RICHARD NIXON PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY
DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
1	Memo	Basic Options in International Monetary Affairs, 3 pp.	n.d.	B
2	Memo	John Ehrlichman to Bob Haldeman, et al. re: White House Staff Contacts with Soviet Bloc Diplomats..., 2 pp.	6/4/1969	B
3	Memo	Winton M. Blount to the President re: two-week visit to South Vietnam, Korea and Japan, 4 pp.	11/18/1969	B

COLLECTION TITLE

WHCF: SMOF: Alexander Butterfield

BOX NUMBER

4

FOLDER TITLE

1969 WH Correspondence To/From Others

PRMPA RESTRICTION CODES:

A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
B. National security classified information.
C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.
E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
G. Withdrawn and returned private and personal material.
H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

DEED OF GIFT RESTRICTION CODES:

DOG Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

MEETING WITH
SECRETARY KENNEDY
AND
ECONOMIC GROUP
10:30 a.m.

June 26, 1969

PRESERVATION COPY

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

RICHARD NIXON PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY
DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

ITEM REMOVED FROM THIS FOLDER

A RESTRICTED DOCUMENT OR CASE FILE HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS FILE FOLDER. FOR A DESCRIPTION OF THE ITEM REMOVED AND THE REASON FOR ITS REMOVAL, CONSULT DOCUMENT ENTRY NUMBER 1 ON THE DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD IN THE FRONT OF THIS FILE FOLDER.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE APRIL 11, 1969

Office of the White House Press Secretary

- -

THE WHITE HOUSE

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM BRYCE N. HARLOW TO THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WILLIAM CLAY, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., ROBERT N. C. NIX, LOUIS STOKES, ADAM C. POWELL, AND JOHN CONYERS, JR.

The President has asked me to reply to your letter of April 2 in which you refer to an "emerging pattern of relaxed enforcement of Civil Rights" under the new Administration. In all candor, I must say that I am aware of no such relaxation -- quite the contrary.

As your letter points out, the President has made quite clear his strong personal commitment to civil rights and equal employment opportunities. In this context, on March 28 he stated: "I want to emphasize my own official and personal endorsement of a strong policy of equal employment opportunity within the Federal Government. I am determined that the Federal Branch of the Government lead the way as an equal opportunity employer."

You should know that President Nixon has already appointed more members of minority groups, citing just one example, to executive level positions than have ever served at any one time in any Administration in our Nation's history. These men and women are not in jobs that are safe or easy; they are among the most critical decision-makers in the government. But they were appointed without fanfare or publicity, and with genuine disregard for the color of their skin: the President appointed them simply because, just as in the case of his other appointees, he felt that they were the best qualified individuals for their jobs.

The matters of Deputy Secretary Packard's contract awards and Secretary Volpe's revised compliance procedures have both received considerable attention in the press. Rather than "signs of retreat," as you state, a close look at both actions reveals that important new ground has been broken in the field of contract compliance.

Secretary Volpe took office to find that compliance procedures in the Department of Transportation were paralyzed by bureaucratic tangles. Department procedures called upon potential contractors to devise "Affirmative Action Plans" on their own, which had to be cleared by state agencies (such as Highway Departments) before they even could be sent to Washington. Many companies with the highest of intentions were uncertain of exactly what was expected of them, of what constituted a satisfactory Action Plan. A number of nationwide companies had submitted Action Plans in each of the 50 states to find their plans accepted in some and rejected in others, and each of the rejections calling for very different revisions.

The Department of Transportation's compliance procedures were clearly slowing down business without achieving the intended results. Energy was being wasted putting things down on paper that should have been spent insuring that equal opportunity was in fact being practiced in companies with government contracts. The Secretary did a very simple thing -- he said that the Department of Transportation would itself draw up Action Plans for contractors, and the companies simply would have to accept them to proceed with government work.

MORE

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Thus, uncertainty on the part of the companies was eliminated, as were the problems created by varying state standards. In the process, the scope of the Department's compliance guidelines was extended to all contractors (instead of only those with contracts over $500,000) and to all subcontractors with contracts over $10,000. This constitutes an expansion from 30% of all contractors to almost 100%.

The advice and approval of the Office of Contract Compliance was solicited at all times during these compliance revisions. The comment that certain civil rights advocates were not consulted would seem to be an extremely weak objection. Those who have subsequently examined the revised and strengthened procedures have been unanimous in their endorsement. Indeed, the White House has received a personal letter from one of the most prominent civil rights leaders in the country in praise of Secretary Volpe's action.

Turning now to the matter of Deputy Secretary Packard's actions in awarding contracts to three Southern textile companies, the three companies in question have been receiving numerous contracts from the Department of Defense for many years. In the year preceding Mr. Packard's appointment, the Department has been engaged, without success, in ongoing negotiations with each of these companies to obtain Action Plans that meet government guidelines. During this time, all three companies were receiving contracts on an ongoing basis. Upon taking office, Mr. Packard recognized that these negotiations were getting nowhere, and decided that his personal intervention was necessary. Some people may consider this award of the contracts in question to have been an act of faith in the presidents of each of these companies, but it was "an act of faith" that has been promptly repaid. On March 27 a rigorous Affirmative Action Program was submitted by Burlington Industries, Inc., meeting government compliance guidelines in every detail. On April 4, a similar Action Program was submitted by Dan River Mills, Inc., and approved by the Defense Department. Negotiations are continuing with J. P. Stephens & Company which promise to bear fruit in a matter of weeks.

Continuing negotiations under former conditions clearly would not have resulted in such early agreement, and punitive action would, of course, have foreclosed all possibilities of progress. So, far from "retreating" from the goal of equal employment, it seems to me that Mr. Packard has been responsible for a courageous bit of diplomacy, one which has resulted in breakthroughs in this delicate field few would have thought possible.

I do not mean to overstate the Administration's success in furthering the cause of equal employment in its first three months, I merely wish to point out that, in my opinion, this Administration is committed to equality of opportunity in all facets of American life, without exception or qualification. But we have all learned, in these past troubled years, that genuine progress does not come merely from passing legislation or signing agreements. It takes constant, daily efforts on all of our parts, most especially those of us in government. It is on results thus achieved that this Administration wishes to be judged. We ask only that we be judged fairly.

/S/ BRYCE N. HARLOW
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

MORE

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

TEXT OF A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WILLIAM CLAY, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., ROBERT N. C. NIX, LOUIS STOKES, ADAM C. POWELL, AND JOHN CONYERS, JR.

As Representatives of some of the most oppressed and disadvantaged citizens in our country, we view with grave concern the current political attacks on the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in its efforts to seek compliance with the duly constituted law enacted by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Members of this Commission have served our country loyally and with distinction. They ably represent the diversity of interests and ethnic groups of which we as a nation are composed. Permitting them to be harassed by those who seek to avoid complying with the Civil Rights Act defames in our opinion the sanctity of the democratic processes and encourages street action and violence as means of correcting injustice.

Mr. President, we support your "own official and personal endorsement of a strong policy of equal opportunity within the Federal Government" and we will back you in any specific implementation of such a policy. But we are equally concerned with the Government's role in assuring equal employment opportunities outside the government in accordance with law and especially with those who do business with the government. And so far the performance has not matched the promise of equality.

Particularly we wish to cite recent variations from equality of opportunity. Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard varied from good practice in awarding government contracts to southern textile mills practicing racial discrimination.

Also, we take issue with Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe in not requiring proof of nondiscrimination before awarding highway contracts.

Viewed, therefore, in this emerging pattern of relaxed enforcement of Civil Rights, the current political attacks on members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission can only be construed as a new national policy being developed in opposition to the social gains of this decade.

We sincerely hope we are misreading signs of retreat. Dependence on voluntary compliance with fundamental laws has been proved ineffective and inadequate in less critical periods when domestic and international problems were much simpler. Certainly this concept is out of step with the changing times in which we now live.

Today millions of our citizens must either obtain better job opportunities now or forever suffer unemployment, poverty and unwholesome environments. Among these are our constituents whose resources -- and patience -- are being rapidly exhausted. Racial discrimination remains the major cause of job inequality. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is the major agency to deal with this problem. We, therefore, urge you to support and strengthen the law and the Commission as part of a sound and responsible approach to achieving national objectives.

/S/ AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM
WILLIAM CLAY
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
ROBERT N. C. NIX
LOUIS STOKES
ADAM C. POWELL
JOHN CONYERS, JR.

# # #

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 14, 1969
Time: 4:10 p.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

FOR: cc (for information):

J. EHRLICHMAN

FROM THE STAFF SECRETARY

SUBJECT (see attached): Announcement of President's decision to allocate his raise to White House Expense fund.

ACTION AND REMARKS:

____ For Necessary Action	____ Draft Reply
____ Prepare Agenda and Brief	____ Draft Remarks
____ For Your Comments	____ For Your Information
X For Your Recommendations	

Other:

DUE: Date: February 18, 1969 Time: 2:00 p.m.

Please attach this copy to material submitted.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately.

K. R. COLE, JR.
For the President

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

STATEMENT RE USE OF SALARY INCREASE

The generous act of Congress increasing the annual salary of the President from $100,000 to $200,000 is very much appreciated. At the present time I find, however, that because the funds provided for expenses to carry out the official duties of the Presidency are completely inadequate, the need is much greater for that purpose than for personal income. Accordingly, I have instructed that the entire $100,000 increase in salary is to be turned over to the White House disbursing officer as it is received to be used for defraying official expenses.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
WASHINGTON

April 16, 1969

PAUL W. McCRACKEN, CHAIRMAN
HENDRIK S. HOUTHAKKER
HERBERT STEIN

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Economics of the Investment Credit

1. Elimination of the investment credit would assist the Government in serving national objectives that are of higher priority than the stimulation of business investment.

2. Elimination of the investment credit effective now, coupled with tax reliefs or expenditures primarily benefiting low-income people, with an offsetting budgetary impact, but taking effect on January 1, 1970 would be slightly but probably not significantly disinflationary.

* * * *

The basic case for eliminating the investment credit is that the stimulation of business fixed investment by positive tax measures, going beyond achievement of neutrality, does not have high priority among uses of the Nation's economic resources or among uses of the Federal Budget.

Uses of the Nation's economic resources which, over the next several years, will probably deserve more support or stimulation are:

1. Construction of homes

2. Provision of State and local facilities and services

3. Private investment in human resources

4. Increased expenditure of their own incomes by households generally, and by poor households in particular, through tax reduction.

5. Improvement of the welfare system.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Business investment, housing and State and local investment are the main competitors for the supply of capital available for non-Federal use. It makes no sense to subsidize business investment and then have to subsidize housing and State and local investment to make sure they conform to "national objectives."

The whole problem becomes clear when viewed through the Federal budget. We now have commitments to:

1. Keeping the budget at least in balance, except in recession
2. Eliminating the surcharge
3. Giving tax relief to the poor
4. Relaxing the spending restraints on the Departments for the fiscal year 1971
5. Providing some revenue sharing for States and localities.

This is going to be an exceedingly difficult package to deliver for fiscal 1971 even if the Vietnam War ends soon, and it will be a difficult package to deliver even after fiscal 1971 unless tight control is maintained on the Department of Defense. Elimination of the investment credit would save about $2.8 billion of revenue annually and help make fulfillment of these commitments possible.

If this longer-run case is accepted, the question of the short-run economic effect of eliminating the credit remains. It is assumed that the elimination of the credit would be effective for investment commitments made after the announcement date -- say April 22, 1969. It is also assumed that there would be a tax reduction on low-income taxpayers cutting the revenues by a rate equal to the rate of revenue gain from eliminating the credit but not effective until January 1, 1970.

Would the net effect of this "balanced" package be inflationary or deflationary, when and by how much?

We assume first that monetary policy, as measured by the rate of growth of the money supply, is not changed in response to the tax changes.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

On this assumption the initial effect would be deflationary throughout. During the remainder of 1969 the only effect is the negative effect on business investment of the repeal of the investment credit. This effect would be small at first because of the large amount of work already in process. However, the effect would rise. Early in 1969 there would be an offsetting effect in the form of increased consumption resulting from the cut in the lower-bracket income taxes. This effect would also start small and build up. The net initial effect would always be negative, however, partly because the elimination of the investment credit is assumed to come over eight months before the tax cut and partly because the elimination of the investment credit has a bigger initial effect on spending per dollar, than the tax cut.

The initial effect would be multiplied as a result of the reduction in incomes it causes, which in turn would reduce spending. However, there would probably be some offset as a result of the increased supply of funds for investment. During the second half of calendar 1969 there would be an increase in the government surplus relative to the needs of business for external funds. In 1970 the increase of the surplus would disappear, but business investment would be declining relative to after-tax income and individual after-tax income would be rising relative to consumption. This increased supply of available funds should induce some rise in housing and in State and local investment.

Even without any allowance for the effect of the availability of funds, the final impacts on GNP, prices and unemployment would be small. Estimates of these effects are shown below in comparison with the most recent Troika projections.

	1969		1970	
	III	IV	I	II
GNP, annual rate ($ billion)				
Without tax package	936.2	948.5	961.1	974.1
With tax package	936.2	948.0	961.0	973.6
Effect	0	-.5	-.1	-.5
Unemployment, %				
Without tax package	3.5+	3.7+	3.9	4.0+
With tax package	3.5+	3.7+	3.9+	4.1
Effect	0	0	0+	.1-
% Change in prices, annual rate				
Without tax package	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.3
With tax package	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.2
Effect	0	0	0	-.1

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The effect would still be rising, and there would be a reduction of $3 billion from the annual rate of GNP in the fourth quarter of 1970. However, even this would add less than .2 of a percentage point to the unemployment rate in that quarter. Moreover, by that time major fiscal decisions will have been made, including removal of the surcharge, which would swamp the effect of the package discussed here.

All of the foregoing assumes no change of monetary policy in response to the tax change. Probably only a slight easing of monetary policy would be required to offset the effect of the tax package on GNP entirely.

Projections of the GNP which rely almost exclusively on the effect of the money supply would show somewhat slower rates of growth than the Troika projections summarized above (on the same assumption about the behavior of money). However, on this view of the world the effect of taxes on GNP is negligible anyway.

Herbert Stein

Herbert Stein

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

April 21, 1969

Dear Mrs. Keyer:

I have read your letter with both sadness and admiration: sadness that the mother of a slain American soldier was subjected to the further distress of being made the unwilling recipient of such a letter as the one you received from the "American Deserters Committee," and admiration for the spirit you showed in responding as you did.

Next to the men whose own lives have been lost, the heaviest burdens of the war are borne by the persons, like yourself, who loved those who have been lost. Other Americans, whatever their feelings about the war, should at least respect the privacy of grief.

We live in an age of great uncertainties, of a clash of faiths and ideologies, and of great impatience. In their zeal for one cause or another, people often become impatient not only of time, but also of such ordinary decencies as respect for the other person's rights, willingness to listen to his point of view, and consideration for his feelings.

I can understand the feelings of those who cry out against war, and demand its end now; I can also understand your feelings in writing that you pray your son's life was not lost in vain. It was not. Your own letter is evidence that the things he died to defend are still alive and vital: the love of country, the great humane traditions, the thoughtfulness of others that is the true cement of civilization.

One of the greatest tragedies of mankind is that so often, through the centuries, the best of our young have been called on to die in the defense of those values. But as we look back over history, we see that it was their sacrifice that kept those values alive.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

You write: "If we cannot believe in our Country and in a merciful God, then I ask -- what shall we believe in?" I think you have provided the answer yourself. If we begin with belief in a merciful God; if we proceed to belief in our Country -- not merely because it is ours, but because its ideals are precisely those that mankind has strived through the centuries to achieve -- and if we round this out with belief in the essential goodness and dignity of man himself, then I think we have the elements of a faith which can withstand the assaults even of those who would intrude on a mother's grief.

You can be proud of your son. And I am sure that he would be proud of you.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON

Mrs. Richard F. Keyer, Sr.
399 Ackerman Place
Xenia, Ohio 45385

RN:JK:RP:pcs

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

FRANK X. KELLY

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
NATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION
THE AMERICAN LEGION

EX. 3-4811 AND EX. 3-4814
1608 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Bill Doyle
Frank Kelly

(1) ABM

(2) ROTC — support on campus
will allow for stand asides

(3) NVN — appropriate response
~~Korea~~

(4) set Colleges admin + elec pub officials

Boys State & Boys Nation

Top echelon of VA

Mil-industrial complex

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

in intend of peace

or a mil vic

in VN for

~~the~~ USG

to make any

appropriate

response

to communist

attacks.

eproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museu

that institution of
higher learning
upgrade all ROTC
programs &
encourage
participation in
them by giving
approp acad credit
& by declaring that each
participant may select
and set as a [illegible] commitment

eproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museu

Commend & pledge
support to Pres in
decision to deploy
modified ABM
– vital to security
of US
& in interest of
world peace

eproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museu

INFORMATION COPY From FX Kelly

THE AMERICAN LEGION

1608 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

Memorandum to: William F. Hauck, National Adjutant DATE April 28, 1969

From: Frank X. Kelly, Assistant P. R. Director

Subject: Conversation with the President

At the National Commander's request, I am dictating a few notes regarding his conversation with the President; 3:05 to 3:35 p.m., Monday, April 28, at the White House.

One of the points the President emphasized was the importance of getting a message to the youth of America that this so-called military-industrial-complex is not the calloused, blood thirsty creature conceived by the SDS and hard core revolutionaires.

He would like someone to speak to our Boys' State and Boys' Nation groups, who can tell these youngsters our military men are pretty good people and we should be thanking God for them. He would like this thought carried to all communities; to service clubs and schools, wherever possible.

The President expressed concern that slightly more than 20 percent of the Vietnam-era veterans have enrolled to date in educational and training programs under the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Of 2.9 million eligible veterans, only some 612,000 had enrolled as of the end of March 1969. This is only half the proportion of Korean and post-Korean veterans who took advantage of the education and training features of the G.I. Bill (40 percent) and a still lower proportion of those of the World War II period (50 percent.)

Commander Doyle reaffirmed The American Legion's support for the President's stand on ABM and said that he has spoken in his behalf on the North Korean incident.

The President said he looked forward to seeing the Boys' Nation delegates when they visit the White House July 23, and hoped to see them in the Rose Garden.

The National Commander underscored our desire to have the President as speaker at our National Convention in Atlanta, August 26, and pointed out that the President more or less committed himself at the Washington Conference, to this extent. They joked about this and the President said that if he was not out of the country, he looked forward to being at our Convention.

Commander Doyle expressed some concern over proposed V.A. budget cuts, but said he would have more specific critique, when he had all the facts.

He said The American Legion had kept out of the squabble over the appointment of a new VA Administrator, since it is the President's perogative to make this appointment. He predicted some criticism over the manner in which other top VA career men were being let out, since these men should be counted on to help a new Administrator.

The President said that he too was most anxious to keep the VA out of politics.

Special Assistant to the President Alexander Butterfield also sat in on the meetings and was most helpful.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

NEWS RELEASE

THE AMERICAN LEGION

HEADQUARTERS

1608 K St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
(202) 393-4811

700 N. Pennsylvania St.
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204
(317) 635-8411

National
Public Relations
Division

C. D. DeLOACH
Chairman

JAMES C. WATKINS
Director
Washington

ROD ANDERSON
Asst. Director
Indianapolis

For Immediate Use
April 28, 1969

Philadelphia, Pa.---"The American Legion believes the deployment of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM), is essential to the national security of the United States, we support the President's proposal for such an installation, and we urge all concerned Americans to let their Congressmen know of their support for it," Legion National Commander William C. Doyle, of Vineland, N.J., said here tonight.

Doyle said the Legion's concern and support for an American ABM system is one of long standing, and that a resolution passed by the Legion's National Executive Committee in Washington on March 15 of this year, merely reiterated basic Legion position and gave "timely support," to the President's favorable view toward such an installation.

"The American Legion believes our survival as a free nation is only as secure as our strength to defend ourselves against any attack, conventional or nuclear. We believe our defenses must be sufficiently strong to deter any nation or combination of nations from launching an attack upon us. We believe that an ABM system is an essential part of such a defense.

"We call upon our government to do all things necessary to make the defenses of this country impregnable and our offensive potential so awesome that no nation dare attack us.

"Our National Convention last September, noting reports that the Soviet Union was increasing its numbers of Inter-continental Ballistic Missiles in hardened sites and reportedly preparing to deploy their own ABM system, adopted a second security resolution calling for the maintenance of strategic superiority over any potential

(MORE)

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

enemy, and that this superiority be given priority over any other national goals.

"The American Legion, of course, is fully aware of and concerned about many other national problems and national goals and aspirations pertaining to those problems. We believe there is a great need, a pressing need for attention to the problems that beset us from within. However, if we fail to maintain our freedoms, if we fail to maintain the capability to defend ourselves in the event of an attack upon this country, if we should fall to an aggressor, the solution to our internal problems won't mean much to us because they will be made by someone else.

"The future of America can best be determined by Americans, and it is our concern that such determinations always will be made by Americans," the Legion leader said.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.
MAY 8 1969

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

CHAMBERS OF
WARREN E. BURGER

Dear Mr Erlichman

Here is a letter which I wish you would hand to the President. I am willing to risk annoying him for what I consider is important to the Country - and to him.

Cordially,

WEB

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.
MAY 8 1969

WARREN E. BURGER
3111 NORTH ROCHESTER STREET
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

May 8, 1969

Dear Mr. President:

I had thought to write you Tuesday on what seemed to me an unwise course followed by some in contrast with the carefully correct course you followed in the Fortas matter. I wish now I had expressed my views promptly, for as a member of the Judiciary, I conclude I have a right to do so on a matter so significantly involving the courts. The developments since Monday - and particularly the utterances from members of the Congress - are, in my view, very damaging to the country, the courts generally and potentially to you.

This week is a time for Republican leaders to "view with dismay" and to "be saddened" and "disturbed" but largely silent. They should not "attack." First there is the matter of basic fairness. Second there are political consequences which will have an impact on the courts and the Supreme Court in particular and especially on the first nomination you send to the Senate.

As to basic fairness: if the facts condemn the conduct of a Supreme Court Justice then let the facts do it in their own good time. If the facts do not warrant condemnation then oratory ought not destroy what the facts cannot. Oratory such as most of that emitted on the Hill tends to obscure the facts and their significance.

As to political consequences: first the public, which is so often more correct than its leaders, may well resent "prejudgment"; second the 1968 Senate supporters of Fortas for Chief Justice have really nothing to say now but they should be left in the center of the stage and not pushed aside by others. At the present rate of oratory they are forgotten but they are bound to be bitter over the harsh attacks - including

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

WARREN E. BURGER
3111 North Rochester Street
Arlington, Virginia

the curiously and surprisingly hasty condemnation by the Washington POST. As a consequence when your first nomination goes to the Senate, this suppressed rage will likely assert itself and your nominee may become their "whipping boy." That in turn will exacerbate the distressing situation in which the Court now finds itself; it will be very damaging to the country and it may be bad for your objective of restoring the Court to its former high standing.

I hope that someone will point out, gently but firmly, that the American system gives every man the benefit of the presumption of innocence in the face of any charge and that everyone should suspend judgment. Time, then, - and the facts - will carry this crisis of the Court to its inevitable conclusion.

Cordially,

Warren E. Burger

The President
The White House

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington 25, D. C.

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

May 14, 1969

Dear Mr President:

Mr Justice Fortas has just come into my office and I have told him that you do not propose to release his communication until tomorrow. He has asked me if he may be advised shortly before the release in order that

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

he might inform President Johnson before he hears it on the radio.

I would appreciate it if this could be done.

Sincerely

Earl Warren

The President
The White House
Washington D.C.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE ABE FORTAS

May 14, 1969

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

For the reasons expressed in a letter of this date which I have written to the Chief Justice, a copy of which, with his permission, I enclose, I wish hereby to tender my resignation as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, which, with your approval, will be effective as of this date.

I have appreciated the opportunity to serve the country and the Court during these past years as an Associate Justice.

Very truly yours,

A. Fortas

Enclosure

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

May 14, 1969

The Honorable Earl Warren
Chief Justice
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

My dear Chief Justice:

I am filing with you this memorandum with respect to my association with the Wolfson Family Foundation, and a statement of the reasons which in my judgment indicate that I should resign in order that the Court may not continue to be subjected to extraneous stress which may adversely affect the performance of its important functions.

As you know, I have delayed issuing a detailed report or announcing my decision until it could first be communicated to the members of the Court. In my judgment, this was the only proper course open to me as an Associate Justice of this Court, because of the Court's position as a separate and independent branch of the government under the Constitution. Because of the Court's recess, this report was not possible until yesterday.

In the spring or summer of 1965, before I was nominated as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, my law firm represented New York Shipbuilding Corporation, a company controlled by Mr. Louis E. Wolfson, with respect to various civil claims. Later in the summer of 1966, and also before my nomination, my firm was retained in connection with some securities problems of Merritt-Chapman and Scott Corporation, of which Mr. Wolfson was Chairman of the Board.

I became acquainted with Mr. Wolfson and he told me about the Wolfson Family Foundation and his hopes and

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

plans for it. He knew that its program - the improvement of community relations and the promotion of racial and religious cooperation - concerned matters to which I had devoted much time and attention.

Mr. Wolfson stated that he intended to increase the Foundation's resources, and he hoped that the Foundation might expand its work so as to make unique and basic contributions in its field. As we proceeded in our discussions, Mr. Wolfson suggested that he would like me to participate in and help shape the Foundation's program and activities. I told him I was interested in these objectives and that I hoped we would continue our discussions.

I became a member of the Court in October 1965. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Wolfson was in Washington and again conferred with me about the Foundation's work and my possible association with it. I again indicated my interest in the Foundation's program and in expanding its scope, and we discussed the possibility of my participating in the project on a long-term basis. Because of the nature of the work, there was no conflict between it and my judicial duties. It was then my opinion that the work of the Court would leave me adequate time for the Foundation assignments.

The Board of the Foundation met in December 1965, and approved, by resolution, an agreement under which I was to perform services for the Foundation. It was understood between us that the program in question was a long-range one and that my association would be meaningful only if it were on a long-term basis. The agreement, therefore, contemplated that I would perform continuing services, and, instead of fixing variable compensation from time to time for work done, it provided that I would receive Twenty Thousand Dollars per year for my life with arrangements for payments to Mrs. Fortas in the event of my death.

In January 1966, I received a check for Twenty Thousand Dollars under the agreement, and began my association with the Foundation. In June of that year I attended

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and participated in a meeting of the Trustees of the Foundation at Jacksonville, Florida. It is my recollection that Mr. Wolfson did not attend the meeting. I went from Jacksonville to his farm at Ocala where I had an overnight visit, as I recall, with him and his family.

Later, in June 1966, I reached the decision that the continuing role in the Foundation's work which our agreement contemplated should be terminated. There were two reasons for this decision: My work for the Court was much heavier than I had anticipated and my idea of the amount of time I would have free for non-judicial work had been a substantial over-estimate. I had also learned shortly before informing the Foundation of my decision to terminate the arrangement, that the SEC had referred Mr. Wolfson's file to the Department of Justice for consideration as to criminal prosecution.

I therefore wrote a letter to the Foundation, addressed to its General Counsel, dated June 21, 1966, cancelling the agreement we had entered into, subject to completing the projects for the year. I recited as my reason only the burden of Court work.

In September and October of 1966, Mr. Louis E. Wolfson was indicted on separate charges stemming from stock transactions, and in December 1966, I returned to the Foundation, in its entirety, the sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars previously paid to me. I concluded that, because of the developments which had taken place, the services which I had performed should be treated as a contribution to the Foundation.

Since becoming a member of the Court, I have not, at any time, directly or indirectly, received any compensation from Mr. Wolfson or members of his family or any of his associates for advice, assistance or any reason whatever, except the Foundation fee which was returned.

Since I became a member of the Court, Mr. Wolfson on occasion would send me material relating to his problems, just as I think he did to many other people, and

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

on several occasions he mentioned them to me, but I have not interceded or taken part in any legal, administrative or judicial matter affecting Mr. Wolfson or anyone associated with him.

It is my opinion, however, that the public controversy relating to my association with the Foundation is likely to continue and adversely affect the work and position of the Court, absent my resignation. In these circumstances, it seems clear to me that it is not my duty to remain on the Court, but rather to resign in the hope that this will enable the Court to proceed with its vital work free from extraneous stress.

There has been no wrongdoing on my part. There has been no default in the performance of my judicial duties in accordance with the high standards of the office I hold. So far as I am concerned, the welfare and maximum effectiveness of the Court to perform its critical role in our system of government are factors that are paramount to all others. It is this consideration that prompts my resignation which, I hope, by terminating the public controversy, will permit the Court to proceed with its work without the harassment of debate concerning one of its members.

I have written a letter asking President Nixon to accept my resignation, effective as of this date.

I leave the Court with the greatest respect and affection for you and my colleagues, and my thanks to all of you and to the staff of the Court for your unfailing helpfulness and friendship. I hope that as I return to private life, I shall find opportunities to continue to serve the Nation and the cause of justice which this Court so ably represents.

Sincerely,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

OFFICE OF
THE DIRECTOR

MAY 14 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: The budget process: agenda for fiscal year 1971

Serious work is already underway on the fiscal year 1971 budget--the first one that will be yours from start to finish. This memorandum summarizes my plans for preparing the budget. Three aspects of the process are stressed:

-- the schedule to be followed to meet the statutory date for submission of the budget to the Congress,

-- the points at which we will need decisions from you, and

-- the controllability problem.

A separate memo is also being sent to you on my ideas for beefing up our review of the defense budget.

A. Spring planning review.

The Budget Bureau's so-called spring planning review (or spring preview) is scheduled to begin late in May and be concluded in July. The preview will permit us to identify and examine systematically prospective major program issues, possible alternatives, and their probable budget impact. Details are purposely minimized in order to concentrate on issues that would be significant to you and to me.

The spring preview consists of:

-- a review of the general economic outlook in terms of broad aggregates to help develop fiscal policy guidelines;

-- an examination of major Federal programs (or agencies), along with their benefits, effectiveness, and costs;

-- an evaluation of the likely long-range (five year) impact of pending issues; and

-- the development of planning guidelines (with target planning figures) that could, with your approval, be provided to guide

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

the agencies in the preparation of the 1971 budget requests they will submit later in the year.

On the basis of expressions of policy that you will be making from time to time in other contexts, I expect to be able to handle most of the issues considered during the preview. But I am sure I will need to discuss several critical ones with you. Moreover, your tentative concurrence will be needed sometime this summer on the budget estimates developed for 1971 planning purposes, both in total and for each major agency.

After your review and approval, I will send the 1971 target figures, and any relevant specific policy guidelines, to the agencies, so that they can prepare their budget submissions consistent with your general policy objectives.

B. Fall review of the budget. The heavy work associated with putting the budget together begins when the agency budget requests start coming in late in September. Agency budget requests (and justifications) are bulky packages of text and tables. In October and November, after studying the requests, Bureau staff hold hearings with agency representatives to obtain a better understanding of the agency's policies, programs and problems. Following the hearings, agency budget requests are "marked up" to reflect the recommendations of Budget Bureau staff to me.

I have been informed by Budget Bureau staff that in several recent years, the budget requests of a few large agencies have been seriously delayed, and as a result the Bureau has not had the time or opportunity to do as thorough a review and examination as it believed necessary. Further, some requests have come to the Bureau without first being screened by the agency head or one of his politically responsible top officials. If situations like these develop this year, I may need your help in getting your department and agency heads to see that their budget homework is done promptly.

In any event, beginning in November and continuing into mid-December I expect to meet daily with Budget Bureau staff to review in depth each agency's request and the Bureau staff's findings. Shortly after these meetings I will let the agency heads know what I expect to recommend to you. Then my phones will start to ring.

I will, of course, listen to agency heads and try to persuade them to agree to recommendations consistent with your overall budget policy guidelines. In some cases--few in number if your guidelines are to be observed--they will convince me to modify my decisions. In a few cases, I suspect, I will not be able to satisfy the agency head's wishes without

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

endangering efficiency, effectiveness, or credibility criteria or without exceeding the budget total you are aiming for. This is when your phones may start to ring.

However, they need not, because I plan to present to you--in a series of meetings--the major elements of the budget request, and my recommendations, for each agency. In that presentation I will highlight all issues important enough for your personal attention, including any unsettled differences in view between your agency heads and me.

Preparing a budget and getting it to the printer is a massive production process. If we are going to make the statutory transmittal date--not later than 15 days following the opening of the regular session of the Congress--I will need to begin getting your budget decisions in early December. I should have all of your decisions by the end of December. Even then, the Budget Bureau staff and agency budget offices will have to work unreasonably long hours--during the Holiday season--preparing a mass of detailed accounting schedules in order for the budget to be transmitted on the due date.

C. The controllability problem.

As you know, even though the fiscal 1971 budget will be your budget, it will be largely determined by past events and laws that have already been enacted. The magnitudes that are, in this sense, uncontrollable in any one year, are substantial. We now estimate that total 1970 outlays will be $192.9 billion. Of this

-- over 50% is for civilian programs that are open-ended (for example, social insurance programs, interest on the public debt, public assistance, veterans benefits and services, and farm price supports) and are therefore almost completely uncontrollable;

-- over 40% is for national defense, an important part of which is relatively uncontrollable, and about one-third of which supports our Vietnam operations; and

-- just under 10% is for civilian programs that are relatively controllable, under existing law, in the year ahead.

By definition, our new initiatives for 1971 would be in the--as of now--relatively controllable program area. We cut these programs over 7% from the Johnson budget and left little fat. Many of the relatively uncontrollable civilian programs grow as our population and economy grow. Achieving significantly greater control over these programs will require congressional action. During the course of putting the 1971 budget together I expect to suggest legislation to curb some of

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

these "uncontrollable" programs. You are already keenly aware that getting the bills through the Congress is a tall order even for Bryce Harlow. Finding elbow room in civilian programs will not be easy.

I have not classified national defense as either controllable or uncontrollable; it has elements of both. Our experience in the recent review of the 1970 budget suggests that potential savings in the non-Vietnam portion of the defense budget could pose the toughest issues we will face this coming fall and winter.

To summarize our calendar on the 1971 budget:

1969:	May 1:	Director's initial "guess" on likely shape of budget.
	May-July:	Spring preview; major issues and guidelines.
	Sept.-Nov.:	Agency requests received and Budget Bureau hearings.
	Nov.-Dec.:	Director's review with agencies.
	Dec.:	President's review with Director.
	Dec.-Jan.:	Final printing.
1970:	Jan. 18-21 (?):	President's Budget Message to the Congress.

Our calendar on the 1970 budget is approximately as follows:

1969:	April 15:	Re-review of January budget.
	August 15(?):	Summary (midyear) review.
1970:	Jan. 18-21(?):	Updated estimates tying to 1971 budget.

Robert P. Mayo
Director

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

May 15, 1969

The Honorable Earl Warren
Chief Justice
Supreme Court, United States
Washington, D.C. 20543

Dear Chief Justice Warren:

Permit me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 14 and the documents referred to therein as transmitted therewith.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your consideration of my problems.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

John N. Mitchell

JNM:skm

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

May 21, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Priority Management Improvement Projects Led by the Office of Executive Management

The Office of Executive Management (OEM) is designed as the principal instrument through which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget carries out his statutory management responsibility under the Budget and Accounting Act. The purpose of our Thursday meeting is to review several critical management problems in the Executive Branch and the plans of BOB, through OEM, to deal with them.

A. Red Tape in Grant Programs. Administration of Federal assistance to State and local grantees is tortuous and slow. It is expensive for all three levels of government, has often bypassed mayors and governors, and has splintered local government. Action projects planned by OEM include:

- Simplification of the cumbersome planning, financial and other technical and administrative requirements placed upon grant recipients.
- Maximum unification of administrative procedures for State and local projects financed from a number of Federal sources.
- Reducing time it now takes for Federal processing of grant applications.
- Consolidation into broader purpose grants of some of the hundreds of present narrow categorical grant programs.
- Special effort to improve administration of the complex Model Cities Program.

B. Centralization in Washington. The heavy concentration of Federal operations in Washington has removed domestic programs too far from the people and the problems they are designed to meet, has slowed the Federal machinery, and has contributed to the administrative quagmire dealt with above. Action projects include:

- Implementing your directive establishing common regional boundaries for HEW, HUD, Labor, OEO, and SBA.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

- Decentralization program in nine departments and agencies to place operations in the field.

- Placing greater reliance on State and local governments in the detailed administration of Federal assistance programs.

- Establishment of councils of regional directors of key agencies to resolve operational problems in the field.

C. Poor Departmental Management. Most departments and agencies are poorly equipped to manage effectively. Actions include:

- Advising interested department heads how to equip themselves to control and direct their departments.

- If resources permit, more detailed reviews conducted jointly with selected departments to assess the quality of departmental administration and recommendations for improvement.

- Provide leadership for departmental development of modern management systems, such as fiscal management, and several phases of contract administration. Especially important are fiscal controls to lessen opportunity for misuse of funds.

- Revise cost reduction program to reduce emphasis on reporting and instill greater cost consciousness.

D. Ineffective Organization. The Ash Council will examine major organizational problems. We will provide support to them and work on more limited problems including:

- More effective organization of food distribution programs.

- Reorganization plans strengthening the Secretary of HEW and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

- Assisting Rumsfeld in urgent review of OEO organization.

In proceeding with these projects, we are working closely with the Urban Affairs Council and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations. Because of limited staff (one-third of the level 20 years ago), we are not very active as yet in the defense and international areas.

Dwight Ink

Dwight A. Ink
Director, Office of
Executive Management

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

RICHARD NIXON PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY
DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

ITEM REMOVED FROM THIS FOLDER

A RESTRICTED DOCUMENT OR CASE FILE HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS FILE FOLDER. FOR A DESCRIPTION OF THE ITEM REMOVED AND THE REASON FOR ITS REMOVAL, CONSULT DOCUMENT ENTRY NUMBER 2 ON THE DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD IN THE FRONT OF THIS FILE FOLDER.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

MEMORANDUM

CONFIDENTIAL

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 4, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB HALDEMAN
BRYCE HARLOW
DR. BURNS
JIM KEOGH
BUD WILKINSON
RON ZIEGLER
JOHN WHITAKER

FROM JOHN EHRLICHMAN

SUBJECT WHITE HOUSE STAFF CONTACTS WITH SOVIET BLOC DIPLOMATS AND OTHER OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES

Experience has confirmed the expectation that Soviet Bloc personnel would persist in seeking appointments and "exchanges of views" with members of the White House staff. As additional guidance, you should generally discreetly decline contacts suggested by Soviet Bloc personnel unless you are reasonably convinced that some national advantage or other benefit would result from the meeting. The procedure for notifying personnel with a need-to-know in the White House is as follows:

1. A written notification well in advance of each occasion where you would meet Soviet Bloc Personnel should be sent to both Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, National Security Council, and to Mr. Russell Ash, Security Officer, National Security Council.

2. Such notification should indicate the date, time, and place of the meeting. Please provide the name, and if you know it, the position of the person you are to talk to.

3. If you decline such an invitation, notification should also be sent to Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Ash in order that the frequency and nature of these approaches may be noted.

4. Following your conversation with a Soviet Bloc representative, a memorandum reflecting the substance of what was discussed should be sent to both Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Ash.

It would be appreciated if you would convey the procedures noted in this memorandum to your respective staffs.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE WHITE HOUSE

CONFIDENTIAL WASHINGTON

September 21, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR THE WHITE HOUSE STAFF

SUBJECT: Contacts with Diplomatic and Official Representatives of the USSR and Soviet Bloc Governments.

The President has asked that White House officials and members of their staffs refrain from making contacts, social or otherwise, with diplomatic and official representatives of the USSR. Adherence to this instruction will facilitate the furtherance of such contacts through prescribed diplomatic and protocol channels.

Guidance and notification procedures with respect to contacts and appointments sought by diplomatic and official representatives of Soviet bloc governments, generally, remain as stated in the attached memorandum issued by Mr. Ehrlichman on June 4, 1969.

Henry A. Kissinger

Attachment.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 16, 1969

Re: Personnel Cuts

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: THE PRESIDENT

I am not satisfied with the progress that has been made with regard to the cuts in personnel. Before the Inauguration I ordered a one-third cut in USIA, AID, military personnel except in combat zones like Vietnam and Korea and Western Europe. Nothing whatever has been done to carry this out except paper work. I want you to put a man on it, perhaps Butterfield, and to give me a report in a week as to what has happened. I do not consider anything more important that I will be doing from an administrative standpoint than this. I know that everybody on the staff disagrees with my approach here but this is something I feel very strongly about and I want action on it immediately. I shall expect a report on my desk by Monday of next week. As a matter of fact, I don't want a report, I simply want to know what has been done to carry out my directives that a one-third cut is to be made in personnel in these areas in every mission abroad. I think the only way to do it is for a directive signed by me to each of the agencies ordering such a cut. You are going to get strong resistance from Shakespeare, Hannah, Rogers and also from Defense on this. But I know what I am talking about and even if I didn't I have such strong feelings about it I have made the decision and I want it carried out immediately.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 27, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: THE PRESIDENT

I think it is time that we stop for awhile the massive presentation of mementos to people who visit us in the Cabinet Room or the Oval Office.

We have given so many of these out that they have been somewhat common and consequently perhaps not too much appreciated. My feeling is that as we start the new year that we simply knock it off for a few months or even longer. When special people come in or when somebody requests something, we will provide a gift, but I will not go through the routine of always presenting mementos to people when they come in. Just the fact that they are able to come into the office should be enough during this period.

On another matter, it is very important that you keep my schedule as free as possible between now and January 20. I think we have already covered with Henry the fact that I want no foreign leaders of any kind before the 20th unless it has to do with Vietnam.

I think I may have told George Shultz that we could get together around the 5th or 6th on tax and trade policy. I think I also have discussed with John Ehrlichman the possibility of getting together for a long meeting on our domestic initiatives shortly after the first of the year. To the extent possible, I want to put these meetings off until after January 20. In order to handle the situation, I would set a Cabinet meeting now for the 22nd and invite to that meeting only members of the new Cabinet. I would set a Leaders meeting also for the 22nd and invite in this instance the full complement of the Republican leaders.

As far as bipartisan leaders are concerned, I shall have to play that by ear depending upon developments in Vietnam. I had told Mansfield that I would see him shortly after the first of the year, perhaps the 2nd or 3rd. My present intention is to do that unless some development occurs which would make it wise for me to postpone it. Otherwise, I would like to set a bipartisan meeting for the 23rd--in other words, the day after the full Republican leadership meeting. I want a recommendation from Timmons as to who ought

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

to be included in such a bipartisan meeting. I think it is well, too, for you to discuss with Ehrlichman what he feels we should set up with regard to bipartisan meetings on government reorganization plans which we of course must explain to the Congress at a relatively early date.

Exceptions to my rule with regard to appointments before January 20 of course will have to be made for any budget decisions or decisions on messages which must be made before that date. On the other hand, you will generally find that I can put off those decisions until after the 20th.

With further reference to my schedule, I think you should do some planning for a master schedule covering the first six months of the year. Here you will have to include for purposes of decision the State Visits that will be made here and the trips that I will have to make abroad, possibly one to Europe in that period, the stag dinners that Maury Stans has requested, the Evenings at the White House (incidentally, I am inclined to think that with the enormous pressures we have to bring in people who helped us in the campaign, the Evening at the White House will serve best as a catchall and that we should save the State Dinner invitations for only the very top contributors to whom a State Dinner would be considered almost a prerogative). In addition, Church services, Press Conferences, any trips we might want to take within the United States. In making the plans for the master schedule, I would like to have these trips abroad where possible planned at a time that will have me out of the country when the White House Correspondents, the Gridiron, and other affairs take place where I want Agnew to be there as my representative this year as well as next.

I think it is important for you to get ahold of this schedule now before I am inundated from all sides by the political people, by Henry, John Ehrlichman, Shultz, Timmons and others with their requests for setting up breakfasts, lunches, dinners, briefings, etc. I expect the schedule to be particularly heavy during the first six months of this year due to the fact that we have to catch up on some of our political people. On the other hand, the responsibilities that I have to get the new term started off in the right direction must be my overriding concern. Consequently, we must not let this schedule run away with us or I will find that I will be so busy seeing people and going through the motions with all of the special interest groups that I will be unable to do the job I was elected to do. I think you should have a hard-nose talk

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

with Ehrlichman, Timmons, Shultz and Kissinger on this matter, and I think also, when they are in place, talk to George Bush and Maurice Stans so that they will understand when we will not be able to do every event they want us to do.

Also, it is important that you have a talk with Chuck Colson with regard to the Colson/Connally requests that will be pouring in for meetings with labor groups, ethnics, etc. As I add it all up, it is a pretty frightening pile on the plate. We have demands to meet with the financial contributors or political people who supported us in the campaign from the Committee to Re-elect the President all over the nation, from the Colson/Connally groups, from the Congress, from Governors, Mayors, et. al. where Ehrlichman has to press for meetings, for people within the Administration, for celebrities, and of course for media, Presidential Commissions, etc. like FIAB, where I will have to put in some appearances.

With further reference to such meetings, I have changed my mind with regard to the use of the Cabinet Room. Unless I am scheduled definitely to be at a meeting, the Cabinet Room should not be used for a meeting. I could sense when I went into the Productivity Commission meeting that the labor leaders really half-way expected me to be there, and I think that this inevitably will be the case even though you swear in blood when you invite them that the President is not going to be present. Let's just reserve the Cabinet Room for meetings where the President is present. There are plenty of other adequate rooms which can be used for meetings with Administration personnel where I am not present.

In making your planning for the next six months, I would like to get our telephone call operation in a more orderly shape. What has happened over the past four years is that the wheels that squeak the most have been getting the grease. Colson and Dent, for example, always got their names in. Several others who should have had calls were not covered due to the fact that the people who should have recommended them just weren't as aggressive in getting their names in. The use of telephone calls can be enormously effective. However, it must not be done on a hit or miss basis and not on the basis of who happens to be the aggressive person who is pushing for calls. It is somewhat similar to the way we give invitations to dinners, etc. If we listened only to Maury Stans we would only have financial contributors as guests at dinners except for the government officials who have to be invited. That is why it is essential to go out and ask MacGregor and others for their recommendations so we are sure we don't get any imbalance in this respect.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

I want to use the telephone call effectively, but I do not want to waste calls on individuals who might enjoy receiving them but who simply don't rate with others who have a much higher priority. My present inclination is to make a half dozen calls per day. However, unless I have thorough confidence in the recommendations as to what calls should be made, I inevitably am not going to make them. One point I have already covered is that we are going to knock off calls on birthdays, anniversaries, etc., unless they happen to be very special occasions where a party is being given and a call has been requested from a very special friend. The same, incidentally, will hold true of letters to people on their birthdays; only where it is a very special birthday or anniversary to a very special friend should letters go. I don't want to get into the routine of sending a letter or making a call anymore than to follow the routine of giving a gift to everybody who comes into the office.

On another subject, I want you to be sure to follow up with Henry at the earliest possible time with regard to cutting the NSC staff. He is going to drag along here and not make these cuts unless you push him hard. I think that what you need to do is to sit down with him and go over his list name-by-name, and tell him to seed these people where he thinks they are loyalists out into the Departments, and to retain only what he needs on the NSC staff to do the work that deserves the highest priority in the White House. I think Henry and his top people are so burdened down with problems in so many countries that they sometimes are unable to put their major effort against the big problems that really matter. Inevitably of course that means that some of the smaller problems come into my office. The only way to cut down the number of problems that reach my desk and which reach Henry's desk is to cut down the number of staff. I would like for you to give me a report on what success you have on this direction.

I am attaching to this memorandum a very good memorandum I received from Ehrlichman on the intelligence community. Schlesinger's report is brilliant and must be implemented in a number of directions.

Here, however, you have a very delicate responsibility--what you must do is to convince Henry of the necessity of my appointing Schlesinger as the top White House man responsible for reorganizing the intelligence community and in charge of intelligence activities. This of course can be in Henry's shop but Schlesinger must be the man in charge.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

I say this for a number of reasons of which the following are the most important:

1. The Congress is particularly jealous of its prerogatives in the intelligence field. If they get the impression that the President has turned all intelligence activities over to Kissinger, all hell will break loose. If, on the other hand, I name the new Director of CIA, Schlesinger, as my top assistant for intelligence activities, we can get it by the Congress.

2. Henry simply doesn't have the time to spend on this project which is needed. The fact that I have been bugging him and Haig for over three years to get intelligence reorganized with no success whatever proves that point. For example, just read Schlesinger's report of two years ago and note that it has not been implemented in any respect and you can see what the problem is.

3. Henry cannot move in this field effectively due to his very close contact with Haig. Haig with all of his superior qualities is after all a part of the present system and will defend it.

4. Hanging over this whole intelligence question is FIAB. It is a prestigious group, but instead of really being an independent advisory group, it really represents various segments of the status quo in the intelligence community. FIAB will vigorously oppose any attempt to reorganize intelligence.

With all of these problems you can see that it is going to take some pretty skillful management. What I am now suggesting is that you sit down at a time when everybody is in a fairly congenial frame of mind with Kissinger and with Ehrlichman, and also with Schlesinger. The four of you then should have it out with regard to how this intelligence problem should be handled. In the meantime, Ehrlichman's recommendation that Ash conduct an independent study with regard to the management side of intelligence is right on the mark. Let's get that going immediately. Once Ash has his teeth dug into this thing he should also sit in with the rest of you in developing a recommendation for me on the intelligence matter.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

There is one weakness in the Schlesinger memorandum which I want you to have corrected in your discussions. He very correctly points out that we have to get rid of the overlapping, etc., and particularly to cut down on the enormous expenditures in the Defense Department for intelligence. On the other hand, he does not emphasize as much as I would like the need to improve quality as well as reduce quantity of top intelligence people in the CIA itself. The CIA, like the State Department, is basically a liberal establishment bureaucracy. I want the personnel there cut at least by 35 to 40% and I want a definite improvement insofar as attitudes of those in CIA with regard to our foreign policy. There are some very good men there but the great majority are basically part of the Georgetown crowd like their colleagues in the State Department. Give me your recommendations on intelligence after the 20th.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

NOT FOR RELEASE UNTIL 10 A.M. ON JUNE 19th

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

BILL BROCK
3D DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

1535 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
PHONE: 225-3271

COMMITTEE ON
BANKING AND CURRENCY

JOINT ECONOMIC
COMMITTEE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

June 17, 1969

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Mr. President:

We submit to you the following report of campus unrest. The critical urgency of the problem cannot be overstated.

This report reflects our impressions of student attitudes and problems, along with some proposed solutions applicable at local, state and national levels. It represents a general consensus of our 22 man group. However, because each of us undertook this task as individuals, we must reserve the right of members to expand upon, or even disagree with, any specific point.

It is our hope that the findings included in this document will be of use to you in your continued efforts at solving what has become a major national problem.

Respectfully yours,

Bill Brock
Edward Biester
George Bush
John Buchanan
Lawrence Coughlin
Marvin Esch
James Hastings
Larry Hogan
Manuel Lujan
Donald Lukens
Pete McCloskey
Jack McDonald
Jerry Pettis
Albert Quie
Tom Railsback
Lou Frey
Donald Riegle
Bill Steiger
Phil Ruppe
Guy Vander Jagt
Lowell Weicker
William Whitehurst

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Factors in Unrest	6
Internal Factors	6
Communication	6
Responsiveness	8
Student Intolerance	9
Hyprocrisy	10
Relevance	11
Over-Reaction	13
Blacks at Predominately Black Institutions	15
Non-White Student Issues	17
Large vs Small Institutions	20
External Factors	21
Racism	21
Military Industrial Complex	21
Poverty and Hunger	22
Imperialism and the Third World	22
Police State	23
Economic Oppression	23
Remoteness from Power	24
Misplaced Priorities	24
Vietnam	24
The Draft	25
Values: Materialism	25
Over-Reaction	25
Hypocrisy	26
The Media	26
Ideas For Consideration	28
1. No Repressive Legislation	28
2. Establish A Commission on Higher Education	28
3. Open Communication to University Community	29
4. Lower the Voting Age	29
5. Draft Reform	30
6. Encourage Student Participation in Politics	30
7. Expand Opportunities for Involvement	31
8. Coordinate Youth Programs	32
9. Perspective	32
10. Balance	33
Appendix	35
Dynamics of Confrontation	35
Anatomy of Conflict	36

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

PREFACE

A deep concern about today's problem of unrest among our youth, and the realization that we possessed little reliable information about events on the American campus prompted us to go out to a variety of colleges and universities to talk with students, faculty, administrators, and other officials on their own ground. We had nothing to sell, no speeches to make, and offered only a desire to know and understand the factors which appear to threaten the destruction of many of our most respected institutions and the alienation of many of this nation's finest students.

The problems confronting higher education are so complex that no study or analytic effort yet mounted can really claim to be comprehensive. We recognize the need for continued in-depth research. Nonetheless, we believe we achieved substantial success with respect to our main concern - the acquisition of some degree of personal understanding of the nature of the problem.

We came away from our campus tour both alarmed and encouraged. We were alarmed to discover that this problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realize, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries. By the same token, we were encouraged by the candor, sincerity and basic decency of the vast majority of students we met. Too often, however, we saw their idealism and concern vented in aimless or destructive ways.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

If one point is to be emphasized in this report it is that violence in any form, in any measure, under any circumstances, is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression - and that it can no more be tolerated in the university community than in the community at large. If there is to be orderly progress and a redress of legitimate student grievances, student violence must be averted.

As Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States, has said:

> "The right to disagree - and to manifest disagreement - which the Constitution allows to the individual ... does not authorize them to carry on their campaign of education and persuasion at the expense of somebody else's liberty...."

It is clear that if violence on our campuses does not end, and if the reaction to it is on the one extreme too lax, or on the other extreme too harsh and indiscriminate, the vast moderate student majority may be forced into the arms of the revolutionaries, and those few who seek to destroy the fabric of higher education will have succeeded.

We agree with the editorial in the June 8 New York Times:

> "If lasting damage to the independence of the universities is to be avoided, if the society's attention is to be redirected to its larger, more serious problems, violence has to cease and tranquility has to be returned to the campuses."

There is on the campus today a new awareness of potential student power and the emergence of a large group, probably the vast majority of student leaders and a substantial number of intelligent, concerned and perplexed young people, which has genuine concern over what it feels is the difference between the promise and performance of America. While these students

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

have no monolithic leadership or single set of goals, they are fairly united in questioning many of the values of our system. The revolutionaries on campus who desire to destroy our system are few in number. The vast majority of students are not poised on the edge of revolution and have not lost faith in our system. However, many students can be radicalized when violence or confrontation on campus occurs. Also disillusionment in our system by students can grow, even without violence, if we place one label on all students and fail to understand that they raise many areas of legitimate concern.

Perhaps our most important and pressing conclusion is that rash legislative action cutting off funds to entire institutions because of the actions of a minority of students would play directly into the hands of these hard-core revolutionaries. Legislation which treats innocent and guilty alike inadvertently confirms extremist charges that the "establishment" is repressive and indifferent to citizen needs and concerns. We must not put ourselves in the position of aiding the handful of anarchists.

In a period of conflict and turmoil, deep divisions on campus as well as between campus and community are understandable, but the danger exists that these divisions are polarizing America into two distinct camps. On neither side has there been enough willingness to listen and discuss problems before the fireworks have begun and emotions have been inflamed. Obviously it is time for our traditional American sense of fair play and tolerance to be evidenced by the responsible majority

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

of this nation, young and old. The alternative of students, intolerant and unwilling to reason, and their elders, intolerant and unwilling to reason, constitutes the ingredients of chaos.

To the extent that our universities can foster an environment of trust, participation, involvement and interaction, we believe that the danger of violent confrontation (and the emotional climate which is its prelude) can be reduced. To the extent that this nation can foster an environment of quality, excitement and challenge throughout its total educational system, creative leadership can be developed. In this report we offer proposals aimed at implementing these goals. We can envision no greater tragedy for this nation and the free world than for us to allow our educational system to slowly settle into obsolescence, losing touch with reality and becoming incapable of responding to the needs of students and society.

We also suggest more positive contact between the campus community and the greater community - increased social action programs, volunteer projects and similar activities which provide students with an opportunity to work on pressing human problems side by side with other concerned citizens.

We are convinced that such experiences can be an important supplement to the classroom, acting to restore student faith in the basic soundness of the American system. Additionally, they can demonstrate in positive fashion the sincere good intentions of a significant portion of the adult community - which many students and faculty with whom we met so readily charged with hypocrisy.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Finally, this nation has an enormous stake in preserving our system of higher education. "The task of the university," as Alfred North Whitehead has written, "is the creation of the future as far as rational thought and civilized modes of appreciation can affect the issue." The creation of a better future will indeed be impossible if the free and orderly pursuit of knowledge is jeopardized by the destruction of our colleges and universities either through anarchy, or through a refusal to consider pleas for necessary improvements.

This report, in listing a series of ideas for consideration, is offered not as a panacea, but, hopefully, as a bridge to greater understanding of the problem.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

FACTORS IN UNREST

In an effort to most accurately and clearly represent what students were saying and thinking on the campuses we visited, we have listed below areas of concern as they were described to us by the students themselves. In reporting student views, we are in no way passing judgment, but merely trying to convey a better understanding of what the students feel.

Where we have reached conclusions of our own, they have been specifically noted by indentation and italics, so that there can be no confusing the reportorial and analytical portions of this report.

INTERNAL FACTORS

Communication

On campus after campus we found widespread criticism from students who feel unable to communicate with administrators and faculty. They believe that no adequate channel is open to them to make their views known. Channels which do exist provide only limited access to individuals who will take responsibility for major decisions.

> *In some cases, the university structure itself seems at fault. In these instances the modern university is so large, and decision-making so fragmented, the student often finds it difficult to identify the individual or organization that has the final responsibility for a particular policy.*

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Operating within a large bureaucracy, administrators find it easy or necessary to avoid definitive answers to student inquiries; they pass the inquiries to the faculty, the regents, or the legislatures. These agencies in turn seem even more isolated from the student point of view and even less open to communication.

An immense frustration is built when the student feels he once again must go through a channel which is not "plugged into" the policy-making power of the university.

Charges of communication gaps are leveled against faculty, administrators, and governing boards alike. In many instances students charge that the actions of the overseeing body, i.e., regents, trustees, etc., are determined by outside business and political influences. Such boards are looked upon as keepers of the status quo who make no attempt to consult with students on any decisions, including those decisions which directly affect the student.

Students, in turn, seem unaware of the factors and pressures that the governing board must consider and endure.

Faculties are criticized for time spent on consulting work for the government or for private industry, and for spending too much time researching and publishing. These activities, however worthwhile, are seen as isolating the faculties from the concerns and problems of the students.

In our view the non-teaching activities of some faculty members, particularly in large universities, are excessive. The "publish or perish" phrase is not simply a cliche. In many areas it implies a valid criticism.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Responsiveness

Claims of inadequate channels of communication frequently were linked with complaints about the lack of responsiveness to student demands.

> *The situation is aggravated where there is a lack of agreement, or of shared perspective, between administration and faculty. Despite protestations to the contrary, such circumstances are hardlu unusual. Faculty and administration often are at odds on everything from the way to reply to student requests to the quality, method, and timing of university response to student protests.*
>
> *When university action is taken, or problems are at least under serious review, students who are not involved in the step-by-step deliberations fail to understand the amount of planning required and the complexity involved in the solutions they propose to the university.*
>
> *Since many universities do not seem to be geared to initiate or administer either quick or long lasting change, increasing passion mounts on both sides of an issue with resulting polarization and alienation of more moderate students who may or may not sympathize with some of the basic requests.*

The students feel that it is the administration and the faculty who decide which students will be accepted as student spokesmen. Even when some students are in positions of consultation with the university, administration and faculty, a majority of students may deny that actual representation or communication occurs. On one large campus, for example, a list of student leaders drawn up by the Dean of Students and a list prepared by the editor of the student newspaper had no names in common.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

We feel that these and similar situations can only lead to a conclusion that a lack of real or visible responsiveness has been an ingredient in campus conflict.

Student Intolerance

Although most students would deny it, and many would be genuinely surprised by the charge, the intolerance of a substantial portion of students is a contributing factor to the general unrest. Often insulated from day-to-day social responsibilities and contact with other age groups, some students seldom have the opportunity to see our society solving problems or meeting human needs. In the course of study and discussion, however, they are continually exposed to society's many real failures and seeming inconsistencies. The result for many has been a combination of deep social concern and a disenchantment with traditional institutions and approaches to problems.

Frequently students are strong in framing ideal solutions and weak in analyzing the factors involved in the problem and in its solution. Some demand immediate solutions and failing that, rush into confrontation as the "only alternative course". They may resort to "non-negotiable demands", a technique that is often cited as evidence of student intolerance.

The more militant students insist on acting as a group, feeling that their hope of success lies in refusing to deal with opponents on an individual basis. Refusal to negotiate may indeed indicate merely a desire to disrupt for the sake of disruption but it may also reflect a lack of understanding and a lack of skill and confidence in the bargaining techniques long vitally employed in a democratic society.

Such intolerance contains dangerous seeds of self-destruction. Unchecked, it can

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

only breed a like degree of intolerance on the part of those who have made higher educational opportunity available to more young Americans than any society in history.

It should also be recognized that some of the intolerance displayed is purposeful and perhaps irreversible. The revolutionary is determined to remain unappeased in the hope of prompting administration reaction of a sufficiently excessive or violent nature to "radicalize" the moderate student majority. He must seek this goal because radicalism as a force to destroy can achieve no objectives, can obtain no real results on our campuses today without the tacit or even open support of far more responsible and moderate students who may be captured by the events of the moment. In order to be "radicalized", these students must have their emotions preconditioned by a situation (or series of situations) which would generate an initial expression of sympathy toward the avowed aims of the revolutionaries.

Hypocrisy

Students complained that the university, like society, fails to practice what it preaches. They point to teaching and the transmission of learning as the center of a university, and contrast this with faculty efforts to reduce teaching loads in order to have more time for research. Many students accused university administrations of applying a double standard in enforcing regulations. They claimed that students who violated rules as part of a politically motivated or anti-institutional protest were more heavily penalized than those who violated the same rules for other reasons. Replying to the university's often expressed concern for

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

social problems in the community, students point to university expansion into ghetto neighborhoods through programs students call "urban removal."

They charge that academic freedom is a myth when the university's purpose and direction is "subverted" by massive infusion of funds for military and industrial research. In response to the effort to educate the disadvantaged, students charge that too few are admitted and that those admitted find the institution unresponsive to individual needs and problems.

Relevance

> *Underlying specific issues is a fundamental dispute about the structure of the university and its role in society. A vast gulf exists between the views of faculty and administrators and the views of the students.*

It is characterized by the recently published statement of a university student:

"Most of them (the faculty) hold to the ideal that the university is a neutral institution, devoted to objective truth. But the people who have power in America have pervaded this institution. The university could never be neutral in our present society -- profit making and war making -- I'd be skeptical that the university could assume a neutral posture. The university ought to be a partisan of the progressive forces in society."

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

> *This student's view is an obvious departure from the generally held public view of a university as an isolated tower that transmits and enlarges knowledge in the process of preparing individuals for careers. This student opinion requires that the university be relevant to our era and its problems, that it be committed to an active role as a progressive force. What is important about this perspective is that it is expounded not by a minority of revolutionaries but by very large numbers of sincere and highly motivated young people.*

For the student, a clear definition of this relevancy is very difficult, since its development is in a formative stage and its meaning changes from area to area. On one hand, for the university to be relevant, it is held that it must cease to uphold traditional "establishment" institutions and systems. In this context, many universities have seen demonstrations against campus recruiting by various corporations involved in defense contracts, against the inclusion of ROTC in the curriculum, and against certain research projects. On the other hand, it is suggested that these ties must be replaced with new commitments to support urban improvement, and the extension of civil rights. Clearly many complaints about specific course requirements are closely related to this concern for the university's relevance. The students ask, "What is a university? What should the relationship be between the university and the surrounding community?" They are asking to what extent higher education should be radically altered to prepare graduates to go into society to change things.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

They are asking how much of what they learn is "relevant" to today's society. They would like to see a closer relationship between their courses and the problems they see. They are asking for courses which can provide answers to problems of race, poverty, and economic oppression, and they regard present course offerings as noticeably lacking in this relationship. In one notable instance these demands would be satisfied by nothing less than student control of the curriculum, but large numbers of students who do not make such radical demands are nonetheless asking for a more "relevant" education.

> *Some students appear to be more caught up in contemporary problems rather than in the difficult process of learning needed to toughen and strengthen their minds to achieve workable solutions to unsolved problems. In these students we found an impatience with and a lack of appreciation of method and process, whether it be the intellectual method of abstraction and generalization or the process of practicing democracy as a value in itself.*

Over-reaction

The student voices deep concern about methods used to respond to student confrontations. Many feel that the university has over-reacted with excessive force. They point to incidents involving clubbing and gassing demonstrators and bystanders, as examples of an "oppressive system". On numerous occasions moderate leaders of peaceful demonstrations cited the subsequent inability to prevent individual

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

acts of provocation and violence by radical students, thereby permitting a confrontation to erupt into violence. Likewise, students pointed to numerous instances of over-aggressive reaction by individual law officials which had the effect of radicalizing otherwise passive onlookers, turning a relatively small-scale disturbance into a general battle.*

Many individual students pointed to the Dartmouth procedure (a court injunction against the occupation of a building, and the peaceful and quiet arrest of demonstrators) as the best approach.

> *Lack of combined faculty-administration action aggravates a situation, and in some instances, a slow response due to a reluctance to act created further difficulties. In other instances an immediate resort to excessive force exaggerated the problem.*

The student frequently complains of double jeopardy - prosecution by civil authorities and then by the university. He maintains that those who violate a university regulation in the more traditional manner, as a prank, are treated more lightly than those who violate the same rule for a political purpose.

*For a more detailed treatment of this process, see the appendix "Dynamics of a Confrontation".

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Additional stress is borne by the administrator because of his role of buffer between the faculty and the governing board. He is subject to the direction of both and often the approval of neither.

Blacks at Predominately Black Institutions

There is a depth of bitterness in even the most moderate of black students at black institutions that surpasses anything found among the whites.

The black student expresses bitterness about our system from personal experience. Many white students expressed concern about problems such as discrimination, poverty and hunger, but unlike the black students, most of them stated they had not personally experienced these problems. As more than one black student said -- "You have to be black to understand".

A substantial number of black students at predominately black institutions stated that they have lost faith in our political system, which over the years has promised them much, but in their opinion, delivered little. They say there "are political wolves in the South and political foxes in the North". Many of the blacks want desperately to believe in the system, but can see no real progress being made. Their problem is more external than internal. They are concerned about non-college problems which they identify as discrimination, economic oppression, loss of identity, poverty, hunger and racism. They ask to be respected and desire true economic opportunity. Words and promises will no longer suffice.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

In many cases the militant blacks at predominately black campuses are looking for a dramatic and, if necessary, violent upheaval in the United States. They would acknowledge our good intentions, but felt that the faster and more complete the failure of moderate programs, the sooner the final and absolute confrontation would occur. When asked how they would change the system, or what changes they would make, they didn't have an answer -- but said that problem would take care of itself.

The black feels that the white radical is playing a game, and only need shave his beard and cut his hair in order to melt into the mainstream of the establishment, while the black student cannot.

The main goal of the majority of black students seemed to be service to their "black brothers and sisters". Some said that they would rather die for their people in the streets of the United States than in Vietnam.

The black students in most cases stated that their schools are inferior to white institutions, even when operated by the same authority, such as a state board of regents. In many cases, they also stated that, because of their inferior primary and secondary education, they are unable to compete with the white graduate or in predominately white schools. Many black educators and students felt that the H.E.W. guidelines should be revised until our entire educational system

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

is corrected, to allow for the continued existence of predominately black schools. The rationale offered was that the black schools would allow many blacks to attend college who couldn't get, or stay, in white colleges. Further it would allow the blacks to retain their own pride and identity and find themselves, instead of being submerged in predominately white schools. The black schools would be able to offer many courses and programs in college which would allow the blacks to "catch up" to their white college counterparts who have received a better primary and secondary education.

The educators and students also suggested more programs, based on the Head Start concept, in the high schools or between high school and college to raise the educational level. They emphasized that the programs would work best if blacks were involved at all levels, i.e., they felt only a black could truly understand the problems faced by another black.

> *Relative to the relaxation of HEW guidelines, we discovered that the black institutions are making a concerted effort to recruit white students and faculty. While they have been moderately successful as far as faculty are concerned, they say it is extremely difficult to convince white students to attend a predominately black institution.*

Non-White Student Issues

The primary concern of minority students is to acquire the kind of education they perceive as essential to being able to return to their communities and better the conditions of

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

their people. They want their education to provide the training they need to deal with the problems of minority groups in America, and they see higher education as the best avenue to their personal development.

A particular example of the demand for relevance has been the widespread support for minority studies programs by blacks and other non-white minorities. Most of the activity in this area has taken place on predominately white campuses, and is often discussed within the framework of the problems of minority group students when they find themselves in a basically all-white environment. The students like to compare their position on a campus where they constitute less than two per cent of the student body, to the problems faced by a white student if he were to attend a university where the student body was 98 per cent black. Both faculty and students said that without thorough preparation of internal college processes and organization, increases in non-white admissions can result in the severe disillusionment of non-white students and a backlash among others on campus. They expressed the feeling that the courses offered by the university do not give adequate coverage to blacks and other minorities in American history and in other subjects dealing with the processes of American society. They feel that such courses are cast in terms and events totally foreign to the experience of most black students. It is claimed that an economics course

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

which fails to present "accurate" views of economic conditions of ghetto life is not relevant, and history courses designed for middle class whites are not relevant for blacks.

The minority groups say that much of the difficulty turns on the inadequacies of the public school systems in deprived areas, as well as disadvantages which pervaded their early lives. Failure to respond to these concerns, we were told, would threaten to drive the black activists into the ranks of the revolutionaries.

> *Demands for Black Studies Departments, minority student centers and the admission of large numbers of minority students who often lack adequate preparation are issues not easily resolved. A number of universities are beginning creatively to make the kinds of adjustments needed. Of special interest are the programs now in operation at a few schools to accept students who do not meet normal requirements for entrance, to provide financial aid, special tutoring and courses, and enrollment in a five year program leading to a degree.*
>
> *It is important to make a clear distinction between the purposes and goals of black militant students and white revolutionaries. Aside from similarities in tactics, there are substantial differences. Without doubt, the alienation and bitterness among some black students is so great that they have completely lost faith in the ability of the nation to remove obstacles to full equality (see preceding section). Many black student activists on predominantly white campuses, however, appear to be seeking to reform the university, to make it better suited to serve their needs and desires, to create the mechanism for training students from minority groups to go back into their communities to deal with major social and*

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

economic problems, and not to destroy the university. This is in contrast to the goal of destroying the institution held by some white and black revolutionaries. Thus black student militants have held the white revolutionaries at arm's length -- forming alliances when useful but preserving their separate identity and independence. By the same token, the formal involvement of black student groups in issues not directly related to minority student problems has been, in most cases, limited.

Large vs Small Institutions

An immediate difference appears in the ability of smaller institutions to deal with some problems more readily and with greater acuity than the multi-university. Size affects responsiveness, communications and many other needs. Meeting them at larger schools is more difficult, but it is not impossible, and the effort must be made.

Obviously, there are very good reasons for the tremendous growth of some institutions in recent years. The population explosion, increasing demand for mass education, university financing, and the national reputation of specific institutions have all resulted in the development of a number of very large schools.

The challenge is to find ways to preserve the benefits of size while overcoming its disadvantages. We must seek ways to strengthen the ability of our universities to provide close personal relationships and the experiences available in small group settings. Greater development of community colleges, and even cluster colleges around the large university, can also play an important part in "re-humanizing" the learning process.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

EXTERNAL FACTORS

As with the section on internal factors of student unrest, our main concern is to clearly depict what the students themselves told us. All interpretation and analysis by ourselves is included in separate indented, italicized passages.

Students relayed to us deep feelings about "the System", "the Establishment", etc. The word, System, covers a good deal and its components vary from campus to campus. In all we have discerned certain common threads. The System, as they define it, is characterized essentially as follows:

Racism

The student perceives the gulf between the promise and performance of this nation with respect to race relations. He sees inequality of opportunity, failure of the educational system, and he relates these to the country as a whole as well as to the university. For the most part, we found a perceived neglect of human problems to be the single largest motivating force behind the alienation of today's student. Whether in black studies questions, or in the university's relation with its surrounding community, an over-riding concern was the status of minority groups.

Military Industrial Complex

There is considerable student opposition to our formidable Defense budget. Why, they ask, do funds for domestic and educational programs get cut while the Defense budget goes almost unchallenged? They see a close relationship between the academic

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

community and the military. They see university presidents sitting as members of boards of large industrial corporations. They see cuts being made in funds to hire teachers while boards of trustees authorize new buildings and facilities in order to receive greater Federal research funds.

Poverty and Hunger

In this age of affluence the medium of television brings home to people the gap between well-to-do and the poor. There is a growing dissatisfaction on the part of students with the response of the nation to the disadvantaged. They are not willing to wait to overcome decades of poverty and racial intolerance, and they question apparent past inaction. The immediate problems around the college campus often become the focal point for their attention. The failure of many institutions to act with regard for the neighborhood around them has caused the student to take as his own the cause of the Harlem or Woodlawn resident.

> *Certainly, student involvement in such matters is not new: witness the civil rights marches of the early 1960's. What is new is the intense impatience with change or the apparent lack of change in the lives of many Americans.*

Imperialism and the Third World

On a number of campuses a recurring question related to the role of the United States and the problems of what is termed the "Third World" (blacks, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, etc.). The view expressed was that we are the imperialists in Vietnam, in Formosa, in Latin America, and that the emerging nations are a new force with whom we have not yet come to grips.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Some feel we are not treating other people in the world fairly, and from the view of the student, we are paying the price of not heeding the views and needs of others. In their view, self-determination, as expressed by the United States, is a pious proclamation which relates only to those with whom we agree.

Police State

The experience of one school more clearly demonstrates this problem than any other. When the students left in the summer of 1968 the campus police wore no weapons. When the students returned in the Fall of 1968 the campus police were equipped with billy clubs, guns, and mace. For a school that had experienced no difficulty, the students questioned why this was done. As violence grows, and as counter-violence escalates, the student views his relationship with both the university and the outside world as increasingly beset by the police and National Guard. Each demonstration brings with it the threat of violence on both sides.

Economic Oppression

The readiness of legislatures and alumni to strike back at campus turbulence seems only to reinforce the student's view that big government and big industry more and more dominate the university and society. What has happened at Peoples Park in Berkeley, on Mifflin Street in Madison, and other places, are examples of a new concern for matters outside the university, yet, in which the university plays a role. Student housing, the increases in rent rates, merchants who charge higher prices to

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

students (as they do to ghetto residents) are examples used by students to justify their claims of oppression.

Remoteness from Power

> *A very large part of the alienation of students stems from their feeling that they cannot control their own destiny. Institutions are too large, and too remote for the individual to have an opportunity to change that which he does not like. The multiversity concept is often pointed to here, as is the overwhelming size of government, industry, and labor unions.*

Misplaced Priorities

Over and over again we heard about priorities and the feeling that these are "out of whack" in the United States. The space program, large farm subsidies, cuts in education, the Defense budget, and more, all were cited as examples of the failure of our society to meet its urgent domestic needs.

Vietnam

It is apparent that Vietnam originally served as one of the major factors in radicalizing students. It is still a major source of alienation and dissatisfaction with our society and our national government. Many consider the war immoral and unjust. An increasing number vow to take any steps necessary to avoid military service.

> *However, it was repeatedly brought home to us by radicals and moderates alike that an end to the Vietnam war would not mean an end to campus unrest - or even a major, long-range, reduction of tensions.*

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

The Draft

Coupled with Vietnam the operations of the Selective Service System serve as a significant problem among students. The present administration of the draft is viewed as totally unsatisfactory, as being unjust to minority groups particularly, and as a tool of the Federal Government to enforce discipline. Faculty and students alike tend to equate expulsion from the university with compulsory service in Vietnam.

Values: Materialism

As one student put it, "This is a 'thing' culture, and I want it to be a 'people' culture." In the midst of affluence the students see a society in which a high value is placed on material things. There is a longing for a belief, a belief in something other than material things. There is a deep conviction on the part of many students that they want to do something to help others, not only themselves. This is part of a rejection of materialism as viewed by the student. Moreover, there is a questioning of the fundamental values of our society, and our system of government.

Over-reaction

> *As can be seen from the portion of this report which analyzes confrontation, the efforts to control violence - as well as those steps leading to violence - too often create an over-reaction on the part of all concerned. In our view there has been an over-reaction on the part of students to what they consider to be the unresponsiveness of the institutions to legitimate calls for change.*
>
> *This compounds what under the best of circumstances is a complex problem. But an excessive reaction from the outside world, aroused and disturbed as it is,*

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

does little to help. In a violent situation, students, faculty, administration and the community, are caught in a tangled web of sympathy, fear, reaction and frustration. Obviously then, as the Eisenhower Commission on Violence has said in its most recent report: "Over reaction in response to a violent illegal situation can be very dangerous."

The idea that campus violence comes from only a few is a myth. There are many dedicated, bright students who are concerned about the problems but who are not yet violent. They have not, however, rejected completely the view that they should resort to violence. Unfortunately, they can point to some campuses where violence has produced results.

Hypocrisy

Through all of the external and internal factors runs this thread. Each campus would produce differing examples of this theme, but it is an underlying feeling on the part of the students.

Students believe that our society is hypocritical. They point to the treatment of blacks while contrasting this to the ideal of the Declaration of Independence; they see poverty in the midst of plenty.

The Media

Most of the people we talked with stated the opinion that superficial mass media coverage was contributing to the widening disillusionment and misunderstanding between the public and the nation's campuses. The media, particularly that utilizing the visual impression, concentrates on the dramatic, the sensational, the vivid acts of violence or disorder.

There is altogether too little effort made to thoughtfully explore the underlying issues and problems that concern the vast majority of students and educators who genuinely want to change things for the better. Not only does

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

this distorted coverage inflame the worst fears and stereotypes in the public mind, but it adds to the frustrations of those trying to work for progress and constructive change on campus.

We believe the media can and must become a more powerful forum for bridging the "perception and understanding" gap between the public and our universities.

The very nature of modern communications - visual, instantaneous - plays a role both in determining the tactics of demonstrators and in shaping public opinion about events on a campus. The public focuses on disorders, and these have occurred with sufficient frequency to leave the impression that little else is taking place in higher education.

The point to be made is that the media can offer a mechanism by which misconceptions can be corrected. Although some publications and broadcasting networks have devoted substantial time and effort to excellent in-depth studies of the factors discussed in this report, more is required if understanding is to be created.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

IDEAS FOR CONSIDERATION

As we learned, there is no single answer, nor any set of answers, to the problems faced by students or our society. The internal and external factors which we have tried to catalogue here lead us, nevertheless, to suggest for your consideration, Mr. President, a series of ideas which we believe merit urgent consideration.

1. NO REPRESSIVE LEGISLATION. Any action by the Congress or others which would, for example, penalize innocent and guilty alike by cutting off all aid to any institution which has experienced difficulty would only serve to confirm the cry of the revolutionaries and compound the problem for each university. This holds, also, for any action which would establish mediation or conciliation on the part of the Federal government. In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community.

2. ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION. In light of our findings we believe that a Presidential Commission on Higher Education would be a valuable step. Running through our report are examples of problems which students, faculty, and administrators have raised and which deserve further exploration. What is the role of the Federal government in research? What has this contributed to creating priorities within the university? How best can communication be opened

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and maintained? How well does this report reflect the reality of the American college scene? These and more would be appropriate questions for such a Commission which we believe should include a thoroughly representative selection of students, faculty, and administrators together with the general public. We do not foresee an investigative body but rather one which can help to create understanding among members of the academic community, as well as the general public.

3. OPEN COMMUNICATION TO UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY. We have found that many were surprised by our visit and by our willingness to listen and learn. There is a need to expand lines of communication. We urge that Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, the White House staff, and others in the Executive Branch begin an increasing effort for this kind of two-way street of listening, learning and responding. Once our communication has become established it will be important to sustain it. Some of the questions raised by students were truly the kind which deserve and demand answers. Some of the viewpoints expressed by students deserve understanding. And some of the misconceptions of the system of government within which we operate desperately need correction. This can best be done, we believe, through an ongoing program of communication.

4. LOWER THE VOTING AGE. There is no question that the American college student for the most part is better educated and more vitally concerned with contemporary problems in our country than at any previous time in our history. We feel

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

that active involvement in the political process can constructively focus his idealism on the most effective means of change in a free society.

The right to vote will give Young America the chance to become a responsible, participating part of our system. In essence they will have the chance to put their performance where their words are.

Between the time they become eligible for the draft, and the time they presently become eligible to vote, there is a natural tendency to lose interest in politics and government because there is no right to participate. An extension of the franchise to the age of 18 when their interest is high can help engender in our youth (and our future leadership) an awareness of the full meaning of democracy.

5. DRAFT REFORM. In line with your own recommendations for reform of the Selective Service System, we believe Congress should move to act promptly on this important issue. It is a matter which affects hundreds of thousands of American young people and it is presently a sword over their heads. This can be improved and positive action on the matter would be significant.

6. ENCOURAGE STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN POLITICS. We found that the overwhelming majority of students with whom we visited hold little regard for either political party. The questioning of our system of government points to a loss of confidence in established institutions and that includes political parties.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

An increase in this loss of confidence poses a serious danger to the viable functioning of American government. Just as government must be responsive, so must political parties by responsive and open.

7. EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT. We found an encouraging desire on the part of many students to do something to help overcome the problems of our society. This dedication or commitment to help others is a hopeful, important area which should be encouraged. Specifically, we recommend establishing a National Youth Foundation. We believe this concept should be initiated in order to better utilize the energy and resources of student groups. Models of student-community involvement were found at the University of South Carolina, Radcliff and Michigan State University, among others, and we urge legislation to foster and encourage this opportunity for experience, learning and participation.

We also recommend establishing a Student Teacher Corps. Many more students are considering entering the teaching profession and this idea is one which we feel should be encouraged. In concert with the Teacher Corps, the student teacher concept can be a valuable tool to tap student potential and expand the learning opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Further, we recommend increasing our support of the College Work-Study Program, National Defense Student Loan Program, and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program. These three Federal programs would be beneficial in meeting the needs of students

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and the institutions in responding to student concerns. They are budgeted at levels far below the authorization, and we believe they should be increased.

From the community at large, American business, which has played such a large role in financially supporting higher education, must commit human resources as well. Expanded job-opportunity programs, work-studies programs, business men and other community leaders teaching on campus, intern and apprentice efforts, leadership in student-community problem solving, attendance at campus forums, among others, could measurably enhance the experience-learning process.

8. COORDINATE YOUTH PROGRAMS. We think it would be helpful if an effort were made to coordinate all the present youth programs of the Federal government through one central office. At the moment there is considerable proliferation among many agencies as well as duplication of effort. In order to more effectively use the present resources of the Federal government we urge your consideration of a mechanism to coordinate and follow-through the work of our numerous programs and agencies.

9. PERSPECTIVE. There is a need to mobilize opinion and resources. A sense of perspective is lacking on the part of the students and on the part of the public. What students are saying is, in some cases, the same as what the average American is saying regarding priorities, responsiveness, and humanization. Presidential leadership, governmental concern,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and communication are all a part of the necessary work which must be undertaken if we are to replace revolution with reform, and despair with hope. Clearly we have found that violence is no answer, and that violence as a means to achieve an end is counter-productive. The crucial factor in the widening gap between students and others is the student's perception of reality. That must be understood by all who seek solutions. This requires of us comprehension, and of the student, understanding.

10. BALANCE. Henry Thoreau observed that, "There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."

To take an isolated view of our universities as the one weak link in our educational system is to unfairly single out college students, their parents, professors and school administrators.

We must remember that the average college freshman has already undergone a dozen years of formal education before he enters the gates of the university. Obviously, he is going to reflect, at least in some measure, the strengths and weaknesses of the training he has already received. Many of his attitudes and many of the factors which may lead him into difficulties on campus, have already been implanted.

Therefore, a sweeping change in campus conditions alone is no guarantee of a return to orderly progress in our universities. There exist imperfections in our educational

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

system from pre-school programs to graduate studies. These flaws in American education deserve the immediate and thorough attention of the nation. The problems which have already surfaced on the college campus exist in various dormant forms in our secondary schools, and the inadequacies which foster them can often be traced back even further. Until consistent, challenging, quality education becomes a reality, the problem will remain.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

APPENDIX

DYNAMICS OF CONFRONTATION

Every stage of college confrontation - "before", "during" and "after" - is represented among the Task Force visits, including:

- Tranquil campuses: With no history of, and little likelihood of, disruption.
- Uneasy campuses: With some of the ingredients of discontent.
- Troubled campuses: With various forms of group civil disobedience, e.g. sit-ins, protest rallies, occupation of buildings.
- Paralyzed campuses: With civil war and open military siege.
- Convalescent campuses: With diverse groups struggling to heal the wounds of confrontation and resolve differences. But the seeds of instability remain and there are conflicting opinions as to whether real progress or continuing instability will result.

Although schools vary widely in region, size, student body profile, structure, governance, and campus issues, there does emerge a common and almost predictable pattern of escalating circumstances through which a university can slide from dissent to open confrontation and chaos. This progressive breakdown is by no means inexorable on every campus, since only a few hundred of the nation's 2500 colleges have experienced disruption.

On many campuses a good mix of conditions, plus cooperation among students, faculty, and administration continues to make it possible to resolve differences without open confrontation and to make progress as a community. These influences toward rational progress are mentioned elsewhere in the report.

The temptation to oversimplify cause and effect relationships should be resisted - keeping in mind that some schools with much trouble have been working hardest, albeit unsuccessfully, to develop progressive change and self-governance.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

However, the frequency of confrontation has increased at such an alarming rate over the last year, that it is well to look at the negative conditions which seem to accompany crisis. Once the dynamics of this process start to spiral ahead, the forward momentum and the fragility of any equilibrium lead to an almost inevitable escalation of risk, danger, and lack of coordinated civilized control over events.

Anatomy of Conflict

1. The underlying malaise and frustration with both societal and personal issues - coupled with the existence of hardened revolutionaries among students and their sympathizers or even counterparts among the faculty.

2. Identification of an emotional issue which has broader appeal to the target group - non-violent moderates. The issue may be local and narrowly defined, e.g. minority studies, student participation, education reforms - or it may be broader and more symbolic, e.g. the "people's park", military involvement like ROTC or research, reaction to police or military force.

3. In most cases, confrontation comes only after frequent requests for change have failed or gotten bogged down. These attempts may cover several months during which there appears to be little or no action or responsiveness other than perhaps talk or committee wheel spinning. These complaints and/or demands may be legitimate, or they may be a deliberately escalating sequence designed to force confrontation. The reasons for slow action become less important than the absence of results - even though, ironically, the problems are sometimes not within the complete control of the immediate university community. Occasionally, militant radicals may seek violence and confrontation immediately, though this often fails from lack of moderate student support.

4. During this period, faculty and administration are unable to coalesce around initiation of prompt change. This usually results in increased polarization and alienation of more moderate students who sympathize with some of the basic ideas for change.

5. At some time, often almost spontaneously, there is a student-initiated provocation or minor confrontation, which might take the form of a sit-in or rally. Sometimes, incidents such as rock-throwing, yelling obscenities and destruction of property occur. Lack of good, clear, timely communications among faculty, students, and administration

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

begins to exacerbate the crisis. Misinformation becomes more common than good information.

6. This provocation is then often met by excessive and/or indiscriminate rebuff, including the use of outdated and unenforceable disciplinary procedures or even police in large numbers, weapons, etc. At this point, the moderates, carefully preconditioned to a general feeling of sympathy by events, by fellow students of a more radical orientation, and even by some faculty, and motivated by their lack of confidence and respect for the establishment, as well as by the immediate violation of "their community", join the fray in ever-increasing numbers. It is not difficult to imagine the recruits gained from witnessing a clubbing, tear-gassing, or firing of riot guns. Such an overwhelming siutation can readily give the revolutionary cause legitimacy in the eyes of thousands of campus moderates. Thus, it accelerates the process of "radicalizing" a major portion of the student body. In most cases this change is irreversable once made. By this time, the original issue has given way to far broader symbolic implications - and the original core of radicals, whether SDS or some other, have been swept aside by the tide of events. No matter - they have achieved their objective.

7. Positions of all parties become hardened, alternatives narrow as everyone stands on "principle", and virtually no one has full control over events. Finally, because of the excesses on both sides, there usually ensues a period of negotiations where all sides respond to pressures and some sort of compromise is worked out - but only because the pressures are so intense.

8. Relative calm returns, but left behind is an atmosphere of latent crisis. Student attitudes are more embittered and there may be a polarization among faculty, administrators, and most certainly, the surrounding public. To many, there is a general verification of the principle that only the strategy and tactics of confrontation can produce meaningful change, at least in the short run. Others sometimes see a few seeds of progress along with continuing, and perhaps more serious problems.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 24, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR

Members, Environmental Quality Council

Subject: Follow-up on first meeting of the Environmental Quality Council

1. The President indicated that the next meeting would be at San Clemente in August, and suggested that the members arrange to go on a tour of the Irvine Ranch development. Dr. Moynihan and Dr. DuBridge will make arrangements through Charles Thomas. On the agenda at the San Clemente meeting will be a report by Mr. Rockefeller on what the Citizens' Advisory Committee and other private and volunteer organizations have done and can do.

2. Each Cabinet officer should designate principal staff contact to work with the Executive Secretary, Dr. DuBridge. At subsequent meetings, members should consider bringing different members to provide stimulation and different viewpoints.

3. The President stressed the importance of intergovernmental relationships and directed Dr. DuBridge to work with the Vice President in this area. A presentation of the Governors' conference in October might be desirable.

4. It was agreed that the principal problems the Council would deal with could be categorized as air, water, land, noise, and geographic problems.

5. Pesticides -- It was agreed that this should be taken under advisement by the Council. Information from the existing studies and activities in several departments will be provided to Dr. DuBridge. He will arrange for additional staff studies that may be needed, and report back to the Council.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

6. Solid Wastes -- A committee consisting of Secretary Romney as chairman and Secretaries Hardin, Hickel, and Finch was appointed. Dr. Buckley of Dr. DuBridge's staff will provide background information and coordinate staff studies.

7. Air Pollution -- As a first step, automotive pollution will be considered. Secretary Volpe will chair a committee including Secretaries Finch, Stans, and Romney. At the San Clemente meeting, briefings will be provided by government and non-government experts. Dr. DuBridge will arrange.

   Power plants and related pollution problems, particularly the use of nuclear power, will be the subject of future discussion.

8. Noise -- Secretary Stans will chair a committee including Secretaries Finch, Romney, and Volpe. Dr. King of Dr. DuBridge's staff will work with this group.

9. Toxic Materials -- Secretary Volpe will chair a group including Secretaries Hardin, Hickel, and Finch. Defense, State, and AEC need to be represented. Dr. McRae of Dr. DuBridge's staff will work with this group.

10. Outdoor Recreation -- Secretary Hickel will establish a sub-Cabinet committee to coordinate government activities.

11. The President called attention to the opportunities for international cooperation in environmental matters, particularly through the UN and NATO. He specifically noted the opportunity for the Council to play a leading role regarding the United States' position. The existing working group under the FCST Committee on Environmental Quality should provide technical inputs.

12. The President noted in closing his feeling that the Council must operate in such a fashion that "something happens."

Lee A. DuBridge
Executive Secretary

Attachments

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

NOISE

In November, 1968 an FCST report entitled "Noise-Sound Without Value" was released by President Johnson. The President endorsed the recommended allocation of responsibilities among Federal agencies, and directed that steps be taken to improve coordination among them and between the Federal Government, the private sector and municipal authorities.

On June 18 a meeting was held by OST to discuss what actions had been taken and what further actions were desirable. The total noise budget moved from $11 million in FY 1968 to $21 million in 1969. DOD, DOT, and NASA expanded $10 million of the 1969 budget and $18 million of the 1969 budget largely on aircraft noise research. Efforts in the rest of the civilian sector obviously are small.

In general, the agencies are conforming to the pattern of responsibilities proposed in the report. There have been varying degrees of activity largely in planning.

Among other issues raised at the meeting are the need for (a) coordination of all noise-related activities; (b) an information center, (c) establishment of standards, particularly in the health area, (d) determining the relative support which should be provided for noise control in relation to other activities; and (e) application of currently available technology to noise abatement.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

PESTICIDES

The extensive use of certain pesticides has become a matter of great public controversy.

Federal attention to all aspects of the pesticide issue including consumer protection, environmental conservation, public health and agricultural production is needed to determine the need for further action. Several Federal agencies have diverse interests, legislative responsibility, competence and requirements in the field of pest control. Consequently, any actions which may be taken could involve the programs of all agencies with concerns in this area.

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council has recently completed a study on persistent pesticides. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is involved currently in a review of the pesticide issue, while the Office of Science and Technology is concerned with the problem in connection with a report on agriculture-related pollution which was released jointly with the Department of Agriculture.

Data obtained through these studies as well as information available from a variety of sources are valuable contributions to determining a course of action.

The foci of attention for proposed Government-wide analysis include (a) the effects of pesticides on human health, (b) the direct economic and social costs and benefits associated with pesticide use, (c) the effects of pesticides on the environment including on fish and wildlife, and (d) alternatives for increasing the effectiveness of pest control without producing undesirable side-effects.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SOLID WASTES

Recent estimates show that each day the municipalities must collect and somehow dispose of a billion pounds of trash, garbage, and other solid wastes. Each year they spend $3 billion to do so. Three-fourths of the cost is attributable to collection and transportation, the remainder being for disposal by land fill, incineration, compost, etc.

Each day industry generates an additional 600 million pounds of wastes while agricultural wastes of 12 billion pounds and mineral wastes of 6 billion pounds are generated.

The mountain of material generated, the high costs of handling, and the diversity of the material and its location constitute what is known as "the solid waste problem." There is a real opportunity to reduce costs, improve collection, reduce waste, reclaim resources, and dispose of the non-usable residue with less environmental impact.

Present Situation

The Solid Waste Act of 1965 allocated responsibilities for solid waste management to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior. Interior's responsibilities were restricted to mining and mineral processing and manufacturing. Organic Acts of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development both include broad authority for R&D on solid wastes.

The Department of Commerce also has more limited authority with regard to economic impact studies and standards problems. The existing Solid Waste Act gives authority for State and inter-State planning grants to HEW, and HUD has wide authority for planning grants in metropolitan areas. There is authority through the Farmer's Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture for assisting small communities, and HUD has loan authority for construction of solid waste disposal facilities.

The Solid Waste Act was extended to June 30, 1970, by the last Congress, but at the request of the Johnson Administration, was not amended. Existing legislation provides for Federal research, development, demonstration, and technical assistance grants to the States; it does not include authorization for facilities grants to the States or communities. Legislation pending in the Congress includes the latter.

Issues

1. Should solid wastes be considered as one problem or several problems? Where should responsibility be vested?

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

2. Should the Federal role in relation to solid wastes be restricted to R&D? To R&D plus planning grants? To R&D plus planning grants and implementation grants? To R&D plus planning grants, implementation grants, and construction and facilities grants? Should all Federal roles be applied to all aspects of the problem?

3. Is there some way the Federal Government can substantially affect the nature of the input of solid wastes rather than simply coping with the wastes that are currently generated, e.g., could non-returnable bottles be replaced with returnable bottles to reduce the solid waste volume and litter problem?

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

LEGISLATION

Key features of the most important bills now before the Congress which deal with the Federal organizational structure for environmental quality are the following:

Senate

Jackson Bill (S. 1075 as amended):

TITLE I is the declaration of a national environmental policy.

We find no problems with it in principle.

TITLE II, SEC. 201 authorizes research, public information assistance to counties, states, etc., and assistance to the "Board of Environmental Quality Advisers."

SEC. 202 empowers Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to make grants and training grants for the purposes of the Act and provides $500,000 for fiscal year 1971 and 1972, and a million dollars each year afterwards.

We think TITLE II is good, and the grant authorizations desirable, but the funding provisions entirely out of keeping with the size of the job. They are at least an order of magnitude too small and we really think within a few years they will be two orders of magnitude too small.

SEC. 203 directs the Office of Science and Technology to review, appraise, and coordinate research, etc., on ecology and environmental quality; to maintain an inventory of projects, private or public, that might affect the natural environment; to provide a clearinghouse on ecological research and evaluations; to assist and advise state and local governments and private enterprise to enhance the quality of the environment.

No funds are provided. While the coordinating function could be performed within existing structures and funds, the others could not.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

SEC. 204 instructs the Director to consult with and provide technical assistance to other Federal agencies and to get help from them.

> An obvious misprint states this is to be done with or without reimbursement by the "Secretary." Clearly what is meant here is the "Director." Again no funds are provided, which would be a shoestring operation indeed.

TITLE III creates a "Board of Environmental Quality Advisors in the Executive Office of the President." Three members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the President designates the chairman and vice chairman.

SEC. 302 states that the primary function of the Board is to study and analyze environmental trends, etc., bearing in mind conservation, social, economic, and health goals of the nation. The Board is required to report at least once each year to the President on the state and condition of the environment; to provide advice, assistance, and staff support to the President for environmental quality purposes, and to obtain information on the quality of the environment and to make the information public. The Board is to review and appraise Federal programs, policies, etc., and make recommendations to the President and assist and advise the President in preparing an annual environmental quality report.

SEC. 303 provides for the annual report.

SEC. 304 authorizes employment of necessary staff.

SEC. 305 provides a million dollars annually for the Board.

> TITLE III simply renames the Council of the previous bills. It seems to be in direct conflict with the directives to the Director of OST, except that the key word, "policies," presumably gives it a leg-up over OST. It could in fact offer some staff support for the President's Council and is clearly intended to serve this role rather than to have OST do so. It seems to us to be only slightly more acceptable than the preceding bill.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Muskie Bill (S. 2391) (41 cosponsors plus two additional Senators who wish to be included at the next printing)

SEC. 103 would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Environmental Quality, with a Presidentially appointed Director and Deputy Director, and a staff. The Office is to assist and advise the President on Federal policies and programs, and "provide staff and support for any cabinet level council or committee established by the President to coordinate Federal activities which affect the environment." The Office would review and appraise Federal programs and policies, with due regard to priorities, coordination, criteria and standards, and potential effects of new or changing technologies. It would consult with and advise state, local and international bodies.

The Office would be directed to report to Congress annually by January 10 on measures taken to implement the Act; to collect and analyze data; and to convene a biennial symposium on current problems and issues concerning environmental quality, population, and the future.

SEC. 104 would direct the Office to establish broadly representative independent advisory committees.

SEC. 105 would authorize such funds "as may be necessary" for fiscal years 1970 through 1974.

The bill also declares that there is a policy for the environment already embodied in several Acts of Congress. This policy fails to recognize adequately the relation of pollution to natural resources and is by its nature fragmentary.

House

Dingell Bill (H. R. 6750): Amends Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide that the President transmit to the Congress an annual report on Environmental Quality, and establishes a three-man Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President to advise and assist the President in preparing the report and in recommending national policies, etc.

The Council on Environmental Quality is essentially the same as described in the Jackson Bill S. 1075 above and our comments are the same.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Daddario-Mosher Bill (H. R. 12000):

SEC. 1 would rename the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment and Population.

SEC. 2 would require the Department to monitor all natural resources including marine resources; "to be responsible for the continued or improved quality of the Nation's physical environment"; and to be responsible for population management policy.

SEC. 3 would transfer to the Department the Census Bureau, ESSA, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Appalachian Regional Commission, Interocean Canal Study Commission, TVA, Environmental Control Administration, and the National Air Pollution Control Administration.

SEC. 5 would require an annual report on the activities of the Department.

SECS. 4, 6, and 7 are concerned with legal and administrative details.

Reuss Bill (H. R. 11952):

SEC. 1 would transfer to the President's Environmental Quality Council, as established by Executive Order 11472 on May 19, 1969, "the executive branch functions pertaining to evaluating effects upon the environment" which may result from activities under a substantial number of existing statutes.

ESSA and all its functions would be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the President's Environmental Quality Council.

SEC. 2 is a statement of policy together with general directives from Congress to the agencies. One of these would require that all agencies include in legislative requests or other recommendations for action affecting the human environment "a finding by the responsible official that: (i) the environmental impact of the proposal action has been studied and considered; (ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided . . . are justified by stated considerations of national policy . . ."

SEC. 3 would require an annual report by January 20 from the Council, to include recommendations for needed legislation. In the Congress, the report would be referred to the Government Operations Committees.

SEC. 4 would authorize necessary funds for the Council.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Other related bills include the following:

S. 237 (McGovern) to establish a three-member Council of Advisors on Resources, Conservation and the Environment and, in both House and Senate, a Select Committee on Resources, Conservation and the Environment.

S. 1085 (Nelson) to establish a five-member Council on Environmental Quality.

S. 1752 (Nelson) to establish a five-member Council on Environmental Quality and a sixteen member Joint Committee on Environmental Quality in Congress.

S. 1818 (Tydings) to establish an Office of Environmental Quality to be served by a nine-member Council of Advisers.

H. R. 25 (Dingell-Karth) to establish a three-member Council on Environmental Quality.

H. R. 3114 (Reuss) to establish a three-member Council of Conservation Advisers and a sixteen-member Joint Conservation Committee in Congress.

H. R. 3329 (Tunney) to establish a nine-member Council of Ecological Advisers.

H. R. 8588 (Ashley) to establish a three-member Council of Advisors on Resources, Conservation, and the Environment and in both House and Senate, a Select Committee on Resources, Conservation and the Environment.

H. R. 11886 (Tunney) and H. R. 11942 (Griffiths) to establish a three-member Council on Environmental Quality.

H. R. 12143 (Nedzi). Essentially identical to H. R. 6750 (Dingell) except that it incorporates verbatim the policy statement from S. 1075 (Jackson).

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

STATEMENT BY DR. LEE A. DuBRIDGE
AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL

June 20, 1969

Everything outside of the human body constitutes our environment.

We not only live IN our environment, but we live OFF our environment. Everything required for human life and human activity comes from the environment. Our environment supplies the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat, and all of the materials we require not only for bare existence but for civilized living.

Life evolved on the planet we call the earth (and apparently on no other planet in our solar system) because the earth possesses the environmental characteristics necessary to sustain those physical-chemical processes which are essential to life.

The earth has the right temperature. If it were very much colder, chemical reactions would proceed too slowly to sustain life. If it were much

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

hotter, complex molecules necessary for life would quickly disintegrate.

The earth has in abundant and available form those chemical materials essential to life processes: oxygen, carbon, water, sodium, calcium, iron, etc. The form in which life evolved, in fact, was precisely that best adapted to make maximum use of the earth's chemical resources.

The process of living does not destroy the chemical elements which the earth provides, but it does automatically convert them into less available and less useable forms. Thus human beings in all their activities do not actually consume water, they simply contaminate it with other organic and inorganic materials. It may take considerable energy to remove these materials and restore the water to its pure form.

When we burn the carbon in coal, causing it to unite with the oxygen in air to produce heat, we do not destroy the carbon nor the oxygen, we simply form carbon dioxide which is no longer an energy source.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Fortunately, green plants use the energy from the sun to reverse this process and produce new supplies of carbon and oxygen.

When we extract iron from the earth and manufacture steel for our automobiles or buildings and other products, we do not destroy the iron atoms, we only convert them into a less useable form. In principle, the iron can be recovered and used; the process is however often very expensive.

In short, we do not "consume" the materials of our environment, we only degrade them. We convert them from useable products to waste products. We thus degrade our environmental heritage.

In the days when the population of the earth was very small, this degradation of the environment caused by human activities was often imperceptible. The resources of the planet appeared to be almost infinite in comparison with the needs of human beings. Today, with a very large human population living in highly industrialized societies, we realize that we are using or degrading our environmental resources at an alarming rate.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

If we are to live at all, some degradation of the environment is unavoidable. The problem is, how can we reduce the degradation to a minimum and how can we restore the quality of the environment in which we must live?

Prevention and Enhancement

There is both a positive and a negative side to the environment problem. Just as man can mar the beauty of his environment, he can also enhance it. He can plant trees and flowers and shrubs. He can build beautiful homes, buildings and other structures. He can set aside preserves where forests, plants and wildlife will flourish and reproduce. He can clean up the ugly piles of waste, debris and junk which previous generations have left behind and which this generation continues to produce.

Even more important is the prevention of unnecessary environmental degradation. As pointed out above, it is an essential fact of life that every human activity, especially in an industrialized society, produces waste

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

materials. If we are careless, these waste materials will pollute our air and our water and degrade the beauty and usefulness of our lands. If we are careful, we can avoid such results.

Avoiding Pollution

There are two essential steps which must be taken throughout the nation to avoid the pollution of our air and water with materials harmful or dangerous to life. First, disease-carrying organisms must be destroyed or degraded into harmless forms before disposal. Second, dangerous, poisonous or noxious chemicals must be removed and separately disposed of.

These are straightforward tasks in principle, but the practical difficulties are very great. New technologies are needed to remove harmful materials from stack gases and liquid effluents. One must examine automobile and diesel exhausts, the stack gases from power plants, industrial processing plants, homes and apartment buildings and every other potential source of pollutant either liquid or gaseous. Furthermore, it is never possible to reduce the pollutant content to an absolute zero, and it is never possible to

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

achieve the process without a cost or penalty. Thus, standards must be set which are reasonable and economically feasible, but they must be flexible so that more stringent standards can be set when technology permits or when it is found that harmful effects to living things may be produced by very small amounts of a given pollutant.

Responsibility for regulation and control may exist in municipal, regional, state or federal agencies and jurisdictional problems are often severe. Different areas of the country with different climatological and meteorological conditions may require different standards and different regulations.

Non-harmful but Objectionable Pollutants

Eliminating physiologically harmful pollutants may be simpler than removing pollutants which are objectionable but not definitely harmful. Public opinion will surely not tolerate dangerous pollutants and will support mechanisms to eliminate them. But even sterile or non-poisonous wastes dumped into the

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

atmosphere, or into lakes, rivers or oceans may constitute a degradation of the environment which we should seek to reduce. Here there may be public resistance, especially on the part of those who must pay the bills and who may contend that disposing of "harmless" materials should be permissible if this is the cheapest way to dispose of them at all. Here public opinion and a sense of good citizenship on the part of individuals and companies must be engendered in the search for acceptable alternatives.

Competing Requirements

There is, nevertheless, a valid competition between the needs of our society to provide living and working facilities for its people to develop natural resources, to foster economic progress while at the same time one avoids unnecessary envrionmental degradation. The siting of a power plant which is essential to provide the requirements for a city may nevertheless meet objections from those who wish to preserve the natural environment to avoid possible dangers or contamination or to interfere with recreational areas.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

A new highway may be essential to provide travel facilities and to reduce traffic congestion, yet it may impinge on residential or recreation areas, it may mar the beauty of a rural countryside or introduce noise or air pollution.

Every new residential or industrial development, every new highway, dam, harbor, bridge or waterway may change the character of the environment sometimes in objectionable ways to some people. Forests must be cut to supply lumber and paper for our every-day needs. Minerals, oil and fuels must be retrieved from the earth. Water must be diverted from natural rivers into canals and viaducts to provide for agricultural and domestic use. Thus, we daily of necessity interfere with our environment. To insist that there should be no environmental interference would be to insist that human life should cease or that economic development would come to a halt.

The choice between alternatives becomes one of the most difficult decisions to be made at various layers of government. Without question,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

environmental effects and impacts have been unduly neglected in the past. It is important that they not be unduly exaggerated in the future. It will be the task of the Environmental Council to develop rules and policies whereby the competition between uses of the environment can be examined and resolved for the maximum public benefit.

Long-term Problems

Environmental problems will not be cured overnight. Scientific and technological research needs to be initiated in many areas to find new ways for less objectionable disposal of waste materials. The biological effects of many kinds of materials need to be more carefully studied. Extensive systems studies should be undertaken to determine total ecological or social, technological and human factors. Specialists in environmental and ecological studies need to be trained, and a long-term program of public education needs to be initiated.

Environmental problems do not remain static. As population increases, as the need for more energy increases, as industrialization proceeds, minor contaminants may become major ones. If our environment is to be improved

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

and not just maintained in the status quo, ever-increasing standards of environmental considerations need to be developed and implemented. It is a nation-wide, indeed a world-wide, problem and a nation-wide, and possibly a world-wide, effort will be needed to cope with it. One must run faster even to stay in the same place, and still faster to achieve substantial improvement over the long pull.

###

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

This Copy For _____

N E W S C O N F E R E N C E #225

AT THE WHITE HOUSE

WITH RON ZIEGLER
AND DR. LEE A. DuBRIDGE, SCIENCE
ADVISER TO THE PRESIDENT

AT 5:12 P.M. EDT

JUNE 20, 1969

FRIDAY

MR. ZIEGLER: The meeting of the Council on Environmental Quality met from 3:00 until 5 o'clock. Dr. DuBridge will give you a report on that meeting.

DR. DuBRIDGE: Yes. As I mentioned this morning, this was an organizational meeting. There was a very full attendance and a very vigorous discussion.

The President led off by stating again his keen interest in the Federal Government taking a leadership role in the improvement of our environment, and in prevention of further degradation or pollution of the environment.

It was agreed that we would have approximately monthly meetings of the full committee, although we are going to omit a July meeting.

The President invited the Council to meet at the White House in San Clemente, California, for its August meeting.

MR. ZIEGLER: That is further confirmation that the President will be in San Clemente in August.

Q What date?

DR. DuBRIDGE: The precise date has not been set. It will be in late August.

MR. ZIEGLER: That is further confirmation that we are going to be in California.

DR. DuBRIDGE: Did I slip out something?

MR. ZIEGLER: No.

DR. DuBRIDGE: For those of you who were here this morning, we covered all of the items that I mentioned on the agenda. We divided up the general problems into the problems of air pollution, of water pollution, of land pollution -- spoiling the land -- and then some special problems such as noise that will be separately treated.

We also looked at the geographic problems. There are regional problems, there are local problems, there are State problems, and there are municipal problems.

MORE

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Some of these things involve both air and water pollution.

In the field of pesticides, the report was that Agriculture, Interior and HEW have already actively started a coordinated study of the whole problem of pesticides and what to do about them.

The staffs of those departments will work with my staff during the coming weeks to present at the next meeting a package of information and proposals for action.

On the other agenda items which I mentioned this morning, in each case a cabinet committee was appointed to study and come back promptly with recommendations for Federal action.

These are:

On solid wastes, a committee of which Secretary Romney would be chairman and Secretaries Hardin, Hickel and Finch will be members, to look at the whole problem of solid wastes and their proper use and disposal.

One item in the field of air pollution which was given special attention was that of the pollution caused by automotive vehicles, both the short-range problem of what can be done with present internal combustion engines and the long-range problem of whether there is something in the future that may replace the internal combustion engine.

Again, a committee consisting of the Secretary of Transportation as chairman and the Secretaries of HEW, Commerce and HUD as members, to bring back reports on what is being done and what can be done to accelerate the reduction of pollution caused by automotive vehicles.

The noise problem came in for a good deal of discussion, as to how to reduce the noise that is harmful in industrial plants -- for example, where workers are subject to a level of noise which causes serious impairment of hearing -- onto the noise which may not be physiologically harmful but is certainly very objectionable in our cities and near our railroads or freeways, or industrial plants.

The committee appointed to recommend action in this area consisted of the Secretary of Commerce as chairman, with the Secretaries of HEW, HUD and Transportation as members.

In the field of the handling of toxic materials and the transportation of potentially dangerous chemicals for industrial use across the country or along waterways, the handling of all kinds of both waste and useful dangerous chemicals, this problem for study and recommendation was assigned to a committee consisting of the Secretary of Transportation as chairman, with the Secretaries of HEW, Agriculture and Interior as members.

They will bring in as observers representatives from the Department of Defense, Department of State -- since international problems are often involved -- and the Atomic

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Energy Commission.

In the field of outdoor recreation, the Secretary of Interior requested authority to set up a sub-cabinet level interagency standing committee to deal with all the problems of providing adequate facilities for our people for outdoor recreation -- parks, playgrounds -- both in the rural areas and in the cities.

We discussed in a more general way some of the items for future consideration at the meetings and these will come up at future meetings and will be subject to announcement at that time.

It was a very vigorous and lively meeting.

I should mention that Mr. Rockefeller was present as Chairman of the newly formed Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, and he has agreed to give a full report at the next meeting on the activities of his organization and all the related organizations, volunteer organizations around the country that are dealing with the problems of environment, recreation, beauty and so on.

The President was vigorously interested in having Mr. Rockefeller serve as a link to the community of interested people around the country. We will enlist their support, their help and their advice through the channel of Mr. Rockefeller's committee and such other agencies and volunteer organizations as are active in this field.

MR. ZIEGLER: Thank you very much.

MORE

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Q I have Mr. Volpe down as chairman of two committees. Is that correct?

DR. DuBRIDGE: I think that is ,right. We are loading these Cabinet members pretty heavily, but he was the logical chairman in each case.

MR. ZIEGLER : Thank you very much, Doctor.

I have one additional bit of information.

The President will have two meetings tomorrow.

Gardiner Baron Casey, who is the former Governor General of Australia, will pay a courtesy call at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Casey is the former Governor General of Australia, and Minister to the United States from 1940 to 1942. He opened the Australian Embassy here.

Q Are you speaking of the new chancery by any chance?

MR. ZIEGLER: He opened the original Embassy back in the 40's.

The purpose of Mr. Casey's visit to the United States was to preside at the official dedication of the new Australian Embassy Chancery here today.

At 11:00 a.m., the President will meet with the Honorable C. Burke Elbrick, the Ambassador to Brazil. Ambassador Elbrick was confirmed by the Senate on May 1.

He is meeting with the President before he leaves for Brazil.

Ambassador is one of the most senior foreign service officers the Government has. He has served as the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Ambassador to Portugal, and, since 1964, as Ambassador to Yugoslavia. He is a career Ambassador.

There will be no briefing here tomorrow, but we will be here to provide any information that may be available such, as times of the meetings, and so forth.

We will probably have a picture of these two occurrences.

Q Does "no briefing" mean that you are not going to have any news announcements?

MR. ZIEGLER: We will have no announcements, that is correct, tomorrow.

Q Would you care to describe for us a report on the President's conference this morning about the seizure of six San Diego tuna boats off the coast of Ecuador?

MR. ZIEGLER: There was no conference this morning on that subject.

MORE

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum

Q Senator Murphy says there was. You are saying Senator Murphy is not telling the truth?

MR. ZIEGLER: No. Senator Murphy, of course, is one of our finest United States Senators.

Senator Murphy was here for the posthumous Medal awards. He spent a short time with the President.

I think Jerry has confirmed that. He spent about seven minutes with the President. I wasn't in the room, but they probably discussed the matter in general terms.

Q He makes it sound rather large.

MR. ZIEGLER: It was an important event.

Q In that sense?

MR. ZIEGLER : In that sense.

Q Is the White House going to have any pronouncement soon on maybe doing something about guidelines for desegregation of schools, changing them, abandoning them, or postponing them?

MR. ZIEGLER: No. The White House plans no announcement.

Q Will there be any messages next week?

MR. ZIEGLER : There is a possibility of some messages next week, but it is not a certainty.

Q Did you say "some"?

MR. ZIEGLER: A possibility of a or some, but not a certainty. In other words, there could be some messages next week. I won't say that there will be.

Q Not on Monday anyway, Ron?

MR. ZIEGLER: Not on Monday.

Q On what subjects?

MR. ZIEGLER: I don't know.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END (AT 5:25 PM EDT)

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum