

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Bob Haldeman RE: Six Crises. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Copy of a memo from RN to John Ehrlichman regarding a political comeback. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Gerry Van der Heuvel asking for a book on First Ladies for PN, Tricia Nixon, Lucy Winchester, and der Heuvel. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to John Ehrlichman asking for him to deal with the mass of golf balls he received for Christmas. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Bob Haldeman regarding pictures being circulated. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Bob Haldeman RE: Pearson columns. Handwritten notes added by unknown. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Copy of a memo from Rose Mary Woods to Bob Haldeman RE: memo dictated by RN. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to John Mitchell, Bob Finch, Bryce Harlow, Pat Moynihan, and Bob Haldeman RE: New York welfare. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Copy of a memo from RN to John Ehrlichman RE: Moynihan memo. 2 pgs.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Henry Kissinger and Bob Haldeman asking for better foreign policy officials within the White House. 2 pgs.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Bob Haldeman RE: potential political appointments. 3 pgs.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Copy of a memo from RN to Bob Haldeman and Moynihan regarding Moynihan's memo. 1 pg.
1	43	01/09/1969	Memo	Copy of a memo from Daniel P. Moynihan to RN regarding the "urban crisis." 7 pgs.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Don Hughes asking for him to arrange transportation for Vice President Humphrey. 1 pg.
1	43	01/15/1969	Memo	Memo from RN to Rose Mary Woods RE: letter to Pat Brown. Contains response by Woods and handwritten notes added by unknown. 1 pg.

January 15, 1969

BOB HALDEMAN

Originally RN dictated this memo to Finch and Moynihan and then added Mitchell and Harlow.

He said to put on your copy: I want a report on what has happened on this memorandum within two weeks after January 20.

rmw.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Mitchell
Bob Finch
Bryce Harlow
Pat Moynihan

cc: Bob Haldeman

FROM: RN

This New York welfare mess is probably typical of a problem which exists all over the country. I want a thorough investigation made, with all the resources that we have at our disposal, so that we can set the stage for what we have to do later in cutting some of these purely political programs. You will get a lot of nonsense from the establishment in the departments that this is "chicken feed," etc., --this, of course, is the line that Lindsay and his people take -- but the American people are outraged and, in my view, they should be.

I would like Harlow to discuss this with the appropriate legislative leaders on our side to see if they can get cooperation from some good investigating committee to look into this whole matter. Possibly John McClellan might appoint a special sub-committee to investigate the welfare programs.

I do not want this swept under the rug or put aside on the ground that we want to have an "era of good feeling" with the bureaucrats as we begin. This whole thing smells to high heaven and we should get charging on it immediately.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman

FROM: RN

With regard to the pictures that are to be sent around to the government departments and to the embassies abroad, I would like to see three or four of the best Halseman prints blown up into the size that will eventually be used. I have found that a blown up picture may look very different than the smaller one.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Ehrlichman
FROM: RN

In the memento department - I note that I have received a hundred or so "Mr. President" golf balls for Christmas.

I would suggest that you see if Don Carnevale could find an inexpensive way to mount a ball on a plaque and then, with an appropriate inscription, I would give it to people who come in who happen to be golfers. For example, the inscription might be "To be used only for a hole-n-one with best wishes from Richard Nixon."

You will remember the golf ball that I have in my office downtown - I don't recall that it was mounted in such a way that it would be useful in this case but check it out and work something inexpensive out if you think it is advisable.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gerry Van der Heuvel
FROM: RN

I think it would be helpful if you would get the best book on First Ladies - as well as the best book on the history of entertainment in the White House and see that Mrs. Nixon, Tricia and Lucy Winchester, as well as yourself, have copies.

Along this line there may be an outstanding magazine article on the role of the First Lady as well as one on the White House background.

Don't get a whole mass of material together but be discriminating in picking out the very best which might be read with profit by those involved.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Ehrlichman

FROM: RN

In talking with the PR and Research groups you might indicate one effective way to get the come-back story told would be to suggest a book or a major article entitled "The Great Come-backs in American Political History," or if a broader scope is desired -- "The Great Political Come-backs." Limit it to major political figures, of course.

This could make a very exciting book or article if we could get somebody of real stature to undertake it.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

Sometime ago I asked for a check to be made with regard to "Six Crises" - how many hard cover we still have which can be used for autographing and the status with regard to paperbacks on the new edition. Also, I would like a report with regard to the ownership of both the hard cover and paper back rights at this time.


January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

I want you to ride herd on  Klein to see that someone is assigned to read the Pearson columns for the purpose of determining whether anyone in the Administration has violated my counsel for them not to talk to his people. The one exception here, of course, is Rogers who is smart enough to handle his situation.

The time to deal with this kind of problem is right at the outset of an Administration rather than waiting until we get burned.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN
RE: Some Odds and Ends

Paul Smith at Whittier College should be put on some kind of a commission. There is probably an historic commission or something in connection with the Smithsonian. Have someone check the commissions of this type and then make an offer to him.

In that connection, the Pete Flanigan operation does not cover this kind of appointment. What I would like to have within a week after the Inauguration is a list of commissions not requiring fulltime activity but which would mean something from a prestige standpoint to those who receive the appointments. There are at least 75 to 100 of these, according to my recollection. Someone should get on this project before Johnson gets out or at least find out who on the continuing White House staff would have this kind of information. I want to change the membership of all of these commissions wherever I have the option to do so and I want to search around the country to see that people who want some recognition, but who are too decent to ask for it, are properly recognized. For example, I imagine there is some kind of a commission that has to do with medical things -- I would like to put Dr. DeLuccia on that commission.

Along the same lines, Whitney Stone would be a superb

appointment to any kind of a commission of this type. A check should be made with John Alexander as to what Stone might like. This is also a way to take care of people we were unable to give fulltime appointments to.

With regard to the White House historian, I wonder if there is any possibility we might get Hugh Sidey? He has done some brilliant writing on the character of the Presidency and he might see this as an opportunity to round out a distinguished career on that subject. You - rather than Klein - should make the check in this case.

In the PR field - I think ~~the~~ the area where we have fallen down the most is on the comeback theme. Would you get Klein, Wilkinson, Garment, Ziegler, et al to see what can be done to get this story properly across. Incidentally, I have the feeling that our whole PR operation has fallen between the stools since the election. It seems to lack direction and purpose and needs a thorough shake-up. For example, we ought to have a recommendation as to what our PR line should be in the first year of the Administration. This should come from the Garment group and others who might have some kind of in-put, including the research types, etc.

Along these same lines, the idea of a young staff, which I was emphasizing in the latter weeks of the campaign, has failed to come through at all except in the very early White House staff appointments.

Also, we have not gotten through the fact that we have cut substantially the size of the White House staff and some of the extraordinary expenses. I want this handled in a way that it

will not embarrass Johnson personally but that this is simply the RN method of operating.

On both of these subjects I want a progress memorandum within a week after January 20.

The fact that this is a new Administration with young men and new ideas; the fact that the President is setting a real example of not only efficient operation, but of cutting down on personnel. The fact that there is more brainpower in this a Administration than any in twenty years. These are some ideas that I want discussed with the PR group and ways found to get them across. Obviously, one way is to get the top flight columnists to write it and then send it around. Another and better way is to get somebody to do a piece on Television. The press is nailing us very effectively as being a rather efficient, colorless continuation of the past Administration. This, incidentally, is our fault and not theirs. They write this when we have failed to give them something to write.

Incidentally, I do not want a copy of this memorandum that I am dictating sent around to anybody. It is to be handled orally but very hard with all types involved so as to shake them up.

#

*Original marked
Rush*

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Henry Kissinger/ Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

The major hole in our White House staff operation is in our failure to have a man to whom I can refer people who have foreign policy problems they want to bring to the attention of the President. It is no answer to say that whenever such problems are raised I refer them to the State Department people. The kind of problems I am referring to have already been taken up with State Department and the people who speak to me are completely dissilusioned with the way State has been handling the matter. I had four examples of this at the dinner for Maury Stans: John King wanted to discuss some problems with regard to the Mid-East. Tom Pappas wanted to discuss Greece and related Mid-East problems. George Champion wanted to discuss his scheme for a new approach to our aid programs in the Far East and Southeast Asia and several people had ideas on Vietnam. And, Max Fisher, of course, had his Israeli ideas.

In each of these instances, I would not want to refer the matter (the people) to Kissinger. On the other hand, we have to have a man on the White House staff - or maybe even two - to whom I can refer people of this type who have ideas and need to have somebody to listen to them. My immediate reaction would be to give Dick Allen this responsibility. At least he learned to listen to this kind of complaint during the campaign.

I would like for Haldeman and Kissinger to discuss this matter and give me a name so that a name will be available to me by January 20.

Incidentally, this name should be available not only to me but to everybody else on the White House staff. You will find that at least fifty percent of all requests to talk to RN will be in the foreign policy field and we simply have to find a "listener" at the earliest possible time.

Along these same lines, I would like for Haldeman to indicate to the whole White House staff, as well as to me, who is to handle other subjects when inquiries are made.

#

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Don Hughes
FROM: RN

Would you also, in addition to seeing that Johnson has a plane to carry him back to Texas, arrange for Vice President Humphrey to have a plane to take him to Minnesota in the event he wants to go that same day. As you may recall, all that we had was an automobile for the balance of the day.

I do not know what the situation is with regard to Secret Service coverage for the Vice President after he leaves office. My guess is that only the President is covered. I think, however, that I have the right to issue an order in this respect and if I do have that authority, I want Humphrey to have a modest Secret Service coverage for a period of six months after he leaves office.

(Don -- I believe Bob Haldeman and/or John Ehrlichman are the ones who have been working out our problems, etc., with Secret Service. rmw)

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

I want you to ride herd on Klein to see that someone is assigned to read the Pearson columns for the purpose of determining whether anyone in the Administration has violated my counsel for them not to talk to his people. The one exception here, of course, is Rogers who is smart enough to handle his situation.

The time to deal with this kind of problem is right at the outset of an Administration rather than waiting until we get burned.

January 16, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: RN

I have expressed to Goodpastor, Kissinger, as well as to John Mitchell, my concern with regard to the personnel and operations of CIA. That is one of the reasons I am looking for a second man who will not just be another member of the CIA establishment.

Within three to four weeks of January 20, I would like for you to pull together the thoughts that these and others may have on CIA and also check to see what action can be taken by Executive Order without being submitted to the Congress in order to get it on the right track. Bob Murphy, incidentally, should be consulted on this since he is a member of the over-all national intelligence board. You will run into a great deal of inertia and resistance because CIA has been investigated scores of times and always comes out more ingrown and incestious than ever. I am determined, however, to do something about it.. Have Harlow put Scoop Jackson on my appointment at an early date because I want to discuss this with him.

(Bob -- RN actually said "Scoop Taylor" but I am sure it is Senator Scoop Jackson. rmw)

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Ehrlichman
FROM: RN

I want you to read the Moynihan memorandum on the District of Columbia and give recommendations as to what action we should take on each of the items. Obviously a discussion both with John Mitchell and Moynihan in preparing such recommendations would be in order. What, for example, we do about the reorganization plan? The appointments to the City Council and other items will be on our desk immediately after January 20. The Congressional representation recommendation is one I would accept. Rebuilding the city with ~~ax~~ black ownership as recommended in Section 5, might provide a good test tube experiment for some of our ideas on black capital.

The District of Columbia has always been an orphan as far as proper government is concerned due in some part to the fact that the committees in Congress in Congress are the lowest on the totem pole and get pretty poor people on them as a result.

On the other hand, in terms of the "image" of an Administration, nothing we do in any city across the country will have more impact than what we do in the District of Columbia. Not only the Washington papers - the Post and the Star and Daily News will write about what happens there but also the Washington correspondents for other papers who live in the Washington area will either be impressed or critical of what we do.

In other words, while I have always felt that the District was a pretty hopeless problem, it seems to me that this is one area where we can't help but improve on what our predecessors have done. Moynihan seems to have a very good feel for it and I urge that his recommendations not be rejected without proper consideration. The tendency is to simply go along with things as they are - to patch over the problems. What I am trying to convey is a sense of real urgency and interest on my part. I would like to have the best District of Columbia program -- one that I could present in a special message to the Congress -- ready within 30 to 60 days after the Inaugural.

#

RMW

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: ~~Bob~~ Haldeman
FROM: ~~cc:~~ Moynihan
RN

The Moynihan memorandum of January 9 on urban problems should be made available to the research team and to the Cabinet members who are on the Urban Affairs Council. It should be emphasized in distributing this memorandum and others like it, which will be coming in, that this is not a final policy paper but the kind of incisive and stimulating analysis which I think should constantly be brought to the attention of policymakers. Be sure also that Garment gets a copy of this memorandum and of others like it in the future.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Richard M. Nixon

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Urban Crisis

Revised ?

9 January 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: The President Elect

FROM: Daniel P. Moynihan

In the months ahead I will be harrassing you with details of the "urban crisis." Whatever the urgency of the matters I bring before you, I will be doing so in an essentially optimistic posture, which is to say that I will routinely assume that our problems are manageable if only we will manage them. This is the only position possible for government. Yet, of course, it does not necessarily reflect reality. It may be our problems are not manageable, or that we are not capable of summoning the effort required to respond effectively. It seems to me important that you know that there are responsible persons who are very near to just that conclusion. (To be sure, twenty years ago in many scientific/academic circles it was taken as settled that the world would shortly blow itself up, yet we are still here.)

I had thought to summarize the views of the apocalyptic school, ranging in style as it does from the detached competence

of Lewis Mumford who for forty years had foretold the approach of "Necropolis," the City of the Dead, all the way to the more hysterical members of the New Left who assume that the only thing that can save this civilization is for it to be destroyed. However, I have just come upon a document that states the case much more effectively than I might, being a summary of the views of a group of careful men who recently met to discuss the state of New York City. I am associated with a quarterly journal, The Public Interest, which is devoting a special issue to New York. On December 17 we assembled a group of city officials and similarly informed persons for a day-long session at the Century Club. (I could not be present owing to my new assignment.) Paul Weaver, a young assistant professor of government at Harvard, attended as a kind of rapporteur. Later he summarized his impression of the meeting in terms that seem to me persuasive, and as he himself put it, "not a little chilling."

His central point -- an immensely disturbing one -- is that the social system of American and British democracy that grew up in the 18th and 19th century -- was able to be exceedingly permissive with regard to public matters precisely because it could depend on its citizens being quite disciplined with respect to private ones. He speaks of "private sub-systems of authority," such as the family, church, and local community, which regulated behavior, instilled motivation, etc., in such

a way as to make it unnecessary for the State to intervene in order to protect "the public interest." More and more it would appear these subsystems are breaking down in the immense city of New York. If this should continue, democracy breaks down.

To be sure, New York City is not America, etc. Yet my discussions with District officials would suggest that things are not that different in Washington, and in general, throughout the nation trends are in the New York direction. (You may have noted that Lindsay's next budget provides for 1.3 million persons being on welfare by June 1970.)

What this comes to is the realization that much of what is now termed "the crisis of the cities" is more a moral and cultural crisis than a material one. Indeed it is frequently the former that produces the latter. Weaver, for example, refers to the "growing rate of building abandonment" in New York. It would seem impossible that land in New York City could become valueless, but this is true in the worst slums. Whole "zones of abandonment" are growing up in Brooklyn, with owners literally leaving their vandalized properties behind, much as slum dwellers abandon junked automobiles on city streets.

Clearly material programs are a necessary condition of reversing the trend of events, but they are not sufficient in themselves. Somehow the country must come to understand the

Weaver

nature of its "urban crisis." This is the highest task of leadership.

The key problem is that of late the rhetoric of "liberalism" in its more narrow political sense, has become increasingly hostile to those subsystems. As a result, "The thoroughly liberal society,...cannot know what makes it work."

Here is Weaver's summary of the day's discussion:

1. The social fabric of New York City is coming to pieces. It isn't just "strained" and it isn't just "frayed;" but like a sheet of rotten canvas, it is beginning to rip, and it won't be too long until even a moderate force will be capable of leaving it in shreds and tatters. No doubt I'm being too apocalyptic. Still, consider some of the evidence. Among a large and growing lower class, self-reliance, self-discipline, and industry are waning; a radical disproportion is arising between reality and expectations concerning job, living standard, and so on; unemployment is high but a lively demand for unskilled labor remains unmet; illegitimacy is increasing; families are more and more matrifocal and atomized; crime and disorder are sharply on the rise. There is, in short, a progressive disorganization of society, a growing pattern of frustration and mistrust. This, I take it, is one of the reasons for the high and growing rate of

----- Weaver

building abandonment; the immediate area surrounding the lot is such as to render the value of the land nil, even for the potential resident owner. This general pathology, moreover, appears to be infecting the Puerto Rican community as well as the Negro. (It is a stirring, if generally unrecognized demonstration of the power of our welfare machine.) A large segment of the population is becoming incompetent and destructive. Growing parasitism, both legal and illegal, is the result; so, also, is violence.

2. Something comparable is happening in the political arena. New York used to be the very model of moderate, materialistic, incremental Madisonian politics. Only the goo-goos challenged the whole system, but not out of self-interest, and rarely intemperately. Otherwise, participation was limited to the pursuit of limited self-interest; live-and-let-live logrolling was both fact and value; and conflict was avoided as much as possible. But today, there is the "spirit of confrontation," in which self-interest and a desire to change the system are merged in groups which depend for their existence on pursuing a "conflict" strategy. The result is that, to the extent this pattern exists, political executives are less free to determine the mix of (partly inconsistent) values and

----- Weaver

interests which best defines the public interest; public tranquility is unsettled; and political cohesion is threatened. The consequence is to increase the tension between responsibility and responsiveness in government. Thus, Lindsay orders a "no-arrest" policy at precisely the point when law and order are manifestly in decay; it "cools" the city "off" in the short run but may heat it up in the long run. The general problem is whether representative government can maintain a country or city which is divided against itself and which discounts its long-term interest so heavily.

3, Are we then witnessing the ultimate, destructive working out of the telos of liberal thought? The viability of liberal thought rested on the ability of the country which adopted it to be largely self-regulating, self-maintaining, and self-improving. As long as the typical individual was formed and directed in socially useful ways by the more or less autonomous operations of private subsystems of authority, a government which permitted great freedom and engaged largely in the negative and peripheral activity of the umpire was possible. It was also possible for citizen and statesman to live with a rhetoric which denied the existence, functions, and basis of those private subsystems. Being traditional, those subsystems were

----- Weaver

(on the rhetoric's terms) "irrational;" being particularistic, they were not "universal;" constituting and maintaining differences among men, they fostered "inequality;" and forming character and directing energy as they did, they were "authoritarian." The thoroughly liberal society, in short, cannot know what makes it work. Now, in parts of New York City, those subsystems are absolutely breaking down. At the same time, the rhetoric is getting an ever stronger and more blinding grip on "informed" opinion as well as on partisan opinion. The rhetoric leads to policies which actually hasten the dissolution of the subsystems.

That the society is breaking down means that the liberal state will no longer do. It must, on pain of anarchy or civil war, be replaced by a regime which explicitly recognizes the necessity of the subsystems and which is prepared to create substitutes for those subsystems when they breakdown. Our problem is that informed opinion is moving in precisely the opposite direction.

4. All of which is to say that we are moving from Locke to Hobbes. This does not mean we need the Leviathan because the war of all against all is still confined to one segment of the population. There are plenty of public spirited and peaceful people around. But their opinions need to be changed, and the resources of their government increased, or at least centralized.

January 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO: RMW

FROM: RN

*file
memo's*

In trying to clean up the ~~fix~~ odds and ends of mail there was one folder of congrats which included a letter from Pat Brown. I think I either answered these or left them out for answers. The way to make sure is to see whether the letter to Pat Brown went out. Let me know if it did not.

YES YOU WROTE A LETTER TO PAT BROWN AND SEVERAL SIMILAR TYPES AT THE SAME TIME. YOU PUT THEM ON A TAPE.

rmwoods

1/16/69