  
<sup>received</sup>  
getting from both staffs, groping their way along trying

to do what was in the best interest of <sup>the President & the</sup> him and ~~in the best~~ and the best

<sup>interest of the Country</sup>  
~~interest of the country.~~  
interest of the country.

Q Looking ahead, would you expect the White House staff  
to be reduced in size?

Mr. Buchen: I think the President plans to have a small  
staff.

<sup>It has been recommended to</sup>  
Mr. Marsh: ~~As you may know, the "transition team" advising~~ <sup>is report to</sup>  
~~the President recommends~~ <sup>did that there be</sup> a reduction in the size of the

White House staff. But that doesn't necessarily mean that

you move in at your senior staff level. There are a number

of other areas inside the White House where you <sup>might be able to make</sup> can get  
personnel reductions.

Q If we can turn to a specific area of policy-making --

inflation and the economy -- can you tell us how the President

approaches what he has described as the No. 1 domestic problem?

Mr. Hartmann: To start with, <sup>President</sup> ~~Mr.~~ Ford has called a series of economic summit meetings, culminating on September 27-28.

<sup>I believe,</sup>  
The economic summit idea <sup>^</sup> was Senator ~~Mike~~ Mansfield's idea

in the first place. What is intended is a campaign of ~~pe-~~  
<sup>public and political</sup>  
~~litical~~ enlightenment. For the first time since I can re-

member, at least since I was a small boy in the Great Depression, people are really interested in <sup>economics</sup> ~~this subject.~~

Until recently, the great mass of people were not interested and therefore the politicians were not.

~~The~~ one element of this summit meeting which the President added to the idea put forward in a Senate resolution was that it must be public.

There are at least two reasons for that: one, the element of increasing public interest or understanding; and second, and probably most important, the idea of having

those people participating commit themselves publicly, so that they can't come to a meeting in the White House and state their views and then go out and say something else.

These meetings are all being held out in the open and people who participate in them are going to be constrained to give opinions which they're willing to stand by.

Mr. Marsh: I think you're building <sup>toward</sup> a consensus as you <sup>move</sup> ~~re toward~~

<sup>to</sup> ~~port~~ this summit. You're dealing with disparate economic

sectors of the American society, with disparate economic

<sup>It is an educational process.</sup>  
approaches as to how to solve this problem. <sup>^</sup> By identify-

ing the problem or the problems, and by identifying the

different approaches to those problems, as you move toward

the final summit you're building what will be a consensus

from which you can move to a legislative program, if that's

what's going to be necessary.

Q Is the President committed to adopting the consensus point of view?

Mr. Marsh: No, but I think if you are going for legislation, you'd better at least have a majority.

Mr. Hartmann: The first meeting was that of the professional economists. There will be 10 more which have to do with the various areas of the economy, such as business, labor and agriculture.

I was a little surprised at the degree of consensus which we got out of the first meeting of the economists. But I don't think that was the major meeting at all. I think the major meetings are these specific areas, the problem areas. At the end, the people from each of these meetings will be represented by delegates at this final two-day meeting.

I think some sort of a consensus will be achieved. And we will also define the areas where no consensus is possible. In either case, these meetings are essential to the decision-making process.

Q Do you expect that specific actions to stabilize the economy will emerge from the summit?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes. Any major legislative overhaul, such

as a major overhaul of the tax structure, obviously is not going to be tackled until next year. But at the end of our series of summit meetings, or perhaps even before, there will be some specific actions which will be <sup>requested of</sup> ~~given to~~ this Congress in certain critical areas.

Q Is the President considering other actions besides those that will require congressional action?

Mr. Hartmann: I think the number of actions that the President can take with his own pen or with his own mouth are very limited. Aside from the negative things, like saying "I won't ask for tax increases, I won't ask for controls," there isn't very much he <sup>alone</sup> /can do.

Q Were you suggesting that there will be a major tax overhaul proposal next year?

Mr. Hartmann: There will be proposals which will require considerable legislative action. I wouldn't want to describe them, however, as an across-the-board sweeping reform of



the tax structure.

Q Some people say that the President went into the White House without much of a reputation for being terribly interested in economics. How do you respond to such talk? Is he getting actively engaged?

Mr. Marsh: I've observed him in some of these economic meetings and I've been tremendously impressed by his breadth and his depth of knowledge, particularly in federal financing and the whole broad area of the federal budgetary process.

*I think others present were too.*  
~~In the give and take that he has had with men of great reputation in the field of economics, I think they were impressed by his knowledge of the federal system, the federal budget, and the role that he played.~~  
*and*  
*way he handled the meeting.*

Mr. Buchen: People who have sat in economic meetings were amazed at the grasp he has, the perceptiveness of the questions the President asks.

Q The principal thrust of the Ford Administration seems

to be in the area of fiscal policy; that is, holding down the expenditures of the Federal Government and releasing more money that can be used for other purposes -- financing the growth of industry, for example. Is that all he's relying on?

Mr. Buchen: Oh, no. That's simply the field in which the Government can take the most direct action.

Q Is the use of the summit-conference approach on inflation just a one-shot deal, or might it be used to make policy in other areas?

Mr. Hartmann: It hasn't been discussed for any other area, but I suppose if it is a great success, it might be tried in other areas.

Q Turning to foreign policy, does the President take an active and personal interest, or does he leave most of the work to his Secretary of State?

Mr. Hartmann: The President has worked very closely with

Dr.

Mr. Kissinger. But the Secretary of State is in the same situation, more or less, as we are. He counsels the President and the President makes the decision.

Q Has the President been able to give much attention to matters of foreign policy in his first month?

Mr. Hartmann: A great deal more than <sup>we</sup> would like, because ?

Dr. Kissinger spends so much time in there with him, we sometimes can't get in. *of course I'm kidding.*

Q Speaking of Cabinet officers, what use is the President going to make of his Cabinet and his department heads?

Mr. Marsh: On the issues that have come forward on a day-

to-day basis, so far, the Cabinet officers are consulted, *or speaks with or talks on the phone,* *have* they do come over there and he talks with them. They participate ~~pretty~~ *quite* actively, *some more than others.*

Q As individuals rather than as a formal Cabinet?

Mr. Marsh: More thus far as individuals.

Mr. Hartmann: I can give you two examples. When we wanted

to get into the amnesty question, the President said, "You, Jim Schlesinger, and you, Bill Saxbe, put something together and come back and give me your recommendations." Now, he did this directly, just as he would to one of us, without all of this encumbering mechanism of ~~the Domestic Council~~ and great big staffs. He took his two Cabinet officers and gave them responsibility and a deadline, and presently they returned with <sup>most of</sup> the information that he had asked them to get without all of this in-house bureaucracy getting deeply involved into it.

Similarly, in his speech at Ohio State University, in which he called for measures that would bring about a more realistic meshing of education and jobs, he told the Secretaries of Commerce, of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare to come up with some recommendations. There again, the three of them got together as a task force in the Cabinet, so to speak, and they're going to produce some recom-

mendations.

Mr. Marsh: I think, too, you're going to see Cabinet meet-  
*more frequent*  
ings on a regular basis.

Q Will the President maintain the Domestic Council in the White House, or will he return to the old system of dealing only through the Cabinet?

Mr. Buchen: You have to keep the Council. Unfortunately, problems don't fit neatly into different departmental slots. There are too many issues that involve two or more departments. I think you need a Domestic Council to mediate between the departments.

Q You have described in some detail how the President arrives at a decision, how he makes policy. How does he make sure that the policies and decisions are carried out?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, that's something we're learning.

Mr. Buchen: I think that that's another function of the Domestic Council staff as well as the senior staff of the White House. It takes more than one man.

Q Can you tell us what role the President has in mind for Nelson Rockefeller, once he is confirmed as Vice President?

Mr. Buchen: Mr. Ford has indicated quite clearly that he would like the new Vice President to take over the chairmanship of the Domestic Council Committee on the Right of Privacy, which is a Cabinet-level committee. I'm sure that Mr. Rockefeller has hopes of getting into other specific projects.

To what extent he will get into other Domestic Council activities or into activities more related to foreign affairs I don't know. But I'm sure there is going to be an attempt to use his talents to the best advantage.

Every President that ever came on board said he was going to use his Vice President much more than any other predecessor has. It never happened that way. On the other hand, I think you have what President Ford called a "partnership." I think you have a unique situation having two men, neither

of which was elected by popular vote. <sup>No. 2</sup> The man is chosen  
for his ability, not because he made a good running mate at  
the time they were trying to get elected.

So I do think the prospects are much better in this situation for developing a true partnership.

Q Do you expect Mr. Rockefeller to take a major role in the areas of economic, financial, or international monetary affairs?

Mr. Buchen: I think you have a problem. I can see Mr. Rockefeller chairing committees, that sort of thing. But I don't think you can mingle the vice presidential operations with the presidential operations. I don't think you can have the Vice President in an operating role in the White House.

Mr. Hartmann: It is the intention of every President, I suppose, to treat the Vice President as a subordinate and as a senior member of this staff. And it is the intention and determination of every Vice President to resist that. The

Vice President has a constitutional identity of his own and if he were inclined to forget it, the Senate would remind him of it.

Just as <sup>did not</sup>  
1 Vice President Ford ~~refused to~~ become a member of the President's staff, so the new Vice President, once he enters that office, will resist trying to be made a member of the President's staff. And he shouldn't be.

Q Are you suggesting a certain amount of tension between the Vice President and the President is natural?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't think it's so much tension as it is a relationship, not of peers, but neither of employer-employee.

The Vice President's independence brings to the Administration certain strengths and independent input which is invaluable. He doesn't have to tell the President <sup>only the President</sup> what ~~he~~ wants to hear.

Q Neither the President nor the Vice President-designate were elected by a popular vote -- a unique situation for



this country. Does this affect the President's own approach to the way he will govern?

Mr. Hartmann: I think the House and Senate are certainly at least as representative as the Electoral College has ever been -- and, in a technical sense, nobody has ever been elected by popular vote. I don't think the present situation changes the President's mandate to govern.

Q Does the President feel it affects his ability to govern?

Mr. Hartmann: No, I haven't noticed it.

Q It is now being speculated that the President's decision to pardon Mr. Nixon will end his so-called honeymoon with Congress. Do you agree?

Mr. Buchen: Despite the mixed feelings about it, the President's action isn't going to have any long-range effect.

I don't think that the people in Congress who have a concern for the future of the country are going to act against him on legislation because of it. I don't think those men are

that small.

Q What about the problem of divided Government? How will a Ford legislative program fare in a Congress that is strongly Democratic and is almost certain to continue that way next year?

Mr. Marsh: The President has enormous good will in Congress now. He has a number of very close personal friendships ~~on both sides of the aisle~~ *in both parties* of men ~~on the opposite side~~ *in Democratic party* in positions of leadership.

Those relationships were built notwithstanding that very frequently they had opposed one another on key issues. I think they recognize that he's a very sincere ~~fellow~~ *person whose* ~~that's~~ going to do his best, *and* that he will level with them. They'll also see that he takes them into his confidence.

I think you'll see a ~~tremendous~~ *very* close relationship where the Congress will play a key role, ~~of having~~ *where Members from both sides of the aisle will have* access to the White House, ~~on both sides of the aisle, where they can com-~~ *will be able to* municate their views, and their views will be received.

That method of operation will be very helpful because, before he sends things up to the Hill, he's going to make assessments as to what will fly or what won't or what may be questionable. And the things that are going to be questionable -- that's where you're going to have to devote your effort and your attention.

The President recognizes that at times the Hill relationship will be an adversary <sup>one</sup> type of proceeding. But it will be open and conducted in a way that's very honorable among friends. There's not going to be namecalling. I think that you'll see that his program will be given a fair shake by the Congress regardless of its composition.

Q How much campaigning will Mr. Ford do this fall in behalf of Republican candidates?

Mr. Marsh: The present guideline is that he <sup>will</sup> shall make certain selected Statewide appearances. <sup>I believe</sup> ~~There are about six~~ <sup>but I'm not</sup> ~~sure and defer to someone else~~ <sup>on this</sup> ~~scheduled now, I think~~

Q It's not what you would characterize as a very heavy campaign schedule?

Mr. Marsh: No, I wouldn't consider it that.

Mr. Hartmann: All that we've planned for up to the moment are in the two weeks at the end of September and the first two weeks of October. And there's a period there just before Election Day when we really haven't scheduled anything and we're going to wait and see.

Q There has been a lot of speculation that the President isn't going to campaign aggressively because of his desire to preserve his "marriage" with a Democratic Congress. Is this the case?

Mr. Hartmann: He's going to campaign aggressively for people, he's not going to campaign aggressively against people. In fact, he's not going to campaign against anybody.

He's going to campaign for certain Republicans in crucial contests, and Republicans in general. But there are some

who aren't  
good guys, Republicans, that he is ~~is~~<sup>it</sup> going to hurt -- ~~was~~<sup>might</sup>

even have his picture taken with. There are those in the

~~Democratic~~<sup>Democratic</sup> party that he isn't going to campaign too vigor-

ously against.

Q The polls indicate that the Republican Party is at its lowest ebb in voter-identification in 20 or 30 years. Does President Ford intend to try to rebuild the Republican Party?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes, he's been doing that for some time, with varying results. Most recently, during the period of his Vice Presidency, I think if he didn't rebuild it, he at least

saved it from ~~destruction~~<sup>disaster</sup>. It was going out of style be-

fore he rallied it. He is not going to be such a partisan

as to destroy ~~the~~<sup>his</sup> prospects of living together in peaceful

coexistence with ~~the~~<sup>a</sup> Democratic Congress. But I think he's

going to do his best to rebuild the party. You can look back

at history and you find that some of the most popular Presi-

dents have been some of the strongest partisans as well.

It's not necessary to destroy your effectiveness as President by being partisan. It depends on the way you play it, it seems to me. Harry Truman was certainly partisan, and so were both Roosevelts.

- more -

Q Do you think the President may have "turned off" the "conservative" wing of the Republican Party by his stands on such things as national health insurance and amnesty and by naming Mr. Rockefeller as Vice President?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't really believe this is a serious problem. If the President stands his ground as he will on fiscal responsibility, stands his ground as he will on a strong national defense, stands his ground as he will on returning more power to the States and money with it, stands his ground as he will on forced busing to achieve racial balance -- all of those things will satisfy "conservatives" and talk of defections will blow over.

Q While he was Vice President, Mr. Ford said he would not seek the Presidency in 1976 should he ascend to that office before then. Why did he change his mind -- and why did he announce he would run again two years in advance?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, Mr. Ford always had a way of putting

a loophole in that statement. He always said in all the conversation I ever heard that he would have to think it over again if he should become President in the interim.

As for the timing, the reason <sup>I think</sup> he announced he would run again so soon was simply to dispose of the question. Realistically, there is no way he could avoid it. Oh, he could have played coy. He would have had to give coy answers every time he had a press conference. It would have gotten a little tiresome. So he just said he probably will run again.

Q If Mr. Rockefeller is confirmed and if their working relationship is good in the next two years, would you assume that the Republican ticket in 1976 is going to be Ford and Rockefeller?

Mr. Marsh: I think that would be a likely choice for a ticket, though I can't say what either of those two individuals might want to do in 1976.



Mr. Hartmann: The incumbent Vice President is always the odds-on favorite, either to succeed himself as Vice President or to be the next candidate for President. Usually he has a considerable advantage. The mere act of trying to get rid of one <sup>as Vice President</sup> creates problems, although FDR did it quite regularly.

I think that you have to say that assuming Governor Rockefeller is confirmed and serves for two years, he would have to be at the top of the vice-presidential <sup>prospects</sup> list in 1976.

Q On another subject, relations with the news media were a problem for both Presidents Nixon and Johnson. Do you expect things will be different for President Ford?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes, he's getting along well with the press.

The reasons are twofold: One, generally you like people who like you, and since he likes press people, they like him -- in <sup>the</sup> a <sup>that</sup> sense, there is a mutual respect, giving him the benefit of the doubt. Secondly, there is the new open

atmosphere around the White House.

Q Considering the tremendous number and diversity of tasks of a President, do you think the Presidency, as an institution, has become really an impossible job for any one man?

Mr. Buchen: It is an overwhelming job.

Mr. Hartmann: But President Ford seems to thrive on it.

He's a remarkably well-organized man in terms of the use of his own time. He can shift his attention from one thing to another with amazing speed. I think the answer to your question lies in the ability to keep in mind at all times,

"What is the most important matter that should be before me?" So far, it doesn't seem to be wearing him down.

Mr. Marsh: I for one don't subscribe to the theory that it's an impossible job. It's a job that is changing because of the demands of our times. But I think it's also a job that is susceptible to both organization and management, and also I think it's susceptible to a great deal of style,

8 meaning the manner in which an individual goes about performing it. Our system is such that the Presidency is a manageable job if you can develop the techniques for it and if the individual has the ability. I think that President Ford does have the ability.

(END INTERVIEW)

INTERVIEW WITH  
ROBERT T. HARTMANN, COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT  
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., COUNSELOR TO THE PRESIDENT  
PHILIP W. BUCHEN, ~~CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL~~ *TO THE PRESIDENT*

Washington, D. C.  
September 9, 1974

"U.S. News & World Report"

Q Gentlemen, President Ford's decision to grant full pardon to former President Nixon was both sudden and dramatic.

Does it generally reflect the way Mr. Ford runs the White House?

Mr. Buchen: ~~In some ways, yes, and in others, no. It does reflect a boldness of decision, a willingness to appraise the situation and let the consequences take care of themselves.~~

Mr. Ford realized that a move as sudden and dramatic as that one would have mixed consequences which could not have been evaluated, however long he studied the problem. This was one decision where he had to reflect more in his own mind than consult other people, as he usually does. But it does reflect his willingness to make <sup>tough</sup> ~~bold~~ decisions.

Q In the case of the Nixon pardon, did the President ask his top staff members for advice on what to do?

Mr. Hartmann: We were first made aware of the issue when

the President said, in effect, "Here is the problem. I am tending in this direction. But I need to have some additional information, and I would appreciate your views." It was not a case of saying, "Here is the problem, what should I do about it?"

Mr. Marsh: When the President brought the subject up, there was a free and frank exchange of views. Different aspects of it were discussed that would give him reason to think and reflect. There was a solicitation and opportunity for staff to make an input face to face.

Q Did anyone object to the decision?

Mr. Hartmann: I wouldn't call it so much objecting to it as pointing out certain pitfalls, certain consequences that

- more -

might flow from it which might be adverse to his political interests. But he really didn't seem very concerned about that.

Q Mr. Ford was essentially a "loner" in making the final decision --

Mr. Marsh: It was a lonely type of decision for him to have to make, but I don't think the decision was out of character.

Q Would it be correct to say that Mr. Ford had made up his mind to pardon Nixon whatever the courts did, so he just decided to get it out of the way without going through an empty criminal process?

Mr. Buchen: I'm certain that was in his mind. He assumed that inevitably some clemency had to be shown. The question is, if you know a man is about to walk a plank, when do you decide to save him? When he first steps upon the plank or when he gets to the middle or when he gets near the end or

when he plunges over and you dive after him to save him from drowning? It's a question of the most humane timing.

Q Was Mr. Ford's main consideration the extent of the suffering that Nixon had already gone through?

Mr. Buchen: Not so much the Nixon suffering but what the country would go through as they <sup>may have had to</sup> watch ~~this~~ <sup>^</sup> this man go step by step toward the brink.

Mr. Hartmann: The President's inclination was clear. It was his intention, from the beginning that as soon as he had reached a firm decision in his own mind he wanted to state that decision without any further delay.

Q Does the President's decision on the Nixon pardon suggest he has a tendency to make up his mind first on important issues and then ask for supporting material?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't think this particular decision is at all typical of the norm in his decision-making process. This was a particularly personal decision -- one that was a mat-

ter of his own conscience and his own feelings. Decisions which have to do with such things as legislation or policies are handled in quite a different way.

Q How would you describe Mr. Ford's normal way of operating?

Mr. Hartmann: The normal way is to get ~~as~~ many people out collecting the facts, and then, having been given the facts and the dimensions of the problem, to consult with a considerable number of people both in and outside the Government -- the individuals depending on what the problem is.

We have no way of knowing in <sup>most</sup> ~~many of these~~ instances how many people he calls on the telephone, how many people he talks to while he's playing golf or while he's riding in an airplane or on various other occasions. He draws on a wide circle of friends both here in Washington and all over the country.

Q Does he make much direct contact on his own with old contacts in Congress?



Mr. Hartmann: Yes, I can't think of a matter that's come up in this first month, and also during the time he was Vice President, where he didn't make at least a half a dozen phone calls, in addition to ones he had other people make.

Q It sounds as if he is not very highly staff-oriented, as some past Presidents have been --

Mr. Hartmann: He's very much a <sup>^</sup>~~personal~~ individual operator in terms of getting confidential counsel. He likes to get it firsthand and without a lot of other people in the circuit and without a lot of other people in the room <sup>or, he gets it himself</sup> ~~or~~ on the telephone.

Q How is he going to continue to find the time to do all of these things, make the personal contacts, make the decisions? Is it going to be a problem?

Mr. Marsh: I think the President is a decisive man, but he's also a careful and a very deliberate man. He seeks opposing views, but he does not equivocate about making a

*a selection among*  
decision when presented with/opposing views. He will draw  
on and rely on staff assistance, but will not ~~bend~~ himself  
to that. He's extremely wide-read from the standpoint of  
current events -- the press, news digests.

Another thing: He's not given to long philosophical dis-  
cussions with individuals. He likes things laid out very  
rapidly. *Very* <sup>*it's best if a*</sup> frequently you can carry on/short conversa-  
tion<sup>*and*</sup> with him ~~is~~ can do it succinctly and summarize.

In this manner he may draw on a large cross section of  
*to reach his decision and*  
views/to support the action that he wants to take. ~~to reach~~

Q Would he rather hear advice than see memos?

Mr. Marsh: My experience has been that you had better never  
give Mr. Ford a paper if you don't expect him to read it.

If you <sup>*put*</sup> ~~set~~ things on paper, he likes to have short summaries,  
*precise and*  
objective, laid out with the various courses of action.

Really, though, he likes best the oral presentation where  
it's presented in an objective way.

*a predominantly aural*

Mr. Buchen: He's got ~~an oral~~ mind rather than a visual mind.

Q Is he a speed reader?

Mr. Hartmann: He reads about twice as fast as I do. He

gets through newspapers and magazines a lot faster than most

*# Mr. Marsh:*  
people do. He's the most efficient man in the use of his

time that I've ever worked around.

Q In running the Administration, will the President appoint

an economic "czar," or men with broad powers in any other

field?

Mr. Hartmann: My feeling is that we are not going to have

very many "czars." We're just going to have a President.

Q Why is that?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, the President operates on the principle

of competition, both of men and ideas. I don't want to

carry the football team analogy too far, but he is a great

- more -

believer in competition. He uses the principle of competition in getting the best out of people, both on his staff and those whose allegiance is ~~only~~ voluntary, perhaps transitory.

When he took over the leadership of the House, he followed two Minority Leaders who were pretty much one-man shows.

He immediately broadened the formal leadership of the minority party of the House to about nine people, who were representative of the geographical <sup>and ideological</sup> spread of the party. They

were all trying their best to make a good impression on

their new <sup>leader</sup> ~~boss~~ and be the one who was closest to his ear.

He used them in competition against one another to get the job done, <sup>although</sup> ~~where~~ he had really no coercive power over any of them.

The same thing is true on his staff now. He never has a single individual who does everything, knows everything and who is the straw boss for everybody else. He will have

areas of responsibility, somewhat hazily defined sometimes, but he will give one person this responsibility and one of them <sup>another</sup> ~~this~~ one. Sometimes he'll give them both the same <sup>job</sup> /, to see who comes out best.

The end result is that he can either take the best of the two or he can combine the best features of the two and have a better result. He also gets quicker results that way.

Q Is it a good idea to have duplication of effort and overlapping functions?

Mr. Buchen: If there's a duplication of effort, a certain redundancy is always good because you're going to get a better product. Some people may feel there is a danger that, with divided responsibility, important matters may fall between two stools, and not get acted upon quickly enough. I disagree, because the general tendency of anybody working on a project is to move in wherever he thinks it is necessary to bring the thing to a head. When the respon-

sibility is located in one man, he's not going to let anything fall between the stools. He's going to clear ~~it~~ with those who are concerned.

*all possible issues*

Mr. Marsh: I think a safeguard against any decision slipping between the cracks is the active interest in Government that's demonstrated by the press. Issues that are important are constantly being brought to the attention of the President and his staff simply because of the intense interest that you have from the press, who every day ask about most of those issues.

Q General Alexander Haig now has the title of Chief of Staff in the White House. Is he working at the same level as he did in the previous Administration? Is his role changing?

Mr. Hartmann: There have been so many crash matters in the past few weeks that one or more of the three of us here have had to undertake, that we're very happy that General Haig

has been carrying out the <sup>operational</sup> ~~handling~~ functions of the staff, which are enormous, complicated and have in some respects a life of their own.

To answer your specific question, General Haig is operating at the same level as he did in the past. But if you mean is he the only one who goes into the Oval Office and gets out the answers, then my answer is "No."

Q If General Haig should leave in the next few weeks or months, as has been reported, would he be replaced by somebody else who would serve as Chief of Staff?

Mr. Hartmann: The President has not yet indicated. But any Chief of Staff for this President, if he is indeed to wear that title, would not be an all-powerful Colonel House or a Sherman Adams. He would be more like an administrative assistant on the Hill who runs the office work.

*But, his Counsel would also be important and would be sought.*

Q The White House staff you're describing sounds like a more loosely-knit organization than, say, Presidents Nixon

or Eisenhower employed. Is that an accurate description?

*At present, nothing is fixed. My guess is that what will*  
Mr. Hartmann: ~~It's not a general staff. It's not a mili-~~  
*evolve eventually will not be* *will probably be*  
tary general staff, or a corporate pyramid. It's more on

the pattern of a congressional or senatorial staff operation,

in which you have lines of responsibility going from the

center out to various people and coming back the same way.

Q Who on the White House staff has the most direct and frequent access to the President?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, there are the three of us. There's

*Dr.*  
General Haig, there's ~~Henry~~ Kissinger, there's the Press

Secretary. Then there are Bill Timmons, in charge of con-

gressional liaison, Dean Burch, *one of his* a political adviser, and

*another* Of course there's Mildred Leonard  
Anne Armstrong, a counselor. *And there are*

*others with direct access when they*  
*need it, like Bill Seidman and - more - Alan*  
*Greenspan and some I'm sure I've*  
*overlooked.*

and Dorothy Downtown (his personal Assistant and Secretary.)



Q Who decides who sees the President?

Mr. Hartmann: The President himself does.

Q Does the President have an appointments secretary who controls his day?

Mr. Hartmann: There is an appointments secretary -- Warren Rustand -- but he doesn't control the President's day. The President controls his own day. The appointments secretary simply keeps track of the President's schedule, *not an easy task!*

Someone who wants to see the President might call him directly, or call the appointments secretary, or one of us here, or several other people. There is no single channel to the President. Sooner or later, the word gets through to Mr. Ford and he'll <sup>decide</sup> ~~tell me~~ whether he wants to see or talk to the caller, *and when.*

Q The President has said his door is always open. But given the size of the job and the number of hours in a day,

won't you have to start getting tough on regulating access to the President?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, I don't know how that particular problem is going to change very much, except maybe get a little easier. He's not going to have to receive every ambassador anew every year, as he's doing now. A lot of things that have gone on in recent weeks won't have to be repeated.

They're <sup>courtesy</sup> ~~one-visit~~ callers.

Q There have been reports of friction between the people

Mr. Ford is appointing to the White House staff and the holdovers from the Nixon White House --

Mr. Hartmann: I think the frictions are basically not so much personal as it is the exasperation which people who

have worked with <sup>President</sup> Mr. Ford for a long time feel over the fact that ~~the Nixon staff does not seem to~~ <sup>others don't immediately</sup> understand the ways

<sup>We are impatient,</sup>  
in which Gerald R. Ford likes to operate. / This is frustrating and exasperating to us, because we feel that Mr. Ford

~~cannot be~~  
~~is not being~~ well served by those who are trying to do it  
another way.

But I think that in time <sup>everyone</sup> ~~they~~ will learn his ways and  
~~they~~ will adapt to them.

Q Then you don't see any great housecleaning?

Mr. Hartmann: Not in the sense of a real Stalin-type purge,  
no.

Everybody is trying to treat the old White House staff  
with great generosity and courtesy. They're all trying to  
do the best they can. However, there is this innate inabil-  
ity of an institution to change suddenly. And the machin-  
ery that serves one kind of a President isn't <sup>necessarily</sup> ~~going to~~ very  
the best to <sup>Presidents</sup> ~~will~~ serve another kind. These two men -- Ford and Nixon --

are very different as individuals. This has caused some  
friction and some trouble because, as I say, it's a little  
<sup>think we</sup>  
exasperating to us who know what he wants and the other  
<sup>also</sup>  
people who think they do.

Those who are unable to adapt will be uncomfortable.

*on both staffs*  
There are some people *on both staffs* who obviously don't fit in. If they haven't left already they doubtless will. But there are not ~~too~~ *very* many people of that character.

Mr. Marsh: The best evidence that there is not major friction is the manner in which the offices function, and the smoothness with which the transition was accomplished. I think it was accomplished smoothly.

If you take two small business corporations and put their two staffs together, you're going to have some differences as you make institutional adjustments. There were institutional adjustments that had to be made by those of us who were with *President* Mr. Ford as Vice President and there were adjustments that had to be made by the people with whom we've come to work.

But I think that was accomplished smoothly, with a minimum of rough spots. The Government was able to respond, and

I think that the President was able to move in the manner in which he <sup>did</sup> ~~was~~ because of the assistance that he was getting from both staffs, groping their way along trying ~~to do~~ to do what was in the best interest of him and in the best interest of the country.

Q Looking ahead, would you expect the White House staff to be reduced in size?

Mr. Buchen: I think the President plans to have a <sup>relatively</sup> small staff.

Mr. Marsh: ~~As you may know, the "transition team" advising~~ <sup>It has been recommended to</sup>

<sup>there be</sup> the President ~~recommends~~ a reduction in the size of the White House staff. But that doesn't necessarily mean that you move in at your senior staff level. There are a number of other areas inside the White House where you ~~can get~~ <sup>might make</sup> personnel reductions.

Q If we can turn to a specific area of policy-making -- inflation and the economy -- can you tell us how the President

approaches what he has described as the No. 1 domestic problem?

Mr. Hartmann: To start with, <sup>President</sup> ~~Mr.~~ Ford has called a series of economic summit meetings, culminating on September 27-28.

<sup>I believe,</sup>  
The economic summit idea <sup>^</sup> was Senator ~~Mike~~ Mansfield's idea

in the first place. What is intended is a campaign of ~~pe-~~  
<sup>public and political</sup>  
~~litical~~ enlightenment. For the first time since I can re-

member, at least since I was a small boy in the Great De-  
pression, people are really interested in <sup>economics</sup> ~~this subject.~~

Until recently, the great mass of people were not interested  
and therefore the politicians were not.

~~The~~ one element of this summit meeting which the Presi-  
dent added to the idea put forward in a Senate resolution  
was that it must be public.

There are at least two reasons for that: one, the ele-  
ment of increasing public interest or understanding; and  
second, and probably most important, the idea of having

those people participating commit themselves publicly, so that they can't come to a meeting in the White House and state their views and then go out and say something else.

These meetings are all being held out in the open and people who participate in them are going to be constrained to give opinions which they're willing to stand by.

Mr. Marsh: I think you're building <sup>toward</sup> a consensus as you <sup>move</sup> ~~reach~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~post~~ this "summit." You're dealing with disparate economic

sectors of the American society, with disparate economic

*It is an educational process.*  
approaches as to how to solve this problem. By identify-  
^

ing the problem or the problems, and by identifying the different approaches to those problems, as you move toward the final summit you're building what will be a consensus from which you can move to a legislative program, if that's what's going to be necessary.

Q Is the President committed to adopting the consensus point of view?

Mr. Marsh: No, but I think if you are going for legislation, you'd better at least have a majority.

Mr. Hartmann: The first meeting was that of the professional economists. There will be 10 more which have to do with the various areas of the economy, such as business, labor and agriculture.

I was a little surprised at the degree of consensus which we got out of the first meeting of the economists. But I don't think that was the major meeting at all. I think the major meetings are these specific areas, the problem areas.

At the end, the people from each of these meetings will be represented by delegates at this final two-day meeting.

I think some sort of a consensus will be achieved. And we will also define the areas where no consensus is possible. In either case, these meetings are essential to the ~~the~~ decision-making process.

Q Do you expect that specific actions to stabilize the economy will emerge from the summit?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes. Any major legislative overhaul, such



as a major overhaul of the tax structure, obviously is not going to be tackled until next year. But at the end of our series of summit meetings, or perhaps even before, there will be some specific actions which will be <sup>requested of</sup> ~~given to~~ this Congress in certain critical areas.

Q Is the President considering other actions besides those that will require congressional action?

Mr. Hartmann: I think the number of actions that the President can take with his own pen or with his own mouth are very limited. Aside from the negative things, like saying "I won't ask for tax increases, I won't ask for controls," there isn't very much <sup>alone</sup> he/can do.

Q Were you suggesting that there will be a major tax overhaul proposal next year?

Mr. Hartmann: There will be proposals which will require considerable legislative action. I wouldn't want to describe them, however, as an across-the-board sweeping reform of

the tax structure.

Q Some people say that the President went into the White House without much of a reputation for being terribly interested in economics. How do you respond to such talk? Is he getting actively engaged?

Mr. Marsh: I've observed him in some of these economic meetings and I've been tremendously impressed by his breadth and his depth of knowledge, particularly in federal financing and the whole broad area of the federal budgetary process.

*I think others present were too.*

~~In the give and take that he has had with men of great rep-~~

~~utation in the field of economics, I think they were im-  
pressed by his knowledge of the federal system, the federal  
budget and the role that he played.~~

Mr. Buchen: People who have sat in economic meetings were  
*the President*  
amazed at the grasp ~~he~~ has, the perceptiveness of the ques-  
*he*  
tions ~~the President~~ asks.

Q The principal thrust of the Ford Administration seems

to be in the area of fiscal policy; that is, holding down the expenditures of the Federal Government and releasing more money that can be used for other purposes -- financing the growth of industry, for example. Is that all he's relying on?

Mr. Buchen: Oh, no. That's simply the field in which the Government can take the most direct action.

Q Is the use of the summit-conference approach on inflation just a one-shot deal, or might it be used to make policy in other areas?

Mr. Hartmann: It hasn't been discussed for any other area, but I suppose if it is a great success, it might be tried in other areas.

Q Turning to foreign policy, does the President take an active and personal interest, or does he leave most of the work to his Secretary of State?

Mr. Hartmann: The President has worked very closely with

Dr.

Mr. Kissinger. But the Secretary of State is in the same situation, more or less, as ~~we~~ <sup>all his advisors</sup> are. He counsels the President and the President makes the decision.

Q Has the President been able to give much attention to matters of foreign policy in his first month?

<sup>I would say</sup> Mr. Hartmann: A great deal more than ~~I would like, because~~ <sup>or he has</sup> given <sup>to any other one subject</sup> ~~Dr. Kissinger spends so much time in there with him. We~~ <sup>except possibly inflation</sup> ~~sometimes can't get in. Of course I'm kidding~~ ?

Q Speaking of Cabinet officers, what use is the President going to make of his Cabinet and his department heads?

Mr. Marsh: On the issues that have come forward on a day-to-day basis, so far, the Cabinet officers are consulted, <sup>or he phones and</sup> they do come over ~~there and~~ talks with them. They participate pretty actively.

Q As individuals rather than as a formal Cabinet?

Mr. Marsh: More thus far as individuals.

Mr. Hartmann: I can give you two examples. When we wanted

to get into the amnesty question, the President said, "You, Jim Schlesinger, and you, Bill Saxbe, put something together and come back and give me your recommendations." Now, he did this directly, just as he would to one of us, without all of this encumbering mechanism of ~~the Domestic Council~~ and great big staffs. He took his two Cabinet officers and gave them responsibility and a deadline, and presently they returned with <sup>most of</sup> the information that he had asked them to get without all of ~~this~~ in-house bureaucracy getting deeply involved into it.

Similarly, in his speech at Ohio State University, in which he called for measures that would bring about a more realistic meshing of education and jobs, he told the Secretaries of Commerce, of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare to come up with some recommendations. There again, the three of them got together as a task force in the Cabinet, so to speak, and they're going to produce some recom-

mendations.

Mr. Marsh: I think, too, you're going to see <sup>more frequent</sup> Cabinet meet-

ings on a regular basis.

Q Will the President maintain the Domestic Council in the White House, or will he return to the old system of dealing only through the Cabinet?

Mr. Buchen: You have to keep the Council. Unfortunately, problems don't fit neatly into different departmental slots.

There are too many issues that involve two or more departments. I think you need a Domestic Council to mediate between the departments.

Q You have described in some detail how the President arrives at a decision, how he makes policy. How does he make sure that the policies and decisions are carried out?

Mr. Hartmann: Well, that's something we're learning.

Mr. Buchen: I think that that's another function of the Domestic Council staff as well as the senior staff of the White House. It takes more than one man.

Q Can you tell us what role the President has in mind for Nelson Rockefeller, once he is confirmed as Vice President?

Mr. Buchen: Mr. Ford has indicated quite clearly that he would like the new Vice President to take over the chairmanship of the Domestic Council Committee on the Right of Privacy, which is a Cabinet-level committee. I'm sure that Mr. Rockefeller has hopes of getting into other specific projects.

To what extent he will get into other Domestic Council activities or into activities more related to foreign affairs I don't know. But I'm sure there is going to be an attempt to use his talents to the best advantage.

~~Every President that ever came on board said he was going to use his Vice President much more than any other predecessor has. It never happened that way. On the other hand, I think you have what President Ford called a "partnership."~~  
~~I think you have a unique situation having two men, neither~~

*Number Two*  
of which was elected by popular vote. The man is chosen  
for his ability, not because he made a good running mate at  
the time they were trying to get elected.

So I do think the prospects are much better in this situation for developing a true partnership.

Q Do you expect Mr. Rockefeller to take a major role in the areas of economic, financial, or international monetary affairs?

Mr. Buchen: ~~I think you have a problem. I can see Mr. Rockefeller chairing committees, that sort of thing. But I don't think you can mingle the vice presidential operations with the presidential operations. I don't think you can have the Vice President in an operating role in the White House.~~

Mr. Hartmann: It is the intention of every President, I suppose, to treat the Vice President as a subordinate and as a senior member of this staff. And it is the intention and determination of every Vice President to resist that. The



Vice President has a constitutional identity of his own and if he were inclined to forget it, the Senate would remind him of it.

*Just as* Vice President Ford *did not* ~~refused to~~ become a member of the

President's staff, so the new Vice President, once he enters that office, will resist trying to be made a member of the President's staff. And he shouldn't be.

Q Are you suggesting a certain amount of tension between the Vice President and the President is natural?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't think it's so much tension as it is a relationship, not of peers, but neither of employer-employee.

The Vice President's independence brings to the Administration certain strengths and independent input which is invaluable.

He doesn't have to tell the President *only the President* what ~~he~~ wants to hear.

Q Neither the President nor the Vice President-designate were elected by a popular vote -- a unique situation for

this country. Does this affect the President's own approach to the way he will govern?

Mr. Hartmann: I think the House and Senate are certainly at least as representative as the Electoral College has ever been -- and, in a technical sense, nobody has ever been elected by popular vote. I don't think the present situation changes the President's mandate to govern.

Q Does the President feel it affects his ability to govern?

Mr. Hartmann: No, I haven't noticed it.

Q It is now being speculated that the President's decision to pardon Mr. Nixon will end his so-called honeymoon with Congress. Do you agree?

Mr. Buchen: Despite the mixed feelings about it, the President's action isn't going to have any long-range effect.

I don't think that the people in Congress who have a concern

for the future of the country are going to act against him

his pardoning the former President  
on legislation because of ~~it~~. I don't think those men are

and women

that small.

Q What about the problem of divided Government? How will  
a Ford legislative program fare in a Congress that is strong-  
ly Democratic and is almost certain to continue that way  
next year?

Mr. Marsh: The President has enormous good will in Congress

now. He has a number of very close personal friends ~~type~~

*in both parties and*  
~~of men on the opposite side~~ in positions of leadership.

Those relationships were built notwithstanding that very

frequently they had opposed one another on key issues. I

think they recognize that he's a very sincere *person who is*

going to do his best, *and* ~~that~~ he will level with them. They ~~are~~

*know* also ~~say~~ that he takes them into his confidence.

I think you'll see a ~~tremendous~~ *int* close relationship where

the Congress will play a key role, ~~and~~ having access to the

White House *from* ~~on~~ both sides of the aisle, where *but* they can com-

municate their views, and their views will be ~~received~~ *listened to* x

That method of operation will be very helpful because, before he sends things up to the Hill, he's going to make assessments as to what will fly or what won't or what may be questionable. And the things that are going to be questionable -- that's where you're going to have to devote your effort and your attention.

The President recognizes that at times the Hill relationship will be an adversary type of proceeding. But it will be open and conducted in a way that's very honorable among friends. There's not going to be namecalling. I think that you'll see that his program will be given a fair shake by the Congress regardless of its composition.

Q How much campaigning will Mr. Ford do this fall in behalf of Republican candidates?

Mr. Marsh: <sup>I believe</sup> The present guideline is that he <sup>will</sup> ~~shall~~ make certain selected Statewide appearances. ~~There are about six~~

~~scheduled now.~~

Q It's not what you would characterize as a very heavy campaign schedule?

Mr. Marsh: No, I wouldn't consider it that.

Mr. Hartmann: <sup>most</sup> ~~that~~ that we've planned for up to the moment

<sup>latter part</sup> are in the ~~two weeks up to the end of September and the first~~

~~two weeks~~ of October. And there's a period there just be-

fore Election Day when <sup>he</sup> ~~he~~ really <sup>hasn't</sup> ~~hasn't~~ scheduled anything

<sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ going to wait and see.

Q There has been a lot of speculation that the President isn't going to campaign aggressively because of his desire to preserve his "marriage" with a Democratic Congress. Is this the case?

Mr. Hartmann: He's going to campaign aggressively for people, he's not going to campaign aggressively against people. In fact, he's not going to campaign against anybody.

He's going to campaign for certain Republicans in crucial contests, and Republicans in general. But there are some

~~Why aren't~~ good guys, ~~Republicans~~, that he ~~is~~ going to hurt ~~want~~ ~~might~~

~~even have his picture taken with. There are those in the~~

in the Democratic ~~opposition~~ party that he ~~isn't~~ <sup>wouldn't like</sup> going to campaign too vigor-  
ously against. ~~He even had his picture~~

Q The polls indicate that the Republican Party is at its  
lowest ebb in voter-identification in 20 or 30 years. Does  
President Ford intend to try to rebuild the Republican Party?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes, he's been doing that for some time, with  
varying results. Most recently, during the period of his  
Vice Presidency, I think if he didn't rebuild it, he at least  
saved it from <sup>a rout.</sup> ~~destruction~~. It was going out of style be-

fore he rallied it. He is not going to be such a partisan

as to destroy <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ prospects of living together in peaceful

coexistence with <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ Democratic Congress. But I think he's

going to do his best to rebuild <sup>HIS OWN</sup> ~~the~~ party. You can look back

at history and you find that some of the most popular Presi-

dents have been some of the strongest partisans as well.

It's not necessary to destroy your effectiveness as President by being partisan. It depends on the way you play it, it seems to me. Harry Truman was certainly partisan, and so were both Roosevelts.

- more -

Q Do you think the President may have "turned off" the "conservative" wing of the Republican Party by his stands on such things as national health insurance and amnesty and by naming Mr. Rockefeller as Vice President?

Mr. Hartmann: I don't really believe this is a serious problem. If the President stands his ground as he will on fiscal responsibility, stands his ground as he will on a strong national defense, stands his ground as he will on returning more power to the States and money with it, stands his ground as he will on forced busing to achieve racial balance -- all of those <sup>doubts of</sup> ~~things will satisfy~~ "conservatives" and talk of defections will blow over.

Q While he was Vice President, Mr. Ford said he would not seek the Presidency in 1976 should he ascend to that office before then. Why did he change his mind -- and why did he announce he would run again two years in advance?

*I don't agree with your premise.*  
Mr. Hartmann: Well, /Mr. Ford always had a way of putting



a loophole in that statement. He always said in all the

*interviews I remember*

~~I remember~~ that he would have to think it

over again if he should become President in the interim.

*I think*

As for the timing, the reason <sup>^</sup> he announced he would run

again so soon was simply to dispose of the question. Real-

istically, there is no way he could avoid it. Oh, he could

have played coy. He would have had to give coy answers

every time he had a press conference. It would have gotten

a little tiresome. So he just said he probably will run

again.

Q If Mr. Rockefeller is confirmed and if their working re-

lationship is good in the next two years, would you assume

that the Republican ticket in 1976 is going to be Ford and

Rockefeller?

Mr. Marsh: I think that would be a likely choice for a

ticket, though I can't say what either of those two indi-

viduals might want to do in 1976.

Mr. Hartmann: The incumbent Vice President is always the odds-on favorite, either to succeed himself as Vice President or to be the next candidate for President. Usually he has a considerable advantage. The mere act of trying to get rid of one <sup>as Vice President</sup> creates problems, although FDR did it quite regularly.

I think that <sup>2</sup> ~~we~~ have to say that assuming Governor Rockefeller is confirmed and serves for two years, he would have to be <sup>put</sup> at the top of the vice-presidential <sup>prospects</sup> list in 1976.

Q On another subject, relations with the news media were a problem for both Presidents Nixon and Johnson. Do you expect things will be different for President Ford?

Mr. Hartmann: Yes, he's getting along well with the press.

The reasons are twofold: One, generally you like people who like you, and since he likes press people, they like him -- in <sup>the</sup> <sup>that</sup> a sense <sup>^</sup> there is a mutual respect, giving him the benefit of the doubt. Secondly, there is the new open

atmosphere around the White House.

Q Considering the tremendous number and diversity of tasks of a President, do you think the Presidency, as an institution, has become really an impossible job for any one man?

Mr. Buchen: It is an overwhelming job.

Mr. Hartmann: But President Ford seems to thrive on it.

He's a remarkably well-organized man in terms of the use of his own time. He can shift his attention from one thing to another with amazing speed. I think the answer to your question lies in the ability to keep in mind at all times, "What is the most important matter that should be before me?" So far, it doesn't seem to be wearing him down.

Mr. Marsh: I for one don't subscribe to the theory that it's an impossible job. It's a job that is changing because of the demands of our times. But I think it's also a job that is susceptible to both organization and management, and also I think it's susceptible to a great deal of style,

meaning the manner in which an individual goes about performing it. Our system is such that the Presidency is a manageable job if you can develop the techniques for it and if the individual has the ability. I think that President Ford does have the ability.

(END INTERVIEW)