

The original documents are located in Box 32, folder “Campaign - General” of the Ron Nessen Papers 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. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Some items in this folder were not digitized because it contains copyrighted materials. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library for access to these materials.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

MAY 18, 1973

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS
IN A TELEPHONE CONVERSATION
BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT
AND

NORRIS COTTON
FORMER SENATOR FROM THE
STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
AT THE
NORTHEAST BUSINESS GROUP
AND
SMALL BUSINESS SERVICE BUREAU

MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

8:30 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: I wanted to call and to express my great appreciation for the small business people throughout the Northern area -- Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts -- for their superb effort in membership, as well as philosophically, for the things that I think are pretty fundamental in our American society.

I am delighted, David,* that you are participating in this with your great knowledge, expertise, information, concerning what goes on here in Washington.

Of course, Norris Cotton and Senator Aiken are two of my very favorite people. They served with me for all of the time, really, that I have served in the Congress of the United States, and I know of their total dedication when they were in the House, as well as in the Senate, for what was good in making small business as a force and a factor in the economy of the United States.

I have had an opportunity to look, of course, at the total economy. And we hear, ordinarily, about what big corporations do here or there, but it is my judgment that the strength of America really comes from the small business people who provide services, provide production, provide research and development.

That is what makes America strong. And I congratulate the 1,200 small businessmen in the Northern area of our country for their substantial contribution, substantively, but more importantly, in a philosophical way, in making America the kind of a country we have today.

MORE

*Television Commentator David Brinkley

If I might just add a point of this situation, America has had the problem of being tested at home and challenged abroad. The strength of America is its vision, its dedication, and I have the utmost faith in the small groups, in what is necessary and essential to make America the kind of country that we all believe in.

I respect, of course, the manufacturing and production geniuses of our country. They are wonderful. But the chips that I think are important ought to be put and the guy or the gal -- I guess we have to do that now, don't we (Laughter) -- who, through their little store, their little factory, their little service organization, produce for what people want, what people can get from our kind of society.

David, I just think you are wonderful to be up here with all of these fine people from Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and give them the good old pitch for a better America, a country that went through not only the crisis of the last week, the crisis of the last month, but we took some lickings but we came back strong because the character of America is the foundation of our success.

God bless every one of you. May I add this one thing. Senator Aiken and Senator Cotton epitomize the strength that I have been talking about, and I thank both of them for their great contribution to a wonderful country, who can go from adversity to success because 213 million Americans believe in this country and believe in a better world for everybody.

David, thank you very much.

Norris, how are you?

MORE

SENATOR COTTON: Fine, Mr. President. It is nice to hear your voice. You are most kind to speak so well of Senator Aiken, who deserves it, and Norris Cotton, who deserves part of it. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: I know you both, and what I said about both of you I believe -- and don't give me any hard time, Norris.

SENATOR COTTON: No, I won't. I won't, indeed.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you have any stories that you know about me?

SENATOR COTTON: I couldn't tell the stories tonight because -- I had five of them and I was only allowed to tell one because you were going to call up here. (Laughter)

But, Mr. President, I am happy to inform you that you are in. David Brinkley was asked to predict and he predicted your re-election, didn't he? He pulled out a couple of other boners, too. But -- (Laughter) that was real endorsement.

But seriously, I think that I would gamble that four-fifths of the people here tonight are pretty proud of you for what you have just done in the last week. I want to tell you that.

You heard the applause and that is better than my voice. I will give up the phone, now.

THE PRESIDENT: Norris, let me just say this: the execution of the order, or orders, that was easy, because I knew that we have great Marines, great airmen, great seamen, great soldiers, who would carry out those orders and do what was right for America, and do it successfully.

We have to support them. They are fine young people, well-led, well-equipped and they proved what we have all said -- that we are strong, we are tolerant, we are cautious, but firm. This is what America has to be as we move into the days ahead.

We should thank them. That is the important thing.

David, I hope you enjoy it up there. They are great people and I thank you for the opportunity of just saying a word or two.

MORE

Page 4

MR. BRINKLEY: Thank you, Mr. President.
Some of those in the room look forward to seeing you
in March.

THE PRESIDENT: I will be up there. Thank
you very much.

END

(AT 8:39 P.M. EDT)

lists, return receipts therefor to the registrars, who shall keep a record of the time when and the manner in which the electors' lists are delivered. The registrars may, in their discretion, require the managers of the respective districts to call at their office to obtain such lists.

(Acts 1964, Extra. Sess. pp. 26, 128; 1969, pp. 308, 309; 1970, pp. 347, 372.)

Editorial Note.—Acts 1969, pp. 308, 309, added to subsection (a) the sentence authorizing political parties to decide whether the same or separate ballot boxes shall be used, and superseded former subsection (b).

Acts 1970, pp. 347, 372, deleted from subsection (b) a sentence relating to primaries where the parties do not agree to have only one set of managers for an election district.

34-1304. Time for opening and closing polls.—At all primaries and elections the polls shall be opened at seven A. M. Eastern Standard Time and shall remain open continuously until seven P. M. Eastern Standard Time, at which time they shall be closed. (Acts 1964, Extra. Sess., pp. 26, 129.)

34-1305. Correction of errors in electors' lists.—The registrars shall meet at their main office during each primary or election for the purpose of considering the qualification of electors whose names may have been omitted by inadvertence or mistake from the list of electors. The registrars shall be authorized to place the names of such electors on the registration list. (Acts 1964, Extra. Sess., pp. 26, 130.)

34-1306. Duties of superior courts on days of primaries and elections.—At least one judge of the superior court of each judicial circuit shall be available in his circuit on the day of each primary or election from seven A. M. until 10 P. M. and so long thereafter as it may appear that the process of such court will be necessary to secure a free, fair and correct computation and canvass of votes cast at such primary or election. During such period the court shall issue process, if necessary, to enforce and secure compliance with the primary or election laws, and shall decide such other matters pertaining to the primary or election as may be necessary to carry out the intent of this Code. (Acts 1964, Extra. Sess., pp. 26, 130.)

34-1307. No campaign activities within 250 feet of polling place; extension of such distance.—No persons, with the exception of candidates, shall solicit votes in any manner or by any means or method, nor shall any person distribute any campaign literature, newspaper, booklet, pamphlet, card, sign, or any other written or printed matter of any kind in support of any person, party, body, or proposition on any primary or election day within 250 feet of any polling place or of the outer edge of any building within which such polling place is established, whichever distance is greater. (Acts 1964, Extra. Sess., pp. 26, 130; 1969, pp. 308,

Editorial Note.—Acts 1969, pp. 308, 310, deleted the words "prohibited (a)," which formerly appeared in the heading of this section.

34-1307.1. Unlawful campaign practices.—(a) No person shall distribute, circulate, disseminate, or publish or cause to be distributed, circulated, disseminated or published any literature in connection with any political campaign for any public office unless such literature shall bear the name and address of the person or organization distributing, circulating, disseminating, publishing or causing the same to be distributed, circulated, disseminated, or published. To be in compliance herewith when an organization rather than a natural person commits any of the above acts, then the names and addresses of at least three of the highest officials thereof shall also appear thereon. Campaign literature published and disseminated by the candidate himself, bearing his name and the office for which he is a candidate, shall be considered as in compliance herewith.

(b) No person shall use the name or any colorable imitation of the name of an existing person or organization for the purposes of indorsing, circulating or publishing campaign material without the authorization of such person or organization. For the purposes of this section, the term "any colorable imitation" shall mean any name purposefully used with the intention of the user that a person reading such name will be misled into believing that such campaign material is being indorsed, circulated or published by a person or organization other than the true indorser, circulator or publisher.

(Acts 1968, p. 828.)

Cross-reference.—Punishment for violation, see § 34-9901.

Editorial Note.—Acts 1968, p. 828, designated this section as "34-1307A"; it has been changed to "34-1307.1" in accordance with the format of the Ga. Code Ann.

34-1308. Meeting of poll officers on day of primary or election; duties of poll officers.—(a) The required poll officers shall meet in the respective places appointed for holding the primary or election in each election district at least 30 minutes before the hour for opening the polls on the day of each primary or election. All poll officers, before entering upon their duties at any primary or election, shall take and subscribe in duplicate the oaths required by this Code.

(b) If any chief manager shall not appear at the polling place at seven A. M. on the day of any primary or election, the managers shall appoint a chief manager who is qualified under the provisions of this Code. If any assistant manager shall not appear at such hour, the chief manager shall appoint an assistant manager who is qualified under the provisions of this Code. If, for any reason, any vacancy in the office of manager shall not have been filled, as aforesaid, by 7:30 A. M., the

Republican Southern States Chairmen

James Boyce, Louisiana
Ray Hutchison, Texas
Lynn Lowe, Arkansas
George McMath, Virginia
Mack Mattingly, Georgia
Lee Nunn, Kentucky
Dortch Oldham, Tennessee
Charles Pickering, Mississippi
Dan Ross, South Carolina
Robert Shaw, North Carolina
Bill Taylor, Florida
Paula Unruh, Oklahoma
Edgar Welden, Alabama

Others

Haley Barbour, PFC Southern Coordinator
Lynn Lucas, Secretary to Southern Chairmen
Harry Dent

Richard Cheney
James Baker, PFC Chairman

of his segregationist identification. (In his Memoirs, Truman expressed the opinion that Russell might well have been elected President if he had come from a border state.)

PRIMARIES

The strongest candidate among rank-and-file Democratic voters, according to primary results, was Kefauver. In the March 11 New Hampshire Presidential primary Kefauver defeated Truman, 19,800 to 15,927, picking up all the state's 12 convention delegates. He won a substantial write-in vote in the March 18, 1952, Minnesota preference primary, won the Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries April 1 by overwhelming margins and swept the April 8 Illinois primary. Other Kefauver primary victories were chalked up in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Oregon, South Dakota, California and Ohio (the latter an even split with a favorite-son candidate, former Sen. and former Rep. Robert J. Bulkley). His only defeat came in the Florida primary where Russell beat him, 367,980 votes to 285,358. Kefauver's investigatory activity had upset big city Democratic machines, however, and he was able to win few delegates who were not actually committed to him through primary victories.

DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

The key question when the 31st Democratic National Convention convened in Chicago July 21 was whether Stevenson would allow a draft to be organized in his behalf. At a July 20 Illinois delegates' caucus he had said that he had "no desire" for the Presidency, "mentally, temperamentally or physically." But delegates told him they would press for his nomination regardless. The support for Stevenson, already strong, began to snowball with the July 24 announcement of Thomas J. Gavin, President Truman's alternate as a delegate from Missouri, that he would vote for Stevenson on Truman's instructions.

Stevenson ran second to Kefauver in both the first and second ballots in polling which began at 12:19 p.m. July 25. With 616 votes needed to win, the first two ballots showed no candidate near the required figure. Only on the third ballot, not completed until 12:25 a.m. July 26, did Stevenson move close to nomination as Harriman withdrew in his favor. A unanimous nomination by acclamation was then moved and carried. The three ballots:

	First	Second	Third
Stevenson	273	324½	617½
Kefauver	340	362½	275½
Russell	268	294	261
Harriman	123½	121	---

(For complete balloting including votes for favorite sons and minor candidates, see charts, p. 68.)

Following a conference with President Truman, who had arrived in Chicago the previous day, Stevenson chose Sen. John J. Sparkman (D Ala.), a backer of the national Democratic party on most issues except civil rights, as his running mate. The convention confirmed the choice by acclamation.

Stevenson Acceptance Speech

At 1:38 a.m., July 26, in an eloquent acceptance speech which attracted many to whom previously he was practically unknown, Stevenson pledged to fight for victory in November "with all my heart and soul." But "more important than winning the election is governing the nation," he said. "When the tumult and the shouting die, when the bands are gone and the lights are dimmed, there is the stark reality of responsibility in an hour of history haunted with those gaunt, grim specters of strife, dissension and materialism at home and ruthless, inscrutable and hostile power abroad.... Sacrifice, patience, understanding and implacable purpose may be our lot for years to come," he said. "Let's face it. Let's talk sense to the American people." Stevenson said he was not too much concerned with "partisan denunciation, epithets and abuse because the working man, the farmer, the thoughtful businessman, all know they are better off than ever before."

In other actions, the convention adopted an 8,500-word platform containing weak compromise civil rights and anti-filibuster planks and decided to seat the South Carolina, Virginia and Louisiana delegations despite their refusal to take a compromise party "loyalty" pledge adopted by the convention July 21. The pledge required delegates to seek to get the names of the convention's nominees on the ballot as the Democratic candidates.



REPUBLICAN NOMINATION

Despite other entries in the field, the contest for the Republican Presidential nomination was fought out between the supporters of two relatively clearly defined groups within the party:

Results of 1952 Elections

PRESIDENT

	Popular Vote	Electoral Vote
Dwight D. Eisenhower (R)	33,936,234	442
Adlai E. Stevenson (D)	27,314,992	89

HOUSE

	Old Lineup	Gains/ Losses	New Lineup
Republicans	199	+ 22	221
Democrats	235	- 22	213
Others	1	0	1

SENATE

	Old Lineup	Gains/ Losses	New Lineup
Republicans	47	+ 1	48
Democrats	49	- 2	47
Others	0	+ 1	1

GOVERNORS

	Old Lineup	Gains/ Losses	New Lineup
Republicans	25	+ 5	30
Democrats	23	- 5	18

• Sen. Robert A. Taft (Ohio), 61, represented the conservative Midwestern and Southern wing of the party -- the party "regulars" who fought the battle for Republicanism during the lean New Deal days, Republicans who favored an absolute minimum of Federal Government action in domestic affairs and the least possible U.S. involvement in foreign affairs.

• Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, 62, became the candidate of the "internationalist" wing of the party centered on the East and West coasts -- the "non-professional" but wealthy and influential segments of the Republican party -- which had been able to force the nomination of "moderate" Republicans close to its own stand ever since the naming of Wendell Willkie as the 1940 standard bearer.

The Taft wing considered their party adversaries to be "me-tooers" with dangerously liberal ideas and dubious "Republican" credentials. The group backing Eisenhower considered the Taft wing near-isolationist, ultra-conservative and lacking in solid appeal to the average voter.

Taft Oct. 16, 1951, announced he would seek the 1952 Republican nomination, declaring his conviction "that a majority of the Republicans...throughout the nation really desire me to be the candidate for the party." Taft said he would key his campaign to three issues: (1) socialism and excessive Government controls and spending, (2) restoration of honesty and integrity in Government and (3) "fatal mistakes" of the Truman foreign policy such as "the building up of Russia and the Korean War," which he called "an utterly useless war."

Other announcements of candidacy were made by California Gov. Earl Warren (R) on Nov. 14 and by Harold E. Stassen (R) on Dec. 27, 1951.

Eisenhower Commitment

Gen. Eisenhower in early 1952 was on duty in Paris as commanding general of the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization, having taken leave from his position as president of Columbia University. The major political question as 1952 began was whether he would permit his name to be put forth for the Republican nomination. Previously, he had always rejected talk of his running for President, and he had declined to make his political affiliations known. The mystery ended Jan. 7 when Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge (R Mass.) announced that he was entering Eisenhower's name in the March 11 New Hampshire primary after having received assurances from the General that he was a Republican. In a Jan. 8 statement from Paris, Eisenhower confirmed his Republican loyalties and said he would run for President if he received a "clear-cut call to political duty." Eisenhower said, however, that he would not actively seek the nomination.

PRIMARIES

Despite his refusal to campaign, Eisenhower ran strongly in most of the primaries where his name was entered. He defeated Taft in the March 11 New Hampshire primary by a vote of 46,661 to 35,838, with 6,574 for Stassen. Other major Eisenhower victories came in Minnesota March 18, New Jersey April 15, Pennsylvania April 22, Massachusetts April 29 and Oregon May 16. Taft's wins were mostly confined to the Midwest: Wisconsin April 1 (over Warren and Stassen, Eisenhower not entered), Nebraska April 1, Illinois April 8, Ohio May 6

1952 Convention Facts

DEMOCRATIC

Dates: July 21-26, 1952.

Place: Chicago International Amphitheatre.

Keynoter: Gov. Paul A. Dever (Mass.).

Permanent Chairman: Speaker Sam Rayburn (Texas).

Platform Chairman: Rep. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

Number of Ballots for Presidential Nomination: 3

Nominated: Adlai E. Stevenson (Ill.) for President
John J. Sparkman (Ala.) for Vice President.

REPUBLICAN

Dates: July 7-11, 1952.

Place: Chicago International Amphitheatre.

Keynoter: Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Permanent Chairman: Rep. Joseph W. Martin Jr. (Mass.).

Platform Chairman: Sen. Eugene D. Milliken (Colo.).

Number of Ballots for Presidential Nomination: 1

Nominated: Dwight D. Eisenhower (Kan.) for President.

Richard M. Nixon (Calif.) for Vice President.

(Eisenhower not entered) and West Virginia May (Eisenhower not entered). Warren's most impressive showing was in the June 3 California primary, where he piled up a 2-1 lead over a candidate who said he would throw the state's delegation either to Taft or MacArthur.

Taft Strength Grows

As the spring wore on, Taft's popularity with party regulars and his tireless campaigning began to off in impressive delegate commitments. While Eisenhower remained silent on most current issues, Taft had a clear field to act as the party's chief spokesman in Congress and the nation, emphasizing and reinforcing his reputation as "Mr. Republican." The trend of public statements was distinctly to the right -- more in fact, than had been characteristic of Taft in past years.

"The last chance" of keeping "Stalin from seizing Asia" in preparation for an attack on the U.S. was the U.S. to arm Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist force invade the mainland, Taft said Feb. 12. "Economic assistance to the rest of the world" is not "a necessary part of our foreign policy," he said March 27, urging "selfish point of view." The U.S. should place primary military reliance on "our ability to bomb Russia with atomic bombs," he said April 23, discounting usefulness of ground troops. On May 16 Taft proposed a constitutional amendment limiting non-military government expenditures to 5 percent of the national income. He called for a 15 to 20 percent immediate tax cut. On the increasingly controversial McCarthyism issue, Taft Jan. 21 said the State Department's "pro-Communist policies...f

justified" McCarthy's demands for an investigation of the Department.

Eisenhower Views

The right-wing complexion of many of Taft's statements tended to offend "liberal" Republicans and many independent voters, increasing general public sentiment for Eisenhower's nomination. While avoiding stands on most issues, Eisenhower managed to convey a "moderate" impression with the statements he did make.

On April 25 he was reported to favor giving the states title to tidelands oil, considered a conservative position. But in early May a visitor in Paris reported that Eisenhower favored some type of farm price supports and believed that a Missouri River Valley Flood Control project should be started with maximum authority for the states. A Jan. 16 magazine interview quoted Eisenhower as saying that "in some things...we have drifted too far to the so-called 'left'" but that he favored antitrust laws and "regulation of certain economic activities." Eisenhower publicly backed a Universal Military Training bill. On May 8 he said a proposed \$1 billion foreign aid cut would be "heavily and seriously felt" and might "endanger" Western Europe's security.

While political moderates may have been impressed by these positions, Eisenhower's "middle-of-the-road" course had little attraction for the old-line Republican party professionals who wanted a sharp change from both the domestic and foreign policies of the Truman Administration. Even when Eisenhower returned from Europe in early June, took off his uniform and began an active campaign for delegates, the outlook, in view of Taft's long lead on pledged delegates -- he claimed a near majority -- appeared dim.

Ike Delegates Disqualified

Then, 15 days before the convention, the Eisenhower strategy changed as a result of the tactics of the Taft organization. In numerous Southern states, the Taft-controlled state Republican organizations were disqualifying pro-Eisenhower delegates chosen by local and state party conventions. The rejected delegates included many independents and former Democrats who had entered Republican politics to boost Eisenhower's candidacy, thus jeopardizing the control of the "caretaker" Republican organizations. These moribund GOP groups had existed for years throughout the South for patronage reasons. When the old-line organizations began to throw out Eisenhower delegates, the Eisenhower forces charged that a "steal" was taking place and said that Taft's reputation would be tarnished if he won the nomination under such circumstances. National magazines friendly to the Eisenhower cause helped to dramatize the delegate "steal" issue in the weeks preceding the convention.

General-turned-politician Eisenhower found new confidence as he debated the delegate issue. In Dallas June 21 he said that Taft backers were guilty of "a betrayal of the whole Republican party and its principles" when they "deliberately and ruthlessly disenfranchised" majorities that had voted for Eisenhower delegates in Texas county conventions. No party can clean up government corruption "unless that party -- from top to bottom -- is clean itself," he warned, and no party "can tolerate a rigged convention and hope to win."

Eisenhower Advisers -- 1952

Chief aides to Eisenhower in the 1952 re Gov. Sherman Adams, N.H. - Chief of staff of persc campaign.

Sen. Henry Cabot Lodge, Mass. - Pre-convention campaign manager, chairman of advisory committ
Arthur E. Summerfield, Mich. - Post-convention campaign manager; Republican National Chairm
Arthur H. Vandenberg Jr., Mich. - Executive assistant, speechwriter; head of personal compa staff.

James C. Hagerty, N.Y. - Press secretary.

Rep. Leonard W. Hall, N.Y. - Manager, campaign; political operations.

Rep. Hugh Scott, Pa. - Pre-convention strategic headed national post-convention headquarters New York.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, N.Y. - Adviser on campaign strategy.

Gov. James H. Duff, Pa. - Adviser on campaign strategy.

Fred A. Seaton, Neb. - Adviser, assisted Adams.

Sen. Frank Carlson, Kan. - Adviser, assisted Adams

Sen. William F. Knowland, Calif. - Adviser, assisted Adams.

Sinclair Weeks, Mass. - Adviser, assisted Adams

Thomas E. Stephens, N.Y. - Secretary; aide to Adams

Harold E. Talbott, N.Y. - Republican National Finance Chairman.

C.D. Jackson, N.Y. - Vice president of Time; adviser

Albert B. Hermann, N.D. - Executive director, Republican National Committee.

Kevin McCann - President of Defiance College o Ohio; major speechwriter.

Gabriel Hauge, N.Y. - Speechwriter; research director.

Emmet J. Hughes, N.Y. - Speechwriter.

Milton Eisenhower, Pa. - President, Pennsylvania State College and brother of the candidate.

Bertha Adkins, Md. - Assistant to Republican National Chairman.

Fred C. Scribner Jr., Maine - General Counsel, Republican National Committee.

REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

When the 25th Republican National Convention opened in Chicago July 7, the delegate issue was the hottest - and one of the first -- items of business. In a preliminary test the convention voted 658-548 against allowing delegates with disputed seats to vote on other delegate contests until their own credentials were accepted. This resolution, which had been endorsed by 25 of the nation's Republican governors, prevented the disputed Taft delegates from the South from voting for each others' seating.

The victory of the Eisenhower forces on this issue foreshadowed the General's eventual nomination. Later July 7 the convention voted 607-531 to seat the pro-Eisenhower rather than the pro-Taft delegation from Georgia. The Taft forces then capitulated on the Texas delegate issue, allowing the pro-Eisenhower delegation to be seated. With this psychological victory behind them, the Eisenhower forces made steady gains in delegate pledges as the convention proceeded.

On the first-ballot roll call at 11:50 a.m. on July 11, 1952, Eisenhower received 595 votes -- 9 short of the 604 needed for nomination. Taft received 500, Warren 81, Stassen 20 and MacArthur (who had repeatedly sought to have his name withdrawn from consideration) 10. Following the roll call, Minnesota clinched Eisenhower's nomination by switching 19 votes to the General. After switches had been completed, Eisenhower had 845 votes to only 280 for Taft.

Nixon Chosen

During the afternoon the Eisenhower high command conferred and decided on Sen. Richard M. Nixon (R Calif.) as the Vice Presidential nominee. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey (R N.Y.) was said to be a key figure in persuading Eisenhower to choose Nixon as his running mate. Nixon was nominated without open opposition although the California Republican factions headed by Gov. Earl Warren and Sen. William F. Knowland were reported bitter over Nixon's selection.

In his acceptance speech later July 21, Eisenhower pledged a "fighting campaign," a "crusade" whose aims were "to sweep from office an administration" associated with "wastefulness, arrogance and corruption in high places" and to carry out "a program of progressive policies drawn from our finest Republican traditions."

Republican Platform

The Republican Platform adopted July 10 accused the Democratic Administration of "appeasement of Communism at home and abroad." A tough foreign affairs plank authored by John Foster Dulles (later to be Eisenhower's Secretary of State) said that the Truman Administration had "squandered the unprecedented power and prestige" the U.S. had at the close of World War II, had "abandoned" friendly nations to Communist aggression, had scuttled the Nationalist Chinese regime, had caused the war in Korea through ambiguous policy statements and then "produced stalemates and ignominious bartering" after war broke out. The platform called for an end to the "defensive policy of 'containment' of Russian communism which has not contained it." The platform said a Republican Administration would "repudiate all commitments (of) secret understandings, such as those at Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements."

In a keynote speech to the convention July 7 Gen. MacArthur had castigated the Democratic Administration for alleged foreign and domestic policy "misdirection which has brought us to fiscal instability, political insecurity and military weakness." He said the Democratic party was "the war party of modern American politics." Some MacArthur partisans had hoped that MacArthur -- who had indicated his own preference for Taft as the nominee -- would emerge as the convention's choice if a deadlock developed between Taft and Eisenhower. But the MacArthur speech failed to spark the enthusiasm among the delegates to lead to his nomination, even if Taft and Eisenhower had deadlocked.

THE 1952 CAMPAIGN

Both Eisenhower and Stevenson were faced with important decisions in regard to their own parties before they could launch their campaigns. For Eisenhower, the problem was to end the enmities caused by the bitter nomination campaign and establish satisfactory relations

with the organizationally important Taft wing of the party. For Stevenson, there was the decision of how closely he ought to associate himself with the outgoing Truman Administration and how much President Truman ought to campaign in his behalf.

Visiting Taft's headquarters immediately after the nomination July 11, Eisenhower called Taft "a very great American." Taft pledged to do all he could to help Eisenhower in his campaign and administration. But many Taft supporters were highly disgruntled and dubious over the legitimacy of Eisenhower's Republican credentials. Some observers thought there was a lack of clear policy direction in Eisenhower's speeches during the summer. In an Aug. 25 editorial, Scripps-Howard's pro-Eisenhower New York World Telegram and Sun said that Eisenhower had been "running like a dry creek" and should "come out swinging."

Around Labor Day a new note of militancy was evident in Eisenhower. Speaking Sept. 2 in Atlanta, he said that the Administration bosses "manufacture emergencies as the rugs under which they sweep stupidity, blunders and corruption." In Miami the same day, he said that "no man, however honest, can clean up this mess if he is elected as the nominee of the Administration which created the mess."

Stevenson Advisers -- 1952

Stevenson's key aides in the 1952 Presidential race:

- Wilson W. Wyatt, Ky. -- Campaign manager.
- Carl McGowen, Ill. -- Administrative assistant, consultant on policy matters.
- William McCormick Blair Jr., Ill. -- Administrative assistant, in charge of daily schedule, appointments.
- Stephen A. Mitchell, Ill. -- Democratic National Chairman.
- Clayton Fritchey, D.C. -- Public relations adviser.
- William Neale Roach, D.C. -- Director of operations from Springfield, aide to Wyatt on campaign trains.
- James S. Lanigan, N.Y. -- Worked with local organizations, briefed advance men.
- Richard J. Nelson, Ill. -- President of Young Democratic Clubs; worked with party politicians and organizations.
- Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Mass. -- Research, gathering of basic materials for speeches.
- David E. Bell, D.C. -- Head of research staff.
- William I. Flanagan, Ill. -- Press Secretary.
- Newton Minow, Ill. -- General assistant to McGowen.
- Oscar Chapman, Colo. -- Advance man on campaign trips, kept in touch with state and local party leaders.
- James H. Rowe, D.C. -- Campaign advance man.
- W. Willard Wirtz, Ill. -- Research in the labor field.
- Jacob M. Arvey, Ill. -- Democratic National Committeeman and Cook County Democratic Chairman; moving force in Stevenson nomination.
- Rep. Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio -- Chairman, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, campaign adviser.

To Ron Nessen

CARTER/MONDALE TICKET

When referring to Carter/Mondale ticket, always say "The Mondale/Carter Ticket". Mention Mondale's name first. If people ask why, say we aren't sure where Carter stands but we know where Mondale stands (far left) and, since Carter's embraced his positions, it looks like Mondale has set the tone for the ticket.

This will drive Carter up the wall.

P. A 4 WASH POST 2/11/75

Conservatives to Meet
About Future in GOP

1600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

Campaign '75 Unrolls With Ford and a Plan

By Martin Seligman

Newsday Washington Bureau Chief

h 26, 1975

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Morton leading for '76 campaign manager

Ford mulls Republican leadership

22 Part 1—Fri., May 9, 1975

Los Angeles Times

GOP Committee Spending \$40,000 on Ford Polls

CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN TEAM NAMED

L.A. Times

7-10-75

Longtime Reagan Backers Join Ford

[1976]
23 Jan 1975

Eric Severeid

The President has now layed out his program for the year, for the country, for his own election campaign. He has done this with the State of the Union speech, and in concrete terms, the budget. These statistics tell us more accurately what he really believes in than does the rhetoric. That is why he has not been answered by his oponents. These figures take time to digest. So Sen. Muskie on Wednesday night could not really answer. The President's oponent Mr. Reagan has not yet answered, and he will find it hard because Mr. Ford is now out-flanking Mr. Reagan on the right. For purposes of nomination, no Republican can be too conservative. The election is something else. Mr. Carter, already annoited by some in the press as the Democratic front runner has not answered. Ideally, the oposition party, particularly when it controls the Congress, ought to do far more than react to a president. It ought to have its own thought out, agreed upon program for the country, regardless of what a president proposes -- as the oposition. in Britain tries to do. But our system is different. American political parties are not organizations but big revival tents, and any passerby can enter and hit the sawdust trail. For the next six months, the Democratic answer will be worked out in the form of legislation. This will undo the presidential program in congiderable degree. But, he will have to live with it. Then the Democrats will write a formal platform for their convention, which their ultimate nominee will live with or throw away, depending on the prevailing

winds of public opinion. This general messyness does not mean the issues are not important. They are more important this election year than normally. Program and personality are what count this year. The third "P" party, counts far less. Very soon the mail delivered on Capitol Hill ^{لأنها} become a blizzard of protest as ^{the} ^{of} a serious nature the President's cuts in health, education and other social services sink in on those affected. Serious cuts whether the states run more of these affairs or not. Congress will not be able to stand the blizzard. This is election year. But, the ghost at the political banquet will not fade away, the spectre of a dead crippled federal government somewhere down the line. What, one scholar calls the era of business nationalism ended with the crash of '29 nearly wrecking the business system itself. This era of government nationalism has gone on over 40 years now and the fear is that it now has gone too far. A new balance must be found and soon. How to find it is what the fight is now about.

(1/23/76)



2/25/76 New Hampshire

10x11x11 1/2 Times Roman

President Ford heads for the March 9 Florida primary election after scoring victories in every early presidential preference test from New Hampshire to Hawaii.

The President won the popular vote in ~~New~~ New Hampshire--his toughest Northern state--and also locked up an overwhelming share of the delegates, winning 19 of the state's 21 convention votes.

President Ford said he was "delighted" with the victory and added: "If we win a few more, and I think we will, we'll be ready for the finals (the November general election), and I think we'll win there, too."

The feeling in President Ford committee offices in Washington and in headquarters throughout the country was that New Hampshire has started the President on the road to victory.

"The momentum is with the President now," said PFC political director Stu ~~Spencer~~ Spencer. "We expect to win in Vermont^t and Massachusetts and to go on to Victory in Florida a week later, and we're optimistic we'll continue the winning streak right on to Illinois, ~~and~~ North Carolinaⁱ and Wisconsin."

2-2-2- New Hampshire

The President had started to pile up delegates to the 1976 Republican National Convention even before his primary win in New Hampshire.

In Hawaii, 17 ~~to~~ to 19 of the state's 19 delegates to the convention appear to be ~~in~~ safe Ford votes based upon polls conducted by the Hawaii organization following the Jan. 27 precinct caucuses.

In Vermont, President Ford ~~is~~ is the only candidate on the ballot in that state's March 2 primary election. His signature drive coordinator, Sen. Bob Gannett, gathered several ~~times~~ ^t times the required number of names to put the President on the ballot. Although the primary results are technically non-binding on delegates, ~~the~~ Vermont supporters expect the President to win most of the state's 18 delegates.

In the District of Columbia, all 14 delegates and ~~14~~ 14 alternates are backing the President and are expected to be officially ~~be~~ endorsed by the central committee. PFC chairman for the District, Dr. William H. Cooper, says every candidate who has been endorsed by the central committee "has gone on to win the ^{MAY} ~~May~~ Republican presidential primary in Washington, D.C.

In Minnesota, a sample poll of 100 precincts ~~in~~

3-3-3-3 New Hampshire

conducted following the Feb. 24 precinct caucuses showed the President holding 53 per cent of the delegates to 36 per cent for Ronald Reagan with 11 per cent uncommitted; 42 delegates will be selected from ~~the~~ Minnesota.

And in Iowa, sample polls taken following the state's precinct caucuses in January show the President with a 60 per cent lead in the delegate count there; 36 delegates are at stake in Iowa.

###

[March 1976?]

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

TO: Connie

FROM: Margita E. White
Assistant Press Secretary
to the President

After you run this by Ron, would you
please send it to Dave Hoopes.

Thank you.



EDITORIAL PROFILE
Chicago Tribune

POLITICAL ISSUES:

Support President Over Reagan

On February 29, the Chicago Tribune ran an editorial entitled "Why We're for Mr. Ford" in which they backed your candidacy for the Republican nomination. The original of that editorial has been forwarded to you.

Reagan Campaign

"There is an important reason for welcoming his official entry into the race. Possibly the most fundamental issue before the nation right now is the federal government and its relation to the people, how far its powers should extend, where they should be limited or pushed back. With Mr. Reagan officially in the running those questions will get intense public scrutiny and debate, as they should. And since the incumbent President will be an active partner in that debate, it will have a more direct effect on government than debates usually do."
11/21/75

Wallace Campaign

"What Mr. Wallace defines as the middle class is of course the strongest constituency any candidate could hope for, and his appeal is skillfully framed to attract it. His success will depend on how well he can convince working people that he is in fact their spokesman and champion. . . In this sense, Mr. Wallace's campaign should have an indirect benefit. With him insistently calling attention to the needs and grievances of working people, they are less likely to be overlooked by worthier candidates who might, if elected, do something constructive about them." 11/15/75

Birch Bayh's Suspension of His Campaign

"Sen. Birch Bayh (D., Ind.) has 'suspended' his campaign for the presidential nomination, which is about one-half step short of abandoning it. . . His reason for suspending his candidacy rather than ending it is that he is eligible for \$30,000 more in federal matching funds, in addition to the \$405,000 for which his campaign has been certified, and he needs the money because his campaign effort is \$100,000 in debt. The question is

whether a candidate who is no longer trying to win still qualifies for federal cash. We hope the decision, whatever it is, will not set a precedent for using these funds to bail out political bankrupts." 3/5/76

Jimmy Carter's Win in New Hampshire

"We suspect the name Jimmy Carter is far from a household word, and his rival travelers on the Campaign Trail would no doubt like to keep it that way. . . But on the strength of his plurality in the New Hampshire primary and some impressive. . . delegate acquisitions in other state caucuses, Mr. Carter's Democratic opponents are crying that he must be stopped. . . We suspect that the 'stop Carter' campaign is more a 'save ourselves' effort. . . There are a number of things wrong with the present system of sorting out presidential candidates, but one thing that can be said for the strung-out process of primaries is that it does give candidates a chance to test their electability. . . So if the voters decide that Mr. Carter is worthy of stopping, they will do so of their own volition and not because of his opponent's anguished howls. On the other hand, if Mr. Carter deserves to be the front runner he will probably continue to be the front runner." 3/2/76

New Hampshire Primary

"The primary election in New Hampshire Tuesday has had such intense and prolonged advance publicity that the actual results, whatever they are, will be something of an anticlimax. . . Even as we all give the New Hampshire returns more detailed attention than those from larger and more representative states will be getting in the near future, there should be some serious thinking about improving the system. Perhaps regional primaries are what the country needs. And we should tell ourselves and each other that the New Hampshire returns are just first, not decisive, and that they should not be allowed grossly exaggerated influence on future voting." 2/24/76

Need to Revise Primary System

"The New Hampshire presidential primaries have once again demonstrated a curious fact about the United States. For a people that prides itself on efficiency and know-how, we have devised the most absurdly inefficient electoral test possible. . . In short, New Hampshire, as an omen, of things to come, performs just about as well as the ancient oracle at Delphi, which made its prophecies in language so obscure that believers couldn't figure out what it meant till after the event. We can only repeat what a lot of ancient Greeks must have said: There's got to be a better way." 2/26/76

Massachusetts Primary

"Trying to read too much into a presidential primary is dangerous, but the results from Massachusetts still should be excellent reading around the campaign campfires of President Ford and Sen. Henry Jackson. . . But Mr. Jackson's victory in his first primary contest. . . owes much to a well-financed and well-organized campaign which successfully brought out the vote on a nasty day in Massachusetts. . . On the Republican side, neither Mr. Ford nor Mr. Reagan campaigned very hard in Massachusetts, but Mr. Ford's overwhelming victory suggests that he is far preferable to Mr. Reagan among moderate voters. Since those are the kinds of voters who are needed to produce a victory in the general election, we would expect Mr. Ford's stock to rise among Republicans in other states who might have questioned his electibility." 3/5/76

Nixon Trip to China

"Former President Nixon's decision to visit China this month is unwise from just about every standpoint. . . All of this. . . can only complicate matters for President Ford and Secretary Kissinger. . . It's hard to figure out why the Chinese, inscrutable as they may be, should have contributed to the embarrassment of their presumed friends, Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger, by extending this invitation at this time. In any event, Mr. Nixon had better keep his visit very private or it will become a very bad trip for us all." 2/7/76

The Nixon toast "was criticizing President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger for taking part in last year's Helsinki conference, which resulted in agreement on an array of East-West issues. . . Mr. Nixon is probably sincere in suggesting there is danger in placing too much faith in that agreement or in any agreement with the Soviet Union." Mr. Nixon can attack Mr. Ford's detente efforts only in nonsubstantive terms "because both Presidents have played the same game--keeping two potential enemies off balance and therefore friendlier to us than they might otherwise be. . . We hope the former President did not intend his comment to damage in any way the primary election hopes of his successor. . . We prefer to believe that Mr. Nixon was voicing only a friendly word of warning to the President against pitfalls anyone might welcome warning about." 2/24/76

"Though we agree with Mr. Goldwater that the Nixon trip to China was ill advised, and though some of Mr. Nixon's remarks there have been widely interpreted as oblique criticism of his successor, Mr. Nixon has done nothing to deserve exile." 2/27/76

FOREIGN AFFAIRS ISSUES:

Dropping the Word 'Detente'

"President Ford says he doesn't use the term detente any more, and we quite agree it is time to discard an imported word which has caused as much trouble as any we know of. . . Mr. Ford does not have an easy word to substitute for detente, and maybe that is just as well. He does have a clear understanding of the idea which should replace the current loose understandings of our situation. . . The more clearly we recognize that peace comes through strength and not through relaxing our defenses or our vigilance, the sooner we will approach a real opportunity for peace. It will come not because the Soviet Union has generously decided to relax anything, but because it has realistically decided that it would be madness to transgress against a truly united, truly strong U.S." 3/6/76

Angola

The Administration has to be "doubly careful about committing this country, either formally or through secret assistance. . . to a goal which will be hard to attain without at least the support of Western Europe. President Ford and Secretary Kissinger must weigh the dangers of this course against the dual danger of a Soviet takeover of Angola, which is a serious one, and a congressional takeover of foreign affairs, which could be even worse." 12/18/75

"To Congress the issues seem to be pure and simple: We don't want to get bogged down in another Viet Nam, so the Senate has arbitrarily cut off funds for aid to the anti-Soviet forces in Angola. To Secretary Kissinger the issue is equally clearcut: The Soviet Union is helping the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. . . in the hope of winning access to its strategic bases and resources, so it is essential for the free world that we thwart this effort to subvert an African country. . . If an intelligent judgment is to be made, it requires much more in the way of facts than we now have. . . Given only what we now know, we are opposed to any policy that leaves us with an ironclad commitment." 12/30/75

"Each day brings disturbing new threats in Africa, and the West ponders each one with no clear, unified idea about what to do. It had best develop such an idea soon, because the Communist-led victory in Angola is sending shock waves far beyond that country's borders. . . President Ford and Secretary Kissinger tried to stall the Soviet-backed conquest of Angola by providing military aid; but Congress refused this, and thus, in effect, took foreign policy into its own hands. This is a dangerous state of affairs:

The foreign policy which Congress enunciates through cutting off funds is purely negative, never positive. It says what we won't do, but not what we will. . . Perhaps Europe would awaken from its lethargy if our President and Congress were able to speak with unity and decisiveness on foreign affairs. Congress must recognize--and quickly--that it is trying to control the execution of policies that it is not equipped to plan. If Congress doesn't do so, and if the people don't elect a Congress that will recognize the facts of life, then we shall in effect be giving the green light to whatever the Reds choose to do." 3/1/76

Rambouillet Summit Meeting

"The meatiest news to emerge from the three-day economic summit at Rambouillet, near Paris, was the adoption of a goal to 'work for greater stability' in currency exchange rates. . . There is, of course, a great deal to be said for stability of currency rates. . . But currency stability has to be provided by economic stability. . . If the latter is achieved, the market mechanism of the floating rate system would undoubtedly be able to provide much of the currency stability that everyone wants." 11/20/75

Trip to China

"As for the absense of a communique, we welcome it. We have already suffered too much from the notion that profound differences can be settled or even clearly defined in a few hours of rather ceremonial talk. . . The goal of talks like those Mr. Ford held in China is not agreement for the sake of agreement, but understanding of differing views." 12/5/75

DOMESTIC ISSUES:

Appointment of Scranton to UN

"As the new United States ambassador to the United Nations, William Scranton represents a different personality from that of his colorful predecessor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Indications are, however, that that change will be largely limited to personality. . . We can expect Mr. Scranton to do his job in a somewhat less attention-getting style than his predecessor did. But we can expect him to do his job. With the firm White House support being signaled by Mr. Ford, he should be able to do it more convincingly still." 3/3/76

Moynihan

"Mr. Moynihan is now upsetting an arrangement in which we supply the responsibility and they furnish the insults. And why not? Conceivably, if we share in their part of the job, they may be inspired to take over some of ours." 12/8/75

"We're not sure how the press got hold of Daniel P. Moynihan's cablegram pointing to successes gained under his policy of talking tough to the United Nations. But we are wholeheartedly glad the press did. . . After the cable came to light, Dr. Kissinger praised the ambassador's work, but never quite said he would control the departmental back-biting. Mr. Moynihan did get unequivocal support from President Ford, though, and that is what counts most." 1/30/76

"To all who resent unjust attacks on the United States and who admire bluntly candid responses to those attacks, the departure of Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan from the United Nations comes as a disappointment." 2/4/76

Energy Independence Authority

"We agree with Mr. Ford that it is essential for government to participate in the risktaking involved in developing new sources of energy. We certainly agree that such investments are necessary to reduce the nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy. We'd be more comfortable, however, if the Ford administration linked this proposal to a program designed to encourage private capital formation." 9/24/75

Decontrol of Oil

"While Congress is busy pointing its finger at people to blame, it might point to the mirror. Two years have passed since the embargo hastened the energy crisis, and in that time the government has accomplished nothing of substance in the way of a solution. A good start would be to enact a realistic price decontrol bill, one which reflects the realities of 1975 instead of its rhetoric." 11/7/75

"Oil prices have been slipping, for several months. . . All of this has created an almost irresistible temptation, especially on Capitol Hill, to assume. . . that it never really existed. . . World oil consumption has

declined partly because of the recession. . . and partly because of the conservation efforts which many congressmen are being tempted--and urged--to scrap. Assuming that the crisis is over is the surest way to bring it back. . . The reason to get rid of oil price controls when prices are going down anyway is the same as the reason for getting rid of farm subsidies when farm prices are rising: It is the only time when it is politically possible to get rid of them. To wait until gasoline prices are rising again would rouse all of the consumerist objections and probably delay any sensible action at all, just as it has for the last two years, and perhaps until it is too late." 2/19/76

Energy Policy and Conservation Act

"The best thing President Ford could do with the energy bill when it reaches his desk is drive a spike through it. . . It might be better to let the present price controls phase out over a shorter period of time, or to change the averaging formula, but alternative decontrol methods are no longer an issue. It's this bill or nothing. And as matters stand, nothing is the better choice. We count on Mr. Ford to veto the bill." 12/22/75

Deregulation of Natural Gas

"The House is considering legislation this week that would move toward deregulation of natural gas prices, an idea whose time had come a long time ago. . . By deregulating gas prices, Congress not only would be doing the right thing. It would also help atone for its earlier unwise tightening of oil price controls under the guise of an energy policy. . . So if the House is interested in the long-term good of the gas customer instead of what might be popular in the short run, it will follow the Senate's lead and deregulate natural gas prices. It's the real world which requires the heat." 2/6/76

Tax Cut

"We supported the President's veto not because we favored a tax increase (the economic recovery is still disturbingly fragile) but because if taxes are going to be held down, there must be a commitment to hold spending down, too." 12/19/75

State of the Union Address

"Mr. Ford's program is remarkably sound and consistent, as political programs go, and if it fails it will probably be the result of enemy attack." 1/21/76

Food Stamp Revisions

"Congress has before it at least four proposals to change the format of the Agriculture Department's food stamp program, 'change' being a code word for 'reform'. Congress should make reforms in the program, not to deprive those in real need of food, but to eliminate the abuses that have caused much criticism, including ours." 10/24/75

"Nearly everybody talks about the \$5.8 billion food stamp program, and how it has expanded far beyond what was intended by its creators or can be justified on rational grounds. But who does anything about it?" Until the Congress enacts such proposals, "the administration should vigorously do what it can to reform the food stamp program by executive action." 2/11/76

Daniel Schorr

"The crime in which Mr. Schorr and the Reporter's Committee have participated is not against Congress; it is against their own profession and their own cause. When a career reporter has information that he feels should be made public, it is his duty to do so; not to offer the material to somebody else in exchange for a payoff." 2/17/76

Concorde

"Secretary Coleman's decision is consistent with the American tradition of fair play and free enterprise." 2/7/76

Veterans Administration

"The Veterans Administration is expensive, inefficient, and politically powerful--traits that are interrelated. . . None of this is to deny or question that much excellent work is done by VA agencies and personnel. But the public would have more confidence than it does in the VA if the agency were more receptive to constructive criticism." 1/24/76

Nomination of Justice Stevens

"President Ford has made an excellent choice in his nomination of Federal Judge John Paul Stevens of Chicago to the Supreme Court." 12/1/75

New York City

"As President Ford put it, city and state officials want to leave their problems 'on the doorstep of the federal government--unwanted and abandoned by its real parents'. But the federal government, and citizens throughout the country, cannot countenance such parental irresponsibility unless they want to set up a big orphanage. . . The Ford administration's position no doubt should command wide respect even in New York City." 10/31/75

"The temptation to politicians to undo the hard decisions forced upon them will be almost as powerful tomorrow as the pressure not to make those decisions is today." 11/25/75

Staff/Cabinet Shakeup

"We have a government of laws rather than of men, a government in which major continuing policies are more important than the identity of current incumbents in office. No one-day 'massacres' should disturb the continuity of policies essential to the national interest." 11/4/75

"Whether or not this new team will serve the President and the country as well as or better than the team retiring from the field remains to be seen. Every patriot hopes it will equal, or even better, surpass the generally admirable record of those leaving office." 11/5/75

"Monday was one of Mr. Ford's poorest performances since he came into the presidency. . . During his interview Sunday on NBC-TV, President Ford supplemented his earlier contention that policy differences did not underlie the Cabinet shakeup Nov. 2. . . This supplemental comment is welcome, as a return to the candor characteristic of President Ford at his best." 11/11/75

Deregulation of the Airlines

"The government wants to reduce sharply its regulations of the airline industry, but the airlines don't want any part of it. . . Their opposition sounds a little bit like a grown child, comfortable with Mom and Dad, rejecting suggestions that it's time he found a place of his own. . . It will take a while for an industry that has been hamstrung (coddled) by controls for years to get used to the beneficial wonders of free enterprise. But in the long run everyone should be served well and efforts to reduce regulation should continue." 10/18/75

GENERAL COMMENT:On President Ford

"Presidential advisers who urge Mr. Ford to be more presidential are too much concerned with form. . . Mr. Ford's constituents knew him well when he assumed the presidency. He was a rather ordinary citizen, comfortable with the ordinary citizens who elected him to Congress. They expected him to be open, honest, hard working, and dedicated to the service of his country. They did not expect him to blossom into a superman who would do all things superlatively well. . . We hope he doesn't listen too intently when he is criticized for mishandling his dogs, his skis, or strange polysyllabic words. Above all he should not forget--and his constituents should not forget--that he is Jerry Ford, President, who is basically the same as Jerry Ford, congressman, a little more than a year ago. We have some advice for the President: Hang in there, Jerry. Be yourself. Stumble and fall if you must. Mangle words if you can't help it. Most Americans will be tolerant. They won't hold the little flaws against you if they are sure you are square on the big issues." 12/31/75

On the Economy

"One remarkable thing about this election year is that the economy is being allowed to recover at its own pace, without being forced along by congressional tail winds. This phenomenon is partly a result of a studied effort by President Ford to eschew popular, though ineffective panaceas, and partly a result of the public's growing suspicion of the government's abilities as an economic faith healer. The continuing economic gains are not spectacular, but they are not insignificant, either. . . And, if the economy continues as expected on its slow but steady course, who knows? Maybe by election day the economy will have done for itself at no extraordinary cost what some of the Sky-is-Falling school of Economists in Congress seek to achieve by spending untold billions. Best of all, the benefits of self-generated economic recovery will continue long after the election has been forgotten." 2/28/76

MEMORANDUM

March 12, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: WAYNE VALIS *Wayne Valis*
SUBJECT: Reagan Strategy

Enclosed is the latest Right Report, published by the Richard A. Viguerie Company, which is an accurate barometer of the thinking of the Reagan camp and their allies.

March 10, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: WAYNE VALIS *Wayne Valis*

SUBJECT: Campaign Developments Post-Florida

Today I spoke with several Reagan supporters about Florida.

1. The Reagan Campaign views their recent switch to an "attack strategy" as successful. Reagan staffer Dave Keene told a friend that he believes the recent Reagan attacks on detente and on the President's alleged "pumping up the economy" were successful in turning around the momentum of the Florida campaign. Keene said that had the election in Florida been held a week ago, the President would have won by a much larger margin than he did. Therefore, Keene (and probably others on the Reagan staff) will continue to urge this attack strategy.
2. A conservative Republican, who is usually a reliable source, said that he was with the Reagan people last night and found no sentiment whatsoever for reducing their efforts, much less thought of dropping out of the race. Source advised me that Reagan will be stepping up efforts in both Illinois and North Carolina.
3. The source also told me that it was the feeling of the Reagan people that they were going to do a lot more to generate national headlines, and that Reagan was going to say "interesting things" about the President on a daily basis from now on. Rather than discuss their own programs they will attack us.
4. The source feels that the Reagan supporters have invested so much time and emotional and personal commitment to the effort that many will be bitter-enders. He also said that some among the RR campaign will favor third party efforts if Reagan gets knocked out, even if Reagan himself reconciles with us. He believes that the number, though, of these third party types will be very small and their impact would be small on the general election.



THE RIGHT REPORT

A NEWSLETTER THAT TELLS YOU WHAT IS HAPPENING ON THE AMERICAN RIGHT

Copyright © 1976 Richard A. Viguerie Co., Inc.

Dear Subscriber:

REAGAN HANGS IN THERE. Conservatives who feared a Florida defeat might force Reagan right out of the Presidential race were cheered by his announced intention, despite his 47% - 53% Florida loss, to continue full steam ahead.

Florida was indecisive. Ford supporters believed they could eliminate Reagan if they held him to under 45% of the vote. They failed.

Reagan lost in Florida because he responded too late to urgent suggestions that he abandon the "Eleventh Commandment" and lay into President Ford's liberal weaknesses and policy reversals. When the RR "good guy" effort narrowly failed in New Hampshire, Reagan delayed eight days before coming out with his first strong defense policy blast at Ford. There were then only five days left before the Florida primary.

Most sources agree that the 11th hour change in strategy rescued Reagan from a crushing defeat. Reagan's Southern coordinator, Dave Keene, told TRR, "If we'd held the election a week ago, we'd have lost by a hell of a lot more."

Another five days of hard-hitting campaigning, and we believe Reagan would have won in Florida. Reagan's eight day delay in getting tough probably cost him what earlier looked to be his first primary victory.

It was not until the very day of the Florida primary that Reagan, in Illinois, began to attack the broken promises and unredeemed pledges of Gerald Ford. It was as if Reagan forgot to tell the Florida and New Hampshire voters how he was different from Ford. On March 9 Reagan cited Ford's flip flops on the New York City bailout, tax increases, tax cuts, budget deficit proposals, and common situs picketing.

Still unmentioned were Ford's broken commitment that the Legal Services Corporation would have a right-of-center tilt; Ford's allowing Vice President Rockefeller to gut the Senate filibuster rule last year; Ford's lip service support while he was undermining Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, CIA director Jim Colby, and U.N. Ambassador Patrick Moynihan; the Ford cave-in on energy price de-control; Ford's failure to ask David Mathews any questions regarding his views on, say, busing before appointing Mathews Secretary of HEW, and Ford's suggestion of mostly liberals as possible 1976 running mates.

Reagan's Florida organization was good, but many sources tell us his TV spots were inferior, a startling finding in view of the former Hollywood star's mastery of the media.

The President Ford Committee has moved to intensify its efforts in the Illinois primary next Tuesday and the North Carolina primary March 23.

The Citizens for Reagan Committee now plans to keep attacking Ford daily, in hopes of building momentum and gaining media attention. Reagan insiders now admit they erred by being too nice to Ford for too long.

Money has become a major factor in this contest. Ford has more of it than does Reagan. Ford outspent Reagan 3 to 2 in Florida. North Carolina Reagan leaders, for instance, loudly complain that their national organization won't or can't get them the money they need.

Here's why many movement-oriented conservatives are urging Reagan to stay in the race even if the going gets tougher:

1. Ford is expected to leap to the left in domestic and foreign policy if Reagan leaves the race.
2. Conservatives expect hot battles on platform and delegate allocation rules at the Kansas City Convention, and an intact Reagan team could be vital to conservative chances on these issues.
3. If some tragedy, scandal, or blunder removed Ford from the race, Reagan must be in a position to pick up the pieces.

Scotch one rumor: There's a story circulating in conservative circles that the New Hampshire Reagan campaign shut down its telephone banks on primary day. Not so. The rumor arose when a TV crew filmed the phone banks in Ford's state headquarters on election day and then found no phone banks operating in the Reagan state office. The fact is that all six N.H. Reagan phone banks were operating, but none of them was set up in the state office.

SEN. JACKSON NO CONSERVATIVE. The frequent media description of Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-Wash.) as a "conservative" only shows how far left some of our newsmen and politicians have gone.

We happened to be present at the Commodore Hotel in New York City, May 4, 1974, when the strongly socialist League for Industrial Democracy gave Jackson its "Man of the Year Award." In his acceptance speech, Jackson bragged that he had received inspiration from L.I.D. since he first joined the organization as a college student. (For a thorough discussion of the Fabian socialist L.I.D., see Illinois GOP Congressman Phil Crane's book, The Democrat's Dilemma.)

None of the other Democratic presidential hopefuls has surpassed Jackson's record of supporting massive social welfare spending programs and harassing business with swarms of bureaucrats. He was one of only four U.S. Senators to be rated 0% in 1975 by the National Taxpayers Union. Moreover, Jackson outdid his rivals in bitter, demagogic denunciations of "unconscionable corporate oil profits" during and after the Arab oil embargo crisis.

It's true that Jackson is for a strong national defense, and has been highly critical of detente. He is frequently attacked by Pravda and Radio Moscow. But on domestic policy, he's ADA all the way. Rather than calling him a "conservative," we'd describe Jackson as a patriotic socialist or a C.I.A. liberal.

PRESIDENT FORD10 REASONS WHY HE SHOULD CARRY THE GOP BANNER IN NOVEMBER1. Ford has a strong record as President.

-- Under his leadership, the U.S. is now in the full surge of economic recovery. Inflation has been cut from 12% to less than 6%. Over 1.3 million new jobs have been created since early 1975, erasing the losses of the recession.

-- Ford is the first President since Eisenhower who can campaign with America at peace.

-- President Ford is also building new faith and trust in the Presidency itself.

2. Ford runs ahead of Reagan on all key issues.

-- Polls consistently show that the economy is the number one concern of the American people. Among independents and Republicans, pollster Lou Harris finds that Ford is rated as better able than Reagan to handle inflation (47-26), to handle unemployment (44-24), and to control Federal spending (51-31).

-- Integrity in government is the second most important issue to voters, and here Ford beats Reagan by 44 to 26.

-- Only in some areas of foreign policy does Reagan beat Ford, and foreign policy is a distant fourth among voter concerns this year.

3. Ford runs better against Carter.

-- In every single major poll (Gallup, Harris), Ford runs consistently better than Reagan against Jimmy Carter. Both Republicans are now running behind, but President Ford has a much better chance of overcoming Carter's early lead. In December of 1975, when Reagan was in the first flush of his candidacy, he was the choice of the Independents over Ford by 47 to 32 and was tied among Republicans at 45-45, (Gallup, 12/15/76). By June, the President had clearly overcome the Reagan lead and was the preferred choice over Reagan by a 60 to 30 margin, (Harris, 6/6/76).

4. Ford has shown national appeal; Reagan has not.

-- President Ford is the only candidate in either party who has demonstrated broad, national support. He has beaten Reagan in the Northeast (New Hampshire, Massachusetts, etc.), in the big industrial states of the North (Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey), in the South (Florida), in the border states (Kentucky, Tennessee), in the Midwest (Michigan, Illinois), and even in the Far West (Oregon).

-- With the exception of Indiana, Reagan has never demonstrated an ability to win outside the Sunbelt.

5. Ford has a much more credible electoral strategy than Reagan.

-- Ford has a natural, strong base in the big states of the Midwest where Carter has not shown great strength. Those states represent over 140 electoral votes. Ford would also be able to draw upon traditional Republican strength in the Great Plains and Mountain States, could make inroads in the South and border states, and would have as good a crack at the West as Reagan. Because of Carter's weaknesses in the Northeast, Ford would have a better-than-even chance there.

-- Reagan, on the other hand, is a candidate whose strength is confined to the South and the West. In the South, Carter's total votes in the primaries have been higher than Reagan's by about a 3-1 margin, raising serious questions about Reagan's ability to win there.

-- Reagan's chances would be improved in the West, but the Western States alone are far less than needed for victory. It is important to recognize that in California, Ford runs better against Carter than does Reagan. A Field poll conducted May 31-June 5, 1976 shows Carter holding a slim 41-40 lead over Ford, but Carter leads Reagan 46-38.

-- To win, a Republican candidate must be able to sweep some of the bigger, most populated states. The primary states where Reagan has won have often been the ones with the fewest primary votes; altogether, Reagan's primary states represent 153 electoral votes. Ford, on the other hand, has won primaries in states which represent 258 electoral votes. Needed to win in November: 270 electoral votes.

6. Ford is better able to run against Carter's weaknesses.

-- Two of Carter's greatest weaknesses are his fuzziness on the issues and his total lack of experience on the national and international levels.

-- In more than a quarter of a century of public life, Ford has taken positions on thousands of issues and has a concrete program for the future. Moreover, for those voters who want a man of experience in the most powerful office on earth -- and the number of such voters will grow as the election draws closer -- Ford represents a clear choice.

-- Reagan, on the other hand, has not been forced to deal with issues in great detail, and more importantly, he has no experience on the national level. Just as he is stronger where Carter is strong among the anti-Washington voters, he is weaker where Carter is weak.

7. Ford does not have Reagan's liabilities.

-- Fairly or not, if Reagan were the GOP nominee, the Democrats would use his statements on the \$90 billion plan, Social Security and the TVA to depict Reagan as an extremist. No one who has ever been successfully branded as an extremist has ever won the Presidency.

-- Fairly or not, the Democrats would use Reagan's statements on Angola, Panama and Rhodesia to brand him as a dangerous, trigger-happy candidate.

-- Fairly or not, the Democrats would seek to exploit Reagan's background as an actor.

-- Fairly or not, the Democrats would try to portray Reagan as a man who would lead the country into nuclear war. We might even see the daisy ads again.

-- Fairly or not, Democrats will try to rip holes in Reagan's record as Governor of California, arguing that he increased taxes, that his welfare program failed, etc. Ford's record as President has always been subjected to close scrutiny by the opposition and the national press; Reagan's record as Governor has not.

-- Fairly or not, Democrats will also seek to exploit Reagan's personal tax records. For instance, a recent commentator on 60 Minutes blasted Reagan for accepting public funds to run his campaign but paying only minimal taxes to the Government.

8. Reagan presents the risk of another 1964.

-- In one of his most recent national surveys (May, 1976), Lou Harris found Carter beating Reagan 53-34 while holding a narrower 47-43 lead over Ford. Reagan could beat Carter only among conservatives (46-43). Concluded Harris: "The pattern now being run by Reagan against Carter is highly reminiscent of that of Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential election, when he lost by a landslide to Lyndon Johnson. This pattern thus indicates that in 1976 the electorate is highly unlikely to vote for an all-out conservative for President."

-- In 1964, the GOP Lost 20% of its seats in the House, 6% of its seats in the Senate, and 500 seats in State Legislatures.

-- A repeat of that performance this year, combined with retirements that have already been announced, could reduce GOP membership in the House to just over 100 members -- the lowest ebb for the Republican Party since 1934.

-- With better than a 3-1 majority of Democrats in the House, a 2-1 lead majority in the Senate, and a Democrat in the White House, the liberal Democrats could run roughshod over every Republican position.

-- State House losses could be even more devastating. As of today, Republicans control only a third of the Governors' chairs. Another 1964 would reduce that still further.

-- Who would suffer most from a debacle? In 1964, conservative Republicans suffered the greatest losses while their more liberal colleagues remained unscathed.

9. Only Ford can unite the Republican Party.

-- The latest polls indicate that the potential rate of defection to Carter among Reagan and Ford backers could be as high as 35% -- enough to devastate either Republican candidate. For a Republican to win, it is essential to keep these voters in the fold and then reach out to Independents and Democrats dissatisfied with Carter.

-- A Reagan nomination -- representing, as it would, a repudiation of Republican leadership -- would split the party so badly that it is very questionable whether the GOP could be put back together again.

-- President Ford, on the other hand, has demonstrated that he can work with Republicans of every political belief, from one end of the spectrum to the other. His allies include not only conservatives such as Senator Tower but liberals such as Senator Percy. That sort of broad appeal will be essential to a Republican victory in the fall.

10. President Ford deserves the Republican nomination.

-- Gerald Ford never sought the Presidency. He was asked to come forward at a time when his party -- and his Nation -- were in deep trouble. He has served both as well as any man could.

-- For his party, Gerald Ford has traveled from one end of the country to the other, helping other Republican candidates, raising money for State parties that were in need, and reviving Republican hopes. In the fall of 1975, even when the polls showed that his political trips were hurting his standing with the public, he went to GOP fund-raisers in order to put many State parties back in the black.

-- For his country, Gerald Ford has guided us gently, but firmly, out of one of the deepest troughs in recent history. He has put the nightmares of the past behind us. He has put the economy back on an upward path. And he has kept America strong and at peace.

-- Above anyone else in either party, Gerald Ford now deserves a chance to finish the job he has set out to do.

#

[Aug. 1976?]

Max:

The following have turned up.

1. Price Daniel of Texas
 - a. Former U.S. Senator
 - b. Former Governor of Texas
 - c. John Connally defeated Daniel in Democratic Primary in 1962
 - d. L.B.J. appointed him Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness in 1967 and Assistant to the President for Federal-State Relation
2. Senator Maurene Neuberger
 - a. Retired in 1967 as Senator from Oregon
 - b. L.B.J. appointed her as a member of the General Advisory Committee of ACDA
3. David S. King
 - a. Defeated for U.S. Senate 1962
 - b. Elected 1964 to House and defeated for re-election in 1966
 - c. L.B.J. appointed him Ambassador to the Malagary Republic and to Mauritius concurrently in 1967
4. Orville Freeman
 - a. Defeated as candidate for Minnesota A.G. 1950
 - b. Defeated as Candidate for Governor 1952
 - c. Appointed Secretary of Agriculture 1961-1969

[Aug. 10?, 1976]

August 11, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: MAX L. FRIEDBERG

SUBJECT: Kennedy/Johnson Cabinets

Attached is a list of those serving in Cabinet posts during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

I have distributed this list to Cheney, Marsh, Hartmann and Nassen with the recommendation that the President be consulted prior to any public comment.

Obviously, many of these appointees can be designated accurately as "faithful political partisans," the term used by Carter in his attack today on our appointees.

cc: Bob Hartmann
Jack Marsh
Dick Cheney
~~Ron Nassen~~



Secretary of State

Dean Rusk 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of the Treasury

Douglas Dillon 1/21/61 -- 4/1/65

Henry H. Fowler 4/1/65 -- 12/20/68

Joseph Barr 12/21/68 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Defense

Robert McNamara 1/20/61 -- 1/68

Clark Clifford 1/22/68 -- 3/1/68

--

Attorney General

Robert F. Kennedy 1/20/61 -- 9/3/64

Nicholas Katzenbach 2/11/65 -- 9/29/66

Ramsey Clark 3/2/67 -- 1/20/69

--

Postmaster General

J. Edward Day 1/21/61 -- 8/9/63

John A. Gronouski 9/30/63 -- 9/11/65

Lawrence F. O'Brien 11/3/65 -- 4/25/68

W. Marvin Watson 4/26/68 -- 1/20/69

:

Secretary of the Interior

Stewart Udall 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Agriculture

Orville Freeman 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Commerce

Luther Hodges 1/21/61 -- 1/17/65

John T. Connor 1/18/65 -- 6/7/67

Alexander Trowbridge 6/8/67 -- 3/1/68

C. R. Smith 3/1/68 -- 1/19/69

--

Secretary of Labor

Arthur Goldberg 1/21/61 -- 9/25/62

W. Willard Wirtz 9/25/62 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

Abraham Ribicoff 1/21/61 -- 7/12/62

Anthony Celebrezze 7/30/62 -- 7/27/65

John Gardner 8/18/65 -- 3/1/68

Wilbur J. Cohen 5/16/68 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Robert Weaver 1/17/66 -- 12/31/68

--

Secretary of Transportation

Alan S. Boyd 1/12/67 -- 1/20/69

--

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 13, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF *M. L.*
SUBJECT: Kennedy/Johnson Appointees

Research by Bob Wolthuis has turned up additional
"partisan political" appointments by Kennedy and LBJ.

The list is attached. We are working on researching
all ex-Democratic Congressmen during this period.

Secretary of the Interior

Stewart Udall 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Agriculture

Orville Freeman 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Commerce

Luther Hodges 1/21/61 -- 1/17/65

John T. Connor 1/18/65 -- 6/7/67

Alexander Trowbridge 6/8/67 -- 3/1/68

C. R. Smith 3/1/68 -- 1/19/69

--

Secretary of Labor

Arthur Goldberg 1/21/61 -- 9/25/62

W. Willard Wirtz 9/25/62 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

Abraham Ribicoff 1/21/61 -- 7/12/62

Anthony Celebrezze 7/30/62 -- 7/27/65

John Gardner 8/18/65 -- 3/1/68

Wilbur J. Cohen 5/16/68 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Robert Weaver 1/17/66 -- 12/31/68

--

Secretary of Transportation

Alan S. Boyd 1/12/67 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of State

Dean Rusk 1/21/61 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of the Treasury

Douglas Dillon 1/21/61 -- 4/1/65

Henry H. Fowler 4/1/65 -- 12/20/68

Joseph Barr 12/21/68 -- 1/20/69

--

Secretary of Defense

Robert McNamara 1/20/61 -- 1/68

Clark Clifford 1/22/68 -- 3/1/68

--

Attorney General

Robert F. Kennedy 1/20/61 -- 9/3/64

Nicholas Katzenbach 2/11/65 -- 9/29/66

Ramsey Clark 3/2/67 -- 1/20/69

--

Postmaster General

J. Edward Day 1/21/61 -- 8/9/63

John A. Gronouski 9/30/63 -- 9/11/65

Lawrence F. O'Brien 11/3/65 -- 4/25/68

W. Marvin Watson 4/26/68 -- 1/20/69

[Sept. 1976?]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JESSE HELMS (R-NC)

"HOSTILITY TOWARD SOLZHENITSYN"

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Evans and Novak column of September 2, published the day after the Senate recessed, bears witness to the continuing hostility toward Alexander Solzhenitsyn which still exists in the State Department. The columnists report that Mr. Winston Lord, the State Department policy planning director, referred to Mr. Solzhenitsyn as a "Fascist" or almost so. More important, however, Mr. Lord went on to repeat the old State Department line that Mr. Solzhenitsyn and his views were a threat to peace.

Mr. President, this incident, which took place August 19, is simply a repetition of the disastrous advice which Secretary of State Kissinger gave to President Ford last year in advising the President not to receive Mr. Solzhenitsyn at the White House. Moreover, it occurred only two days after the Republican Party, gathered in Kansas City, hailed Mr. Solzhenitsyn as a "great beacon of human courage and morality," and "his compelling message that we must face the world with no illusions about the nature of tyranny."

Furthermore, the Republican Party, as a whole, pledged that "ours will be a foreign policy that keeps this ever in mind."

Yet, Mr. President, only two days later the

Administration's foreign policy planning director is not even keeping it in mind: he is quoted as rejecting Solzhenitsyn's visit as a basis for foreign policy.

Now this is not just a question of rhetoric. It is clear that the Secretary of State and his Department are completely out of touch with the mood of America. The Secretary and his Department regard Solzhenitsyn as a threat to peace at a time when the Republican Party regards Solzhenitsyn as a bulwark of peace.

Let me quote once again from the Republican Party Platform: "The goal of Republican foreign policy is the achievement of liberty under law and a just and lasting peace in the world. The principles by which we act to achieve peace and to protect the interests of the United States must merit the restored confidence of our people."

Mr. President, I ask, how are we going to restore the confidence of the people if the Secretary of State and his Department do not abandon the policies which have caused the people to lose confidence? Our goal in foreign policy is based upon a philosophy of liberation, not a philosophy of concession. We don't want peace at any price; we want a just peace. We want a peace which restores basic human freedoms and rights.

This is the message which Solzhenitsyn has been bringing us. Solzhenitsyn has been saying that the oppression

and tyranny which characterize Communist countries is not the result of history or temporary necessity; he is saying that Communism is such a perversion of human nature that it necessarily results in tyranny. In other words, there is no hope of a just peace, as long as Communism rules. But if that is a somber message, there is also a message of hope. Solzhenitsyn also shows that Communism is corrupt within, and that the internal resistance is growing. That is why he continues to plead with the leaders of the United States not to strengthen the Communist ruling minority in the Soviet Union with technological and diplomatic assistance. He does not ask us to attack the Soviet Union, or to engage in military operations. He asks only that we withhold our support of tyranny, so that the internal strains and struggles within the Communist empire can emerge and liberate the Soviet peoples.

This is why we must have, as the Republican Party Platform urges, a philosophy of liberation. We must uphold the right and duty of those oppressed by Communism to free themselves. We must never take away their hope that someday the evil will be thrown off, and all the traditional rights of man--the rights of family, private property, and free expression both in economics and speech--may be restored.

That is also why the Republican Party Platform proclaims the following: "Agreements that are negotiated, such as the one signed in Helsinki, must not take from those

who do not have freedom the hope of one day gaining it."

Everybody knows what the Helsinki agreement has done. The President received bad advice from Secretary Kissinger when he signed this agreement. Now we must take steps to see that the Agreement is interpreted in the most hopeful way possible, so as to restore confidence both to our own people and to those who are caught behind the door slammed shut at Helsinki.

It is time now to find out whether Secretary of State Kissinger and his subordinates accept the Republican Party Platform or not. The Secretary has been quoted as saying that he felt it did not apply to any of the policies which he has pursued in the past; but it appears now that nothing has really changed at the State Department. The Secretary must repudiate any statements originating in the Department which suggest that Solzhenitsyn and his views are a threat to peace. The President has told me that he wholeheartedly accepts the Platform and the principles written therein. Secretary Kissinger can do no less. If the Secretary of State does not embrace the Platform, as it stands, especially the sections dealing with foreign policy, he must resign immediately. The Party cannot stand divided in this election. The people expect us to stand upon principle, and those principles are laid out in the Platform. The Secretary has no choice if the Administration is to win

the confidence of the American people. He must embrace the Platform, or resign.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Evans and Novak Column of September 2 be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

The Hostility

Toward Solzhenitsyn

2 50
20 50
25 50
210 50
21 50
21 40
20 50

• Baker

• Elly

• Spencer 2 x 11

RNC participation phone banks

700 bank 7000 phones

Doug Bailey Bailey - Deardorff
assumption

① not decided on issue

② " " individual qualities

③ we have not projected -

A Vision
B Compassion
C Competence
D Integrity

objection -

① show Pres personal history (may know Carter better)

② communicate ^{your} sense of Presidency

③ make sure comparison is communicated

④ communicate record of accomplishments

⑤ " future goals

⑥ Cut Carter down to size

⑦ paint a comparison between Ford & Carter

⑧

Nelson - add leadership

A288

R A

AM-FORD 2NDLD-PICKUP6THGRAF A239 9-15

BY HELEN THOMAS

ANN ARBOR, MICH. (UPI) -- PRESIDENT FORD OFFICIALLY OPENED HIS CAMPAIGN AGAINST JIMMY CARTER AT HIS ALMA MATER WEDNESDAY, CHALLENGING THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE HEAD-ON WITH "IT IS IS NOT ENOUGH FOR ANYONE TO SAY 'TRUST ME' -- TRUST MUST BE EARNED."

FORD CAME BACK TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN WHERE HE GRADUATED 40 YEARS AND SAID HE HAS LED THE NATION TO "AN INCREDIBLE COMEBACK" DURING HIS TWO YEARS IN THE WHITE HOUSE.

"THE QUESTION IN THIS CAMPAIGN OF 1976 IS NOT, 'WHO HAS THE BETTER VISION OF AMERICA,'" FORD SAID. "THE QUESTION IS, 'WHO WILL ACT TO MAKE THAT VISION A REALITY?'"

FORD'S SPEECH AT THE UNIVERSITY WHERE HE WAS A STAR FOOTBALL CENTER IN THE 1930S WAS HIS FIRST OUTSIDE WASHINGTON SINCE WINNING THE REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR ELECTION IN HIS OWN RIGHT. CARTER KICKED OFF HIS DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN ON LABOR DAY IN WARM SPRINGS, GA.

THERE WERE HECKLERS IN THE MICHIGAN AUDIENCE, BUT FORD GOT A ONE-MINUTE STANDING OVATION WHEN HE MADE HIS ENTRANCE WITH HIS FIRST LADY AND A BURST OF APPLAUSE WHEN HE SAID "THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL DEMAND SPECIFICS -- NOT SMILES; PERFORMANCES -- NOT PROMISES."

MRS. FORD ACTUALLY UPSTAGED HER HUSBAND, GETTING TWO STANDING OVATIONS TO HIS ONE. THE PRESIDENT APPEARED IRRITATED AT TIMES WHEN STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY WHICH WAS ONCE A CENTER OF CAMPUS UNREST SHOUTED OBJECTIONS TO WHAT HE HAD TO SAY.

STILL, THE CRISLER ARENA WAS PACKED TO PRACTICALLY THE ENTIRETY OF ITS 14,000 SEAT CAPACITY.

PICKUP 6THGRAF: FORD'S SPEECH

UPI 09-15 08:49 PED

It is difficult to determine exactly what Mr. Carter has in mind with his ~~1-2-3~~ scheme for ^{energy} reorganization. From press reports, however, it appears that at a minimum he does not understand the role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC was established less than two years ago in legislation signed by ~~the~~ President ^{Ford} as an independent, technically oriented, bi-partisan agency to ensure that nuclear facilities are designed, constructed and operated in such a way as to provide that maximum attention is paid to protecting the public's health and safety.

It was felt then by the President and the Congress that nuclear safety was a matter of such import that the nation could not risk even potential conflicts of interest between safety on the one hand and developmental and promotional concerns on the other. Moreover, it was felt that nuclear safety was not a matter of partisan concern and should not have its direction changed when the political winds shift. For these reasons the old Atomic Energy Commission was abolished and in its place two separate agencies were established--the Energy Research and Development Administration headed by a political appointee and responsible for all forms of energy R&D including nuclear and an independent Nuclear Regulatory Commission composed of five members, serving staggered terms, no more than three of whom could belong to the same political party.

Mr. Carter's proposal to eliminate this independent regulatory commission and to subordinate its prime mission of protecting public health and safety to a whole range of developmental and economic concerns shows either an incredibly distorted sense of priorities or else a total lack of familiarity with the issue.



Row --- Too much

MSJ /

R A

AM-CARTER 1STLD-PICKUP2DGRAF A243 9-27

BY WILLIAM COTTERELL

EVANSVILLE, IND. (UPI) -- DEMOCRAT JIMMY CARTER, OPENLY SEEKING TO BESMIRCH PRESIDENT FORD WITH THE MEMORY OF RICHARD NIXON, SAID MONDAY NIGHT FORD HAS BEEN A WORSE PRESIDENT THAN NIXON AND MADE A POINTED REFERENCE TO FORD'S PARDON OF HIS PREDECESSOR.

"RICHARD NIXON WAS BAD ENOUGH. IT'S BEEN WORSE THE PAST TWO YEARS," SHOUTED CARTER AT A RALLY FOR INDIANA DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES.

"WE'VE HAD FOUR TIMES THE DEFICIT AVERAGE UNDER GERALD FORD AS WE HAD UNDER RICHARD NIXON."

CARTER SAID FORD HAS VETOED FOUR TIMES AS MANY BILLS PER YEAR AS NIXON.

"PRESIDENT FORD'S VETOES HAVE NOT BEEN DESIGNED TO SAVE MONEY, THEY'VE BEEN DESIGNED TO KEEP PEOPLE OUT OF WORK," SAID CARTER.

HE ALSO ATTACKED FORD'S RECORD ON CRIME, SAYING, "WE'VE SEEN AN ATTITUDE IN WASHINGTON WHERE THE BIG SHOTS ARE EXCUSED FOR SERIOUS CRIMES BUT THE AVERAGE PEOPLE DON'T GET THAT SAME EXCUSE AND THAT SAME TREATMENT."

RETURNING TO A THEME HE SOUNDED FIRST AT A CAMPAIGN STOP IN PORTLAND, ORE., MONDAY AFTERNOON, CARTER ACCUSED FORD OF BEING TOO COZY WITH LOBBYISTS DURING NEARLY THREE DECADES IN WASHINGTON AND SAID THE REPUBLICANS HAVE DEVELOPED AN ATTITUDE OF "YOU SCRATCH MY BACK, I'LL SCRATCH YOURS" WITH WELL-MONIED INDUSTRIAL LOBBIES.

AT A RALLY IN PORTLAND'S FEDERAL SQUARE, CARTER TOLD SEVERAL THOUSAND PERSONS THAT PRESIDENT FORD HAS BEEN RUNNING THE GOVERNMENT FROM "PRIVATE CLUBS" AND THE "WHITE HOUSE ROSE GARDEN."

HE ALSO SUGGESTED DURING OREGON STOPS THAT ELECTION YEAR POLITICS PRODDED THE FORD ADMINISTRATION INTO TAKING AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN BLACK RULE FOR RHODESIA AND SOUTH AFRICA.

PICKUP2DGRAF: SITTING AT

UPI 09-27 11:20 PED

RN
10/4/76

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 30, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JIM CAVANAUGH
JIM CONNOR
BRENT SCOWCROFT
RON NESSEN

FROM:

DAVID LISSY 

SUBJECT:

JIMMY CARTER IN BOSTON

Jimmy Carter met Thursday afternoon in Boston with representatives of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and other Jewish community leaders. The way the meeting was set up and invitations extended antagonized a number of people and several prominent national leaders refused to attend.

Carter was 40 minutes late for the meeting--in a room which was hot and uncomfortable. In his opening statement, Carter was harshly critical of the President on the boycott issue which he said caused him "deep pain and concern." He said the President had gone back on his word to the B'nai B'rith Convention regarding his support for legislation. Carter said the Congress had done its best but is incapable of leadership and that the President had not demonstrated leadership.

So far as I can determine at this point, however, Carter never said exactly what he was for. He used a lot of rhetoric but not many specifics.

At the conclusion of Carter's opening statement, it was announced there would only be time for 6 questions. The

questions were entirely of the soft ball variety but, even so, Carter generated little applause with his remarks.

On the question of an oil embargo, Carter said he would immediately retaliate by prohibiting sale of anything to any country participating.

Carter spoke of his "good friend" Golda Meir and said he thought of her as he did his mother.

Carter said he would do all possible to renegotiate the Helsinki agreements and would "enforce the Jackson-Vanik amendment. He did not repeat his previous statements against Jackson-Vanik.

The Carter meeting was hardly the success of our last Monday.

[ca. 10/22/76]

Holtzman Asks Ford to Reopen Watergate Probe

Rebuffed by the Justice Department in her attempts to have a Watergate-related investigation of President Ford, Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman (D-NY) is asking Ford to order the investigation himself.

"If there is nothing to hide," Miss Holtzman said in a letter to Ford Friday, "you have no reason to be afraid of what an investigation would disclose."

She said that since Ford alone has the power to "compel an investigation, your failure to order one will, as a practical matter, ensure that the full truth will remain hidden until after the election."

--UPI (10/22/76)

Candidates' FamiliesFORD/DOLETired-Looking Betty Campaigns in Cleveland

A drawn-looking Betty Ford made a brief appearance before a Republican audience in suburban Lakewood, Ohio, Thursday to urge fellow Party members to return her husband to the White House.

"All this political work sums up in one day, election day, Nov. 2," she said. "Keep the President on the job and send him some help."

Arriving from Sunny California, the First Lady was greeted by snow flurries. Mayor Ralph Perk and other Republican leaders met her plane.

Mrs. Ford looked tired and slurred some of her words in the speech to the annual Lakewood Republican Party dinner. She spent only five minutes with the city hall crowd of about 500. Later she received well-wishers at her hotel, also making quick work of that duty.

But asked if Mrs. Ford were ill, her press secretary said she was simply tired out from a long day of campaigning.

--UPI (10/21/76)

Television Interview with U. S. Senator Russell B. Long (D-La.)
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee

ANNOUNCER: From Washington, a 15-minute, unrehearsed interview with U. S. Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. The Senator will be questioned today by Lisa Myers, Capitol Hill correspondent for the Bureau of National Affairs, and Kenneth Allen, Washington reporter for The Alexandria Town Talk and writer of the column "Congressional Gumbo." Now, with his first question, here is Mr. Allen:

ALLEN: Senator, recently in your Senate Finance Committee you were able to amend the upcoming revenue-sharing law which provides Louisiana sheriffs with 15 per cent of the amount of money that each police jury would get. I wonder if you are getting any kind of political feedback from the police jurors over this?

LONG: Well, the police jurors didn't want to share that money with the sheriffs. Some of it would have given the sheriffs a small amount of money; but, in the main, most of these sheriffs felt they had not had their share. They felt somewhat like that fellow who sent an appeal to Washington for help, to the President. He was hoping to get \$100 and he got \$5. He said, "Next time, please send my money directly. Don't send it by way of Washington. They took out 95 per cent for expenses." The sheriffs wanted their money. They said, "Well, if we are supposed to get something out of this thing, we would like to have it direct." The revenue sharing money that went to the parishes did a lot of good to help in the areas where the police juries have responsibility. I was very disappointed that the sheriffs did not get what I thought was their fair share. So, basically what we undertook to do was to say, "This time we will send them their share direct." And we do. I am happy that the House went along with the Senate amendment that I sponsored. And the sheriff will get his share. That means that people will get better law enforcement. They are going to have better roads. They are going to have better community services because of the part we send to the police jury. They will have better protection in their homes and in their personal safety and the security of their property. This is because the sheriff will have a little more money to work with. I say a little more but for a lot of them it will be substantial.

ALLEN: In your formula, you have the police jury paying half of that 15 per cent and the other half coming out of what the state would get. Are you getting any kind of kickback from the legislature?

LONG: I haven't heard any complaints from Governor Edwin Edwards. I hope I won't because some years ago I explained to him that it wasn't working out so far as the sheriffs were concerned the way I had hoped: The sheriffs should have been getting more of the revenue-sharing money. At that time the Governor indicated he would be willing to recommend and support a proposal whereby the sheriffs would get a substantial portion of the revenue-sharing money and the state would pay half the cost of it. So, I think the Governor really favored the kind of approach that I put into effect. Of course, everybody likes to have more money to work with. But I haven't had a protest from the Governor about it. I hope very much I won't. I will keep my fingers crossed about that.

MYERS: Senator, the Democratic Presidential nominee, Jimmy Carter, has been promising the American people to reduce taxes on lower and middle-income groups, to implement new programs which, conservatively estimated, would cost at least \$100 billion a year and, at the same time, to balance the budget. In your opinion, can he deliver?

LONG: It will be sort of like pulling a rabbit out of a hat, if he does. You have these upper tax bracket taxpayers that these politicians like to talk about and say, "We will tax those rich people who are not paying their share." And you look at what they pay after taxes. You have perhaps less than one per cent, about one-half of one per cent, of the people in this country, you have about 5 people out of every 1,000, who are doing very well and a lot of them are not paying as much taxes as we would like to see them pay.

They do that because they spend more time trying to figure out ways to save money on taxes than they do working for the money. And people do that when the government starts taking 70 per cent of your pay check for taxes. We aim \$1-1/2 billion of additional taxes at that small number of people here in this country. But you have about 30,000 or 40,000 people in these tax brackets that people like to talk about as being the very rich. There are just not that many of those people to finance these big programs. If you took everything that they had left after taxes, you would be talking about \$5 billion across the entire width and breadth of the United States of America. That would not finance the cheapest of those big programs, much less the biggest of them. That would finance about 5 per cent. Now, you will be needing the other 95 per cent from somewhere else. Where are you going to raise all that money---if you want to do that type of thing? Let's say you take everything those people are making, not to mention what it would do to stop the economy, because if you take the money all away from them you can't make it serve two purposes. If you took it all, you would have about 5¢ on the dollar on how much you are going to be needing. Beyond that, you are just going to have to start taxing these middle-income people. You can cut it any way you want to cut it. You can't finance these big spending programs without taxing the middle-income people because there just aren't enough rich people in the country. By the time you really get through taxing the eyeballs off of 50,000 people who are regarded as rich in this country to try to support a thousand times their number you will find that what they have just won't go very far.

MYERS: Senator, Jimmy Carter has also gotten himself in a lot of trouble taking about taxes. During the primary he said he wanted to take away really the only big break available to middle-income people, the deduction for home-mortgage interest and property taxes. Of course, a couple of weeks ago there was that Associated Press interview where he said he wanted to raise taxes on everyone above the median income, but had to back down when he found out the median income was below \$14,000. Senator (Robert) Dole (the Republican Vice Presidential candidate) suggests that you go down to Plains and brief Mr. Carter on the tax code. What would you advise him?

LONG: Nobody has asked me what he ought to do about taxes on behalf of Mr. Carter. Now, they have been asking the same people who advised George McGovern. Mr. (Stanley) Surrey has been down there advising him and Mr. (Joseph) Pechman has, too. He has been getting the same advice that Mr. McGovern got. He may be handling it a little bit better. But, I wish him luck. If he had asked my advice, what I would have said was: "Well, what I am advocating will cost money. It will cost a lot of money. But we are going to try to raise it in the most reasonable, fair way we can. And we are not going to tax the poor and we are not going to tax these lower middle-income people. We are going to try to do it in the most reasonable way we can. And we are going to close every loophole we can find." Once he starts getting specific and starts saying he is going to take away the deduction of interest on a home mortgage, you see what that does. That makes all these homeowners sore. They say, "Hold on, just a minute! That is us you are talking about. If it is a loophole, it is our loophole." It begins to create problems. It would have been better not to be specific about precisely how you are going to raise the money to pay for all these things. Anybody would assume that a man trying to pay for a big program is going to try to put his tax program where it would be fair and equitable. That is all anybody has the right to expect.

MYERS: Before we get away from taxes, in the first not-so-great debate, Mr. Carter said he would do away with a lot of business deductions, such as those -- he used the examples of jet airplanes, first-class air travel and the \$50 martini lunch. How do you feel about these write-offs?

LONG: We have talked about that sort of thing. We have had some of those suggestions before. I am sure some of them, if he wants to recommend it, and he is President, we will go along with him on (some of) them. And on some of them we won't. You take this thing about

trying to fix it up, as President John Kennedy wanted to do -- by the same advisors, by the way -- so that a man could not take his wife to a convention. Well, they failed to provide that he could not take somebody else's wife to the convention with him. He could take a secretary, and deduct her expenses. But he could not take his own wife. About all you would be doing in that case is subsidizing a lot of hell-raising conduct that is not good for anybody by saying that a man could not take his wife along. I recall when my Uncle Earl first got to be Governor of Louisiana -- that was about the time that the legislators starting bringing their wives down -- their wives would stay down there for the session with them. They were so much better behaved. There was not all that carousing, hell-raising and all that noise. People conducted themselves better, even if they didn't bring their own wives with them because somebody else's wife was observing their conduct. It was just a much better session of the legislature and it has been that way ever since. So, some of these things that people want to disallow I don't think make all that much sense. You take the thing about an executive who happens to use a private jet. If you have a very good executive who is responsible for the success of that corporation they can just get a great deal more done if they can move him around where he hasn't got to be impeded by airline schedules, if they do have a jet to move their executives around. It would cost them a great deal of money to have to hire a lot of managerial talent to try to overcome the fact that they couldn't make as favorable use of the brightest man they have if they can't use private air travel for their man. So, there are wheels-within-wheels. There are areas where we can tighten up on the laws. We did this last time. We put \$3 billion of additional taxes on one-tenth of one per cent of the people in this country. And we will do that kind of thing no matter who is President. But, it gets a little bit difficult to decide precisely what is a loophole. I tell you what most people think is a loophole: That is the thing that benefits the other guy, if it benefits him. For example, if you are a homeowner and you are deducting the interest expense on your home, you think that is a fine thing and in the public interest, to help people own their own homes. But if you are a tenant and you are not paying the tax and the landlord is paying it and you are not getting the deduction for the interest expense, then, from your point of view, I suppose it is a loophole. Most of those deductions tend to work out that way.

ALLEN: Senator, let's change the subject to the outer continental shelf. This week in the House of Representatives the conference report of the Senate Interior Committee and the House Ad Hoc Outer Continental Shelf Committee was returned from the House by a vote of 198-194 to committee. That bill would have inhibited, perhaps, some exploration off shore. Oil companies say it would be too constricting for them, too restrictive. The environmentalists said it would have been better. What are your views?

LONG: The people who work on the continental shelf off of Louisiana tell me that this bill would have delayed by two years our efforts to find more energy in the most promising frontier areas that we have. In other words, we can produce oil in Alaska, for example, but we haven't been able to get the pipeline built so far to get the oil out of there. If we get the pipeline completed, we will find that it does not begin to have the capacity for all the oil you can produce up there. Where can you produce a lot of oil and get it where the people can use it in a hurry? It is in the Gulf of Mexico and the big frontier areas out in the Atlantic. They provided 45 additional steps that people would have to go through, getting all these permits and holding all these hearings and making all these decisions. That would delay at least two years the progress in finding new oil. They would have even stopped things right dead in their tracks in the Gulf of Mexico with that bill. Senator (Bennett) Johnston and I would have fought it bitterly if it had gotten to the Senate. I hope, as of this sitting, it won't come back in a conference report. Otherwise, we will have to oppose it, I suppose. We don't want to put all these people out of work. I don't know of anything that is worse than putting the people out of work producing energy when we need the energy desperately.

MYERS: Senator, one final question, if I may: Do you share Mr. Carter's views on sin and lust, as enunciated in the "Playboy" interview?

LONG: Well, I feel this way about it. (A) He should not have given the interview. (B) He should not have used the kind of language that he used. And (C) He should not have discussed the matter. He should have let it go by saying, if he wanted to say something about it: "All women are lovely." That is what politicians ought to say.

ANNOUNCER: The Senator was questioned today by Lisa Myers, Capitol Hill correspondent for the Bureau of National Affairs, and Kenneth Allen, reporter for the Alexandria Town Talk. From Washington, this has been a 15-minute, unrehearsed interview with U. S. Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

#

POSSIBLE NEWS EVENTS

Wednesday, October 13

PRESIDENT

- Yonkers, N.Y.: Sign Revenue Amendments
- White Plains,: Reception; rally; N.Y. Rockland Co. Ct. House
- Paramus, N.J.: Garden State Shopping Center
- Union, N.J.: Radio interview; Liberty Hall Historical Sight

ADMINISTRATION

- Vice Pres.: San Francisco: Golden Circle Lunch; Portland: 2 fundraising receptions for local Congressional candidates
- Hills: Dallas: 12:00 Republican Men's Club
- Richardson: Sharon, Pa.: candidate fundraisers; Erie, Pa.: candidate fundraisers
- Coleman: Princeton, N.J.: 7:00 Princeton U.
- Kleppe: Los Angeles: American Gas Association El Cerino Park
- Kobelinski: Hartford, Ct.: Conn. Small Business Federation
- Knauer: Atlanta: Nat'l. Association Mutual Insurance Agencies

OTHER

- Mrs. Ford: D.C.: Junior League Luncheon
- Steve Ford: touring Albuquerque by van
- Dole: D.C.

CARTER/MONDALE

- Carter: Rochester, Syracuse, NYC
- Mondale: D.C.

Thursday, October 14

PRESIDENT

- Sign Polish and Czech. Veterans Benefits Bill (HR 71)
Meeting with Ethnic Press
- Jewish Press Interview
- Martha Graham Dinner

ADMINISTRATION

- Vice Pres.: Portland: Spellman Breakfast, Press conference; Seattle: Press conference/t.v. taping
- Simon: Cincinnati, Lancaster, Toledo, Harrisburg for Congressional candidates
- Mathews: D.C. - National Conference for Hypertension
- Hills: Akron-City Club
- Usery: San Diego: Propeller Club, San Diego Chapter of Industrial Relations Research Association

Thursday, October 14 (cont.)

- Richardson: Cedar Rapids: League of Women Voters, U. of Iowa, reception for Congressional candidate
- Coleman: Los Angeles: United Negro College Fund Dinner
- Kobelinski: N.J. Manufacturers Association, N.Y.C. - meeting with Sen. Buckley; Tarreytwon, N.Y.: Westchester County Association, Bankers Association
- Parsky: Cleveland: Harvard School of Business of Cleveland
- Knauer: Irvine, Ca.: U. of California

OTHER

- Mrs. Ford: D.C.: Martha Graham Dinner
- Dole: Houston: Preparation for Debate
- Mrs. Dole: Williamsburg: Salute to Mrs. Godwin Luncheon
- Steve Ford: Winslow, N.M. by van

CARTER/MONDALE

- Carter: Detroit; Kansas City, Mo.
- Mondale: Houston: Prepare for debate

Friday, October 15

PRESIDENT

- Des Moines: Motorcade: Ames: Iowa St. U. brief remarks, tour veterinary Medical center;
- Boone: tour farm, lunch with farmers;
- Joliet: watch V.P. candidates debate, remain overnight

ADMINISTRATION

- Vice Pres.: New York: lunch with N.Y. county PFC chairmen, meeting with labor leaders
- Kissinger: Cambridge, Mass: Address East-Asian seminar at Harvard
- Simon: Lansing, Mi.: 2 GOP candidate rallies;
- Adrian, Mi.: candidate rally
- Usery: Los Angeles: Mexican-American Opportunity Fund Award Banquet
- Coleman: D.C.: Personnel Executive Interchange
- Kleppe: Scranton: Lackawanna GOP dinner
- Seidman: Southern Pines, N.C.: North and South Carolina Securities Association
- Zarb: Illinois: PFC events being scheduled
- Kobelinski: Chicago: Interview taping
- Gorog: Dayton: Associated Builders and Contractors
- Knauer: San Diego: San Diego Community College

Friday, October 15 (cont.)

OTHER

- Steve Ford: Campaign with van in Arizona
- Dole: Houston debate

CARTER/MONDALE

- Carter: Toledo, Youngstown, Columbus, Plains
- Mondale: Houston debate

Saturday, October 16

PRESIDENT

- Depart Joliet by Whistle - Stop train
Pontiac, Bloomington, Lincoln, Springfield, Carlinville,
Alton, St. Louis: Return to D.C.

ADMINISTRATION

- Simon: Hot Springs: Business Council
- Seidman: Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College
- Knauer: Florida: to be announced

OTHER

- Mrs. Ford: Illinois: accompanying the President
on the train.
- Susan Ford: Tyler Texas: Tyler Rose Festival
- Dole: Wichita: Dinner for Cong. Shriver
Lawrence: Kansas-Oklahoma game
Kansas City: remains overnight

CARTER/MONDALE

- Carter: Plains

Sunday, October 17

PRESIDENT

- Attends church in D.C.

ADMINISTRATION

- Richardson: Miami: Simchat Torah Rally for Freedom

OTHER

- Steve Ford: Los Vegas: tour by van
Barstow Ca.: " " "
Riverside, Ca.: " " "

-- Dole: Waterloo, Ia.; Sioux City, Ia.

Monday, October 18

PRESIDENT

- Present Medal of Science Award - East Room
- Swear in Edward Aquierre

ADMINISTRATION

- Vice Pres.: Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids: press conference, t.v. taping and candidate receptions in each; Detroit: GOP fundraising dinner
- Simon: St. Louis, Omaha: candidate receptions
- Richardson: St. Petersburg, Fl. - Chamber of Commerce, Tampa: Tampa Bar Association
- Usery: D.C.: private carrier conference
- Mathews: Raleigh, N.C.: N.C. State University
- Hills: Albuquerque, N.M.: Women in Housing
- Coleman: D.C.: American Trucking Assn.; Philadelphia: Am. Assn. Port Authorities
- Kobelinski: Chicago: Assembly Group Luncheon

OTHER

- Steve Ford: San Diego: Campaign by van
- Dole: Sioux City; Cape Girardeau, Mo.; Springfield, Mo.;

Tuesday, October 19

PRESIDENT

- D.C.: only staff meetings scheduled at this time

ADMINISTRATION

- Vice Pres.: Minneapolis: reception, t.v. taping, fundraising
- Kissinger: N.Y.: Synagogue Council of America luncheon, return to D.C.
- Simon: San Francisco: candidate reception; Salt Lake City: candidate reception
- Kleppe: Louisville: Jr. Chamber of Commerce National Coal Assn. Dinners
- Richardson: Syracuse, Troy, N.Y.: candidate reception
- Hills: Scottsdale, Ca.: candidate reception; San Diego: Calif. League of Cities
- Lynn: Dallas: S.M.U. Business School
- Coleman: Norfolk, Va.: Nat'l. Assn. State Aviation Officials
- Zarb: Exeter, N.H.: Phillips Exeter Acedemy
- Warner: D.C.: Colonial Dames
- Kobelinski: Indianapolis: Rotary Club

OTHER

- Housing starts data released
- GNP data released
- Steve Ford: Los Angeles, Newport Beach: campaign by van
- Dole: Springfield, Mo.; Ok. City, Ok.; Corpus Christi, TX.; San Antonio, overnight

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE
UNTIL 6 A.M. (EDT)
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26

OCTOBER 25, 1976

Office of the White House Press Secretary
(Portland, Oregon)

THE WHITE HOUSE

TEXT OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY THE PRESIDENT OVER MUTUAL RADIO NETWORK
8:15 A.M., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1976

Good morning. I would like to talk with you this morning, as this year's campaign nears its end, about a subject that is very much on the minds of most American families--taxes. As I have traveled around our country in recent weeks, people have told me, Mr. President, things are going well. America is going back to work. There is a new spirit of confidence in our land. But there is one problem that is bothering us very much--the heavy burden of taxes.

I completely sympathize with this feeling. And I have tried to do something about it. I asked Congress to cut taxes this year at a rate that would have put an extra \$200 in the pocket of the average American family. But Congress turned me down. Next year, with the mandate of your votes behind me, I will go back after them again--and this time we will succeed.

I want to cut taxes, not simply because I want American taxpayers to be able to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, but also because more money for the American consumer means more growth for the American economy--which in turn means more jobs, higher return on investments and greater prosperity for all of us.

Federal income tax payments per capita have gone up more than five times since 1950--more than twice the rate of inflation. This means that we taxpayers are giving more and more of our dollars to the federal treasury--dollars that we could otherwise be using for ourselves and our families.

Of course, when I asked Congress to cut taxes, I linked that request to a matching cut in federal spending. Reducing taxes while continuing to increase spending is nothing but a cruel illusion. Money for that added spending must come from somewhere. If it does not come from taxes, then it must come from inflation--the harshest and most unfair tax of all. By standing up to Congress against increased federal spending, I have at least been able to preserve the tax reduction that we put through last year. The opposition party, in contrast, has promised new programs calling for huge increases in federal spending during the next four years.

The total cost of these programs would be about \$200 billion--requiring a fifty percent increase in federal taxes. Just four key programs promised in the Democratic platform, including the Humphrey-Hawkins federal jobs bill, would cost just over \$100 billion.

A tax increase of this kind would not only place an unfair burden on American taxpayers. It would wreck our economy, raking off funds needed for investment, driving up inflation, causing a new and deeper recession. We have seen in Britain the result of excessive taxation, and unwise government spending--inflation, recession, economic stagnation. I am determined to prevent any similar fate from overtaking our own country.

We Americans have always been prepared to pay our fair share of the costs of maintaining a free society. We know that taxes are not going to go away. But we also know that taxes pushed too high become a threat to freedom itself. The time has come to take a stand. Next Tuesday, with your help, we will check the growth in government spending, and pave the way for a new cut in federal taxes.

#

[Nov. 1976?]

Tax Cuts

On October 28 in Pittsburgh, Carter was promising a tax cut but in Cleveland the next morning his "inevitable tax cut" was conditioned by four "ifs". His press secretary explained Carter's "inevitable tax cut was not a proposal in the sense of a campaign promise. It is a statement in the way of a possibility or probability."

By the time he reached New Orleans on October 30, Carter tried to extricate himself by claiming that President Ford was a Johnny-come-lately to tax cuts and was merely proposing tax shifts. He implied the President had never favored a tax cut. Fact: The President proposed tax cuts in his first and second State of the Union messages.

Phoney Polls

Panic stricken by a rash of unfavorable polls crowding in from across the Nation, Carter and Mondale staffers attempted to offset the bad news by issuing phoney polls and phoney documents. When the Field Poll on California broke on October 28, Pat Caddell released his poll showing Carter leading Ford 48.43 percent in that state.

When the Washington Post revealed that Carter's own polls showed him losing in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio and Illinois, Jody Powell released a phoney memorandum that allegedly revealed internal Ford campaign estimates of the states Ford would carry.

Phoney Economics

Carter claimed in Tulsa on October 30 that the Administration estimates "we're going to have an unemployment rate of 10% by 1978. Administration estimates have consistently stated unemployment will be down to 5% or less by 1978.

In Philadelphia on October 29, Carter claimed that Government statistics portend more unemployment and "a further decline in the standard of living." In contrast the AP reported that independent economic authorities -- the National Industrial Conference Board, Argus Research, Bankers Trust, Citibank suggest the economic pause may not have existed because statistics showing final sales have continued to grow throughout the year. These authorities argue that the true nature of the economic recovery has been distorted by sharp inventory accumulations early this year, and by the subsequent flattening out of this activity.

2-2-2

The President was presented with a plaque for the efforts that had been made to bring private industry, government and education together.

The President stood and performed much as he did a few days ago at the theatre in the round at Valley Forge. He obviously had the election on his mind. Referring to the earlier singing, ~~by~~ by a student, of the song "I could have danced all nite," Mr. Ford said, "I was thinking I hope Betty and I can dance all nite tomorrow nite."

While at the school Mr. Ford autographed a guest book and some other unidentified pad. Was signed the following:

~~Gerald R. Ford~~ Gerald R. Ford
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.
Washington, D.C.
November 2, 1976

brower
jones

P.S. Nothing on Air Force One except the White House handouts on Firestone Hangar speech and miles travelled. All stuff that you received on Press Plane.

NOVEMBER 3, 1976

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TEXT OF A TELEGRAM FROM PRESIDENT FORD TO
PRESIDENT-ELECT CARTER

Dear Jimmy:

It is apparent now that you have won our long and intense struggle for the Presidency. I congratulate you on your victory.

As one who has been honored to serve the people of this great land -- both in the Congress and as President -- I believe that we must now put the divisions of the campaign behind us and unite the country once again in the common pursuit of peace and prosperity.

Although there will continue to be disagreements over the best means to use in pursuing our goals, I want to assure you that you will have my complete and whole-hearted support as you take the oath of office this January.

I also pledge to you that I and all members of my Administration will do all that we can to insure that you begin your term as smoothly and effectively as possible.

May God bless you and your family as you undertake your new responsibilities.

- Sincerely,

Jerry Ford

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 5, 1976

MEMO TO: THE PRESIDENT
THROUGH: THE STAFF SECRETARY
FROM: ANNE V. HIGGINS
Subject: Post Election Mail

Mr. President:

Beginning election night, you have received 1,824 messages expressing deepest appreciation for the "fine" job you have done, thanking you for restoring honesty, honor and pride to the country, and wishing the very best of luck and prayers to you and your family.

Attached is a brief sampling of this mail.