

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>
46	22	02/18/1961	Other Document	Address by Robert Finch: President's Associates Dinner at Occidental College. 18 pages.
46	22	n.d.	Other Document	Handwritten list: Sen., Cab., W. H., Gov., Relig., Pres., Cong., Bus., Educ. 1 page.
46	22	07/20/1960	Memo	Bob Haldeman to Advance Men, re: Article examples of what not to do. 6 pages with attachments.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT FINCH
PRESIDENT'S ASSOCIATES DINNER
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE
FEBRUARY 18, 1961

P. J.

As I rather modestly attempt to convey to you what I believe the lessons of the 1960 presidential campaign should be to each one of us as citizens, educators, business men and the like, it seems to me I should first lay down one or two ground rules.

The first is that with the understanding that ^{this is totally} ~~there are no press~~ ^{off the record} present, I am speaking in complete candor with the hope that what my remarks may lack in rhetoric they will make up in conviction. ^{Don't mistake candor} ^{for apology.}

Secondly, I will generally attempt to be as objective as possible ^{although I'm sure it is obvious} ~~because all of us recognize~~ that my involvement in this campaign was such ^{some} that bias must necessarily be present.

Finally, I must make it clear that I speak only for myself and do not want any implications raised that I am in any way expressing another person's point of view unless I specifically so label it.

Turning first to what might be termed the anatomy of this campaign, I should like to take you back with me to December of 1958 to Florida where Len Hall and I met with Nixon to discuss the 1960 nomination. I ask you to recall the situation at that time. The Republican Party had just been through a brutal debacle at the polls and suffered massive losses across the nation. We experienced our own share of it here in California, with which ^{many} most of you are painfully familiar. The Eastern press, particularly the New York Times, was heralding Nelson Rockefeller as the new ^{Republican} White Knight in shining armor and had written Nixon off for 1960. The Gallup Polls in December of '58

showed Rockefeller leading Nixon as the popular choice for the Republican nomination. Certainly no political leader in recent history had been so *maligned* ~~thoroughly shot at~~ and attacked as had Nixon since 1952.

At the conclusion of the 1958 campaign then, these were the raw political facts. The Democrats outregistered the Republicans 3 - 2 across the country. The Democrats held a 2 - 1 margin in the Senate and House and in state governorships. To be more specific, in 1958 the Republicans only had 14 governors, controlled both houses of the state legislature in only 7 states, only had 592 state senators and only 1,942 state representatives across the country.

As a matter of interest, it is significant to note that in 1952 the Republicans had 30 governors as against only 14 in 1958, 26 states with two-house legislative control in 1952 as against 7 in 1958, 857 state senators in 1952 as against 592 in 1958, and 2,809 state representatives in 1952 as against 1,942 in 1958. In 1952, of course, we controlled the House of Representatives, but in 1958 we had only 153 Republican congressmen. This was the sad state of the Republican organization and of the Nixon fortunes at this point in time. And I can say categorically that as 1958 came to a close Dick Nixon had grievous doubts about whether it was possible for him, or indeed any Republican, to win in 1960.

I think it worth noting that at this moment when Dick Nixon was still in the throes of his own personal decision and without any *semblance of a personal* organization, Jack Kennedy had been moving in an organized fashion for over two years to seek the goal which he later successfully obtained.

The decision having been made to seek the nomination, a variety of factors came together in the next year and a half to improve this unfavorable situation and bring Dick Nixon the Republican nomination.

First and foremost is the result of the manner in which he conducted himself in office, later of course came the unexpected bonus of the Russian trip and the Kitchen Debates, and finally the settling of the steel strike, all of which provided him with a much greater degree of public acceptance and an improved position in the polls.

A second factor, not appreciated by many observers, was the great equity Dick had with the working politicians of the country in 1952, 1954, 1956 and 1958 -- when other campaigners of national stature for the GOP were all too rare.

Finally, there was the undeniably compelling factor that he was the Vice President in an on-going administration, one heart beat away from the Presidential office. And for a convention to have repudiated Nixon would have been for that convention to repudiate the Administration itself.

Looking back, however, upon the various presidential preferential primaries, I must observe that in retrospect from a staff point of view, it might have been to Nixon's advantage to have had to contest in party primaries with opposition as Kennedy did. In other words, after Rockefeller's withdrawal, we were forced to enter Nixon's name in some 12 primaries where Dick could not physically campaign in the way that Kennedy had to. Therefore, without any opposition we had no opportunity to test key campaign personnel on any scale and develop our team in the heat and tumult of actual campaigns.

Now, lets look in a bit more detail at some specific criticisms that have been made of the Nixon Campaign

The first, of course, which raises controversy relates ^{to} the Debates. Critics state it was a mistake in the first place to have any debates. I point out that even prior to the conventions the chairmen of both parties testifying before Congressional committees, had committed themselves to the principle of "great debates" for the reason that they felt they would be able to save many millions of dollars of television expense. Strong pressure had, of course, been generated by the TV networks who felt that these public service affairs would obscure the payola and ^{rigging} giving scandals of the previous year. But beyond this commitment I can tell you that in a poll which was taken in the interlude between the Republican and Democrat conventions that the established Kennedy-Johnson ticket ran a minimum of 10 points better than any combination of Nixon-Rockefeller, Nixon-Lodge, or Nixon-Morton. In other words, those who said, "Why did you agree to debate, weren't you ahead?" were not aware of the fact that when the decision as to the debates had to be made, the best data available showed the Republican ticket substantially behind.

In my opinion ^{FAIR} a criticism of the Debates is not the decision as to whether they should be held (which in my opinion was unavoidable), but rather should go to the format which was adopted. In other words, instead of the give and take of the classical style of debate (which was Nixon's first instinct) and which would have afforded discussion of the issues in depth, what was achieved was a kind of glorified "meet the press" (but with a limited ^{In short deliberately} few minutes for answers. They were ¹designed to entertain; not to inform.

T

in my opinion
This worked for the benefit of Kennedy who provided glib generalizations with limited chance to rebut, and since most of the questions by the panel *dealt with* were specific, there was really no opportunity to discuss basic philosophy.

Finally, it must be recognized that for our ticket to win it was necessary to get eight to ten million Democratic votes, plus between 55 and 60 per cent of the Independent vote. And certainly despite the television appearances, we captured almost this requisite number.

The second major tactical decision which was much criticized arose out of Dick Nixon's acceptance speech declaration in which he stated he would campaign in all fifty states, and of course he did. The argument here was that if he had spent more time in the major industrial states like Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania and New York, that that would have been decisive in terms of the Electoral College. To this argument I would point out that the forces at work in these industrial states -- that is, the big city Democrat machines, the labor controlled vote and the combination of minority and economic factors coupled with the weakness of the Republican organization were not susceptible to being changed that drastically by Nixon's physical campaigning. And secondly, that in appearing in all fifty states we established the Republican Party as a truly national party (making great strides in the South) and were it not for this fifty state campaign I do not believe that we would have carried more Congressional Districts and more states than did Kennedy.

And then there were those who said that Nixon did not "hit hard enough." I will make the flat allegation that no presidential candidate ever presented the

Republican philosophy more clearly than did Dick Nixon. In checking the record of the campaign, I note that in at least one of his speeches each day he pointed to the basic cleavage of philosophy between himself and Kennedy.

He reiterated again, ^{AND AGAIN his view} that the wave of the future turned on the individual American and, ^{to the extent that JFK was specific} unleashing the private sector of our economy, and that the ^{seemed to be greater} opposition's answer was always, ^{like} reliance on the Federal Government, and ~~the return to a very collective approach and conformity.~~

For example, although they did not receive the attention I thought they deserved in the press, Nixon, not only in his speeches, but in major position papers released from time to time during the campaign, made this point and others on (1) scientific research, (2) education, (3) farm policy, (4) communism, (5) tax matters, (6) housing and urban renewal and the like.

These were major efforts and many pages in length. ^{and yet I'll wager many of you had no idea they were ever released}

Finally, we were criticized heavily, particularly by our own Catholic supporters, for refusing to discuss the religious issue. Here the arguments ran that Nixon should openly point to the Bailey Memorandum which Kennedy circulated in 1956 to prove that a Democratic Catholic would get 80 per cent of the Catholic vote in the big cities, ^{and the films} AND THAT Dick should point out that Catholics were in effect being "used." Nixon, as a matter of conviction, refused to do this because he honestly felt that a man's religion had no bearing on his capability for the top office of the land. He would never even allow this to be discussed in strategy sessions, and I do not believe that had he followed the advice of those supporters, that the result would have been altered.

Sam H. Bell believes events weighed more heavily in this campaign than
dia) philosophy. From a STAFF STANDPOINT I KNOW SOME EVENTS OVER
which we had no control hurt badly - Peck, RN's illness,
hodge, Alger

These are tactics but What general lessons are there for us as a result of the 1960 presidential
campaign?

I believe, first of all, that the whole system of presidential preferential
primaries in those states where they exist, need to be re-examined. There are
too many disparities in the manner in which elections are held in these several
states for the results to be consistently significant. In the final ^{wise vs Oregon} analysis also
individual wealth of the candidates ^{or lack of it} involved is too great a factor.

Secondly, I believe that, in the British pattern, the length of a presidential
campaign should be shortened. I mean by this that we would, of course, have
to legislatively restrict through the use of the media the amount of advertising
and actual radio and television appearance made by the candidates to within
specific rates. <sup>On the basis of my experience, I doubt whether we will see
another 50-state campaign such as RN's in our life time.</sup>

Thirdly, I believe that all of our media need to examine most carefully
their responsibilities in a national political campaign. For example, our data
never indicated (and certainly the results did not show) that there was ever the
Kennedy landslide so blatantly predicted in the national periodicals three weeks
prior to the election. More specifically again, I believe it wrong for alleged
political experts in the East to appear on television and radio while the polls
are still open for three hours on the West Coast (and for even longer periods of
time in Alaska and Hawaii) placing partial returns into an electronic computer
which results in odds at 1,000 - 1 for a <sup>of one national candidate
over the other</sup> Kennedy victory. In other words,
people who were still to vote on the West Coast or in Alaska or Hawaii would
assume from this that either there was no point in voting at all, ~~or if they~~
~~planned to vote for Nixon, not go to the polls,~~ or people who wanted to be

"with the winner" would on the basis of those analyses vote for Kennedy when they might otherwise have voted for Dick Nixon.

Fourthly, nothing could have demonstrated as vigorously as this election the importance of each individual vote, *and the problems of its being intelligently cast and properly counted*. While nearly 69 million votes were cast last November, (which was 10 million more votes than in the last election,) ^{for} and the first time each major party drew more than 30 million votes, only 66 per cent of the citizens of voting age went to the polls. Of those who were registered to vote 81.5 per cent voted. *a big improvement*

The American Heritage Foundation has completed a study of obstacles which it concludes prevented nearly 20 million persons of voting age from exercising the ⁱⁿ franchise. It lists as principal obstacles: state, county and precinct residence requirements, lack of machinery to count persons confined to home or hospital by illness or accident, inadequate absentee ballot provisions, rigged literacy tests, poll taxes and social pressures.

The Foundation calls attention to the mobile population of the United States, pointing out that 33 million people moved from one location to another last year. It counts a substantial proportion of these as executives and professional people qualified to be responsible voters. Yet in 35 states, there's a one-year residence law which barred this group from voting eligibility *for national office*

It seems plain from these statistics that there is more to be done toward getting out the vote than merely encouraging those whose eligibility is secure. The machinery of the ballot box needs modernization, a problem for *all* states to meet. *of the removal*

Beyond this, however, for those who are able to vote, you have very great discrepancies -- some deliberate -- in the makeup of the ballot, its

simplicity and understandability in various states. For example there is the negative ballot in Texas where voters are required to draw lines through the names of candidates whom they do not want. This results in tremendous confusion, and many ballots were thrown out or left to the discretion of the election judges. *It has been estimated that approximately 100,000 paper ballots were invalidated in Texas* Many voters did not realize they had to strike all but one of the five or six names which appeared on the presidential ^{paper} ballot. In this respect it is interesting to note that where machines were used in Texas (accounting for approximately fifty per cent of the votes cast in that state) and this problem was not present Nixon ran 40,000 votes ahead of Kennedy.

Then there is the question of voting mechanics in each state. For example, ~~and I would urge Governor Brown's new commission to consider it seriously,~~ I see no reason why California can not do as many other states do and require that absentee ballots, ^{being} after completed ~~to be~~ mailed to the home precinct by election day so that they may be counted with the other votes cast and the results made immediately available. This serves several purposes. For example, in an election as close as this, the national results could have turned on California alone, and for a solid eight days ^{while} the absentee ballots were ^{being} counted, the American people would not have known who the President Elect was to be. Secondly, it removes the possibility of duplicate balloting, ^{for} and if a person is able to vote physically, the inspector at the election board can simply remove the mailed ballot, if the voter has chosen to exercise his vote in person.

^{then there} ~~is~~ there is the question of fraud and outright irregularities at the polls, which deprive the citizen of ^{an} the honest count once he has properly cast his vote

For example, in Chicago, 2nd Ward, 50th Precinct, where there were 22 legitimate resident voters, there were 82 applications for ballots, and 77 actual votes cast. Or in Precinct 27, Angalia County, Texas, there were 86 voters who actually turned out and yet the supervisor turned in a total of 171 votes cast: 147 for Kennedy-Johnson; 24 for Nixon-Lodge. Or to broaden it a little bit, Fannin County, Texas went to Kennedy-Johnson by 3 - 1. They recorded 6,138 total votes cast and it so happened that there were only 4,895 eligible voters according to the rolls.

Excerpt A

I am not hereby suggesting that the kind of fraud for which indictments were issued in Chicago is exclusively the province of the Democratic Party. I am saying that because of the weakness of the Republican Party in the big cities of Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago and the total control of those cities by one party, grave dangers exist as to an honest count in any election. This was certainly true when the Republicans controlled Philadelphia FOR

EXAMPLE.

an accused citizenry and

The only way to prevent fraud is before election day, and this means vigorous party organizations on both sides of the street with every poll manned.

Finally, we come to the question of the popular vote once cast and counted resulting in the Presidency being conferred on the man receiving the most votes. In other words, the problem of the Electoral College.

Electoral College

Officially, history will record that 26 states voted for Nixon; 22 states voted for Kennedy and 2 states voted for ^{Byrd's} Byrd. Now, of course, ^{him} Byrd's name never appeared on the ballot in the 2 states recorded for ^{him} Byrd. For that matter, neither Nixon's or Kennedy's name appear^{ed} on the ballot. But the weakness

Excerpt A

The techniques used though are ordinarily a lot harder to detect. They fall into several broad categories: chain balloting, ghost election boards, vote buying, rigged election machines, voting of transients, voting in the name of the dead, disqualification of valid voters, qualification of invalid voters, falsification of voters' affidavits, failure to count absentee ballots.

of the Electoral College is not simply that the electors of each state have no legal compulsion to vote in the College as their states voted in the popular count. It is rather that until ^{we can get beyond} each state's votes are counted in ^{being} ~~the~~ ^{a winner take all way} manner, you do not encourage the development of real two-party strength in all the states of the nation. It is for this reason that I favor the Coudert Proposal which would be that the Electoral vote would be cast ^{proportionally} to the ^{winning} popular vote in each Congressional District. This would encourage real two-party development. For example, in the South where at the present time many people refuse to vote because they assume ~~the~~ Democrats will carry the state, it would create the desire to ^{the} strengthen party organization at the grass roots level. I am sure that my opinion is influenced somewhat by the fact that if this system had been in effect last November, Nixon by virtue of having carried more Congressional Districts than Kennedy, would have been inaugurated in January.

So much for the campaign. There is, of course, a great deal more which can be said about the election, and I will be happy to answer questions on any of those point or others following the formal part of my remarks.

I will only conclude by saying that in any election where there is only a percentage difference of 1/5 of 1 per cent in 69 million votes cast, and where a total of 15,000 popular votes ^{in 3 states} would have completely reversed the Electoral College result, it is obviously easy to point to one of the many factors which would have affected the final result. ^{and for each person to hold a pet theory as to why we lost.}

Let us attempt to consider for a moment what this election signifies ^{concerns} by way of the present ~~private~~ political philosophy of the American voter.

49.9

Nixon, essentially an economic conservative, polled 49.9 per cent of the two-party vote against an opponent running on a liberal, bigger government platform. According to the Gallup Poll, Nixon received 94 per cent of the Republican vote, 56 per cent of the Independent vote and 15 per cent of the Democratic votes. In my opinion, this means that on the basic question of developing the private sector ^{of our economy} as against government welfarism, the American voter, despite sluggish business and unemployment over the 6 per cent mark, ^{hardly} provided a mandate to massive government spending. This is true in housing, minimum wage and all facets of the ^{national} federal economy. *I must say prophetically that if as Rayburn says we are in the worst depression since 1932, RN's Race was remarkable indeed.*

Secondly, the polls indicated that the personality projected by the two presidential candidates provided no sweeping advantage to either, for ^{it was generally felt that} while Kennedy was the more photogenic and possessed the most political sex appeal, ^{of the women's vote} the Gallup Poll gave Nixon 51 per cent, and gave Kennedy only 49 per cent.

Another conclusion reached by the Gallup organization was despite the extensive use of television and other mass media, relatively few voters were prised loose from their original convictions about the candidates. A nationwide panel of voters interviewed by the Gallup organization at five different stages of the Presidential campaign showed only a 1 per cent change in the candidates standing from August to the election. *In other words, while 20/10*

But what does this election show vis a vis the ^{future of the party} Republican organization? *Republicans console*

~~I think we can take enormous pride in the fact that Dick Nixon carried 226 Congressional Districts, as against 206 Congressional Districts for Kennedy, and that in the course of this campaign we picked up a net of two governors,~~

7 more states in which we control both houses of the state legislature, and almost 30 state senators, and better than ³⁰⁰~~300~~ state representatives. In the House we picked up a net gain of 21 representatives.

What these figures and the almost 200,000 letters which Dick Nixon has received since the election (more, in fact, according to the Senate Post Office than has President Kennedy) tell us is that the Republican Party of today is ideologically strong and virile: that its basic philosophy ^{of individual responsibility} appeals to ^{perhaps a slight} the majority of the American people.

The problem of the Republican Party today is that organizationally its muscles are flabby. As a matter of fact it can be said fairly of both political parties that they have been almost killed by "over hatching" and "over civil servicing." Responsible patronage and responsible organization which used to excite good young people to go into politics is now almost totally absent. The Democratic Party has solved its organizational problem by turning those matters over to the Labor Unions. But we Republicans must unfortunately rely on the excitement of election day to bring out the volunteers and on a narrow base of financing.

As to the future of the Dem. party, I can only observe that holding its diverse ^{new} elements together.
And in commenting on the present weaknesses of our Party, I must observe that I am sorely distressed at what appears to be a lack of constructively critical comment, as well as tactical comment, on the part of Republicans since the onset of the Kennedy Administration. Certainly the Democrats in the early days and weeks of the Eisenhower Administration let not a day go by without bitter comments upon the cabinet of "big business" or supposed conflicts of interest, or nit-picking at the slightest disparity between the platform of the Republicans and their performance.

Certainly an appropriate subject for comment, whether based on ideological or purely moral considerations, is the difference between what Kennedy's platform set forth, what he said during the course of the campaign, and his performance to date.

For example, probably no two subjects were more thoroughly discussed by Kennedy and Nixon in this past campaign than the areas of our nation's economy and defense vis a vis the Soviet Union. Isn't it worthy of comment that the two men selected to head these vital offices (both nominal Republicans) have earlier stated views on a whole variety of subjects completely at variance with the Democratic platform adopted in Los Angeles? More recently, how much real concern has there been about the morality of Kennedy repeating again and again as a fact during the course of the campaign that there was a missile gap, as against McNamara's report that there is no missile gap.

The few voices raised with respect to the selection of Bobby Kennedy seemed to be chiefly concerned with the fact that a President for the first time was appointing a brother to the cabinet, not on the more realistic or important grounds of whether Bobby Kennedy was legally competent to head the chief law enforcement agency of the Federal Government. Or, more importantly, whether he would avoid using those vital offices in a partisan way. Certainly some question should have been raised with respect to whether he would act as Attorney General regarding individual civil liberties and legal processes in the same way that he acted when he was counsel to the Committee on Government Operations.

What kind of morality is it that on the one hand talks about employers needing to take drastic steps to curb the dollar flow and, on the other hand, urges a higher minimum wage which only adds to the labor costs and further drives American enterprise abroad?

What kind of morality is it that calls for increased discipline on ^{the} one hand and massive Federal hand-outs on the other?

Where is the responsible criticism, whose voice has been raised to ask, for example, about the half-million-dollar-plus "back pay" that Defense Secretary McNamara is to receive from The Ford Motor Company ^{one of the largest} over the next five years?

There is no secret about this -- all the facts have been published and documented -- and my point is not, for one moment, that either Secretary McNamara or Ford is "up to" anything. But surely the contrast with Democratic treatment of at least one of Mr. McNamara's predecessors is startling -- and surely we Republicans ought to keep close tabs on such affairs. Indeed: not only ought to; we have a public responsibility to do so.

Of one thing we can be certain. Unlike the Eisenhower Administration, the Kennedy Administration will couch every move with an eye toward its political effect. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall makes no bones of his intention to use public works proposals as a tool to pressure congressmen into supporting the Kennedy Administration's legislative program. Udall was specifically quoted as saying that he saw nothing improper in the role he played in urging various Western representatives to vote for an expansion of the House Rules Committee to open what might have been a bottleneck in

getting Administration bills to the House Floor for a vote. I am not criticizing this technique. I am merely saying that with the Kennedy Administration acting in such an intensely partisan climate, there must inevitably come a counter-reaction with partisan comment from the Republicans, and that this should be accountably constructive. ~~It should be continuing, and it should come from the grass roots up. And, the sooner all of us get at it, the better.~~

I have covered a great deal of ground here in far too short a time. I have attempted to apply some broad brush strokes to terribly complex problems. But in the final analysis, all of what I have been saying, solutions to the problems I have raised, comes down to individual action, individual responsibility, and individual dedication.

In closing I should like to borrow several quotations with the observation that to me these lines come closer to ^{one} why ~~we~~ ^{one} use in politics and ^{one} how ~~we~~ should pursue politics than any I have ever seen.

It was Jim Farley who said, "In the final analysis, the politician has nothing to offer but his word. If he tells the truth and keeps his word, he gains the devotion of his friends and the respect of his enemies . . . The passing of one's word is the execution of a sacred bond -- and the fulfillment of that bond is the hallmark of a great politician."

Second: "He said -- "He who chooses politics as a career will have the experience of ages to guide him in reaching for higher, if unattainable, goals. In extending his grasp, he may give his name to an age where it may shine brightly for all time. For those to whom such fame is denied,

there is comfort in knowing that we are providing experience to be drawn upon by those to come. We are the progenitors of the perfect rulers of the future, men in whom thought and action are delicately balanced and from whose rule, political blessings will flow.

Finally, I would like to quote from one of my favorite political authors of whom I am sure you have never heard. His name is Andrew Oliver. He lived in the American colonies at the time of the Revolution, and he held many public offices. He was not only active politically, he was the father of 17 children.

He said -- "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures -- neither is there any in which he may do more widespread harm -- nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul -- nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career that any man can choose."

Rich Nixon believes this, I believe it too and I trust you and your children will believe it too.

<u>Sen</u>	<u>Tab</u>	<u>Co. H.</u>	<u>Gov</u>	<u>Relig</u>	<u>Pres</u>
Dirksen	Seaton	Hauge	Rockefeller	Shakam	Eisenhower
Morton	Rogers	Harlow	Hatfield	Spellman	Hover
Coldwater	Fodge	Persons	Underwood	McKay	Kennedy
Bush	Fleming	Higerty	Stratton		
Bridges	Warren	Milt E.	Wendy		
Kuchel			Drain	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Eduse</u>
Fong		<u>Long</u>	Quinn	AHP	Sproul
Scott		Byrnes		GE	Lawrence toll
Keating		Reid		JWT	Herbun & Joyce
Javits		Mallick		McDonnell	Olguell
		Bell		Douglas	Kaplan
		Coussellot		Flanigan	
		Wilson		Cisera	
		Miller		Worimer	
		Taber		Tiermon	
		Cipscomb		Stark AMI	

BOB HALDEMAN

July 20, 1960

MEMORANDUM

TO: Advance Men

FROM: Bob Haldeman

The attached copies of articles which have appeared recently or a while back in the press are sent on to you as classic examples of what not to do and as examples of what can happen if you do get too much stuff out ahead of time.

The Kennedy article from Los Angeles shows what will happen if a local guy is cornered by the press and "spills the beans".

The Nixon story from Chicago is pretty much the same.

The earlier Nixon story from San Francisco shows what will happen if a couple of our people get to talking in front of the press, or in a public area where the press can overhear them and emphasizes the need again for carrying on your discussions in private somewhere.

P. S. The enclosed photograph in the Indian headdress is another horrible example of what to avoid. Don't let plans be made for anything which will trap the Vice President into gag photos such as this.

Be Spontaneous-- Ready, Set, Go!

By Art Hoppe

SOME 250 people hurried down to the airport yesterday to say hello to Vice President Nixon. Most arrived just in time to say good-by.

It was all due to ice in Chicago. Mr. Nixon was scheduled to arrive here at 12:15 p. m. by a United jet airliner from Washington to board a chartered plane for Sacramento.

His trip to the Winter Olympics is officially "nonpolitical" and thus any favorable demonstrations at the airport would have to be "spontaneous." As everybody knows, there's nothing in politics that requires more weeks of careful planning than a spontaneous demonstration.



Five spontaneous busloads of Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, assorted students, the Palo Alto High School band and various Young Republicans bearing placards were scheduled to show up at noon in a complex problem of logistics.

AT 9 a. m., local Republican leaders received the word that Mr. Nixon's jet had skipped a stop in Chicago because of icy runways and would arrive here at 11:15 a. m., a full hour early. Consternation.

It was far too late to rearrange the spontaneous demonstration. Furthermore, a second spontaneous demonstration for his arrival in Sacramento wouldn't be ready until 1:20 p. m.

"Couldn't United fly lazy S's over Kansas?" suggested one local aide, thoughtfully tearing out his hair. United couldn't.

"He's just going to have to wait here until 12:15," said another, "or he'll throw the whole itinerary out of kilter for the next three days."

At 11:15 a. m. Mr. Nixon stepped off the plane and co-operatively agreed to the delay. He was tucked away out of sight in a lounge at the far end of Concourse B with Mrs. Nixon, his assistants and five telephones.

An hour dragged by. The crowd spontaneously gathered behind a roped-off area at one end of the tarmac. Republican leaders, who had belatedly got the word of the early arrival, hustled up to Concourse B for huddles.

AT 12:20 Mr. and Mrs. Nixon descended the stairs to the tarmac. The band struck up "Entrance of the Gladiators." A score of placards waved messages ranging from "We R 4 U Dick" to "Welcome Mr. Nixon, Den 4, Pack 63, Daly City Cub Scouts."

A Boy Scout spontaneously presented Mrs. Nixon with a bouquet of roses and Mr. Nixon proved himself an able campaigner, shaking hands, making friendly jokes and signing autographs.

In contrast to the flock of Democratic candidates who flew through these parts last week looking dour, dedicated and determined, Mr. Nixon appeared relaxed and genial—just as though he didn't hate anyone, which presumably he won't until after the Democratic Convention in July.

After 30 minutes of this, Mr. and Mrs. Nixon and the flock of aides boarded the charter plane and flew off to Sacramento where the spontaneous demonstration went off right on schedule, the way a proper spontaneous demonstration should.

Tremendous Welcome Geared Up for Kennedy

By GRACE BASSETT
Star Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES, July 8.—Behind the public "the-people-will-come-to-us" confidence at Kennedy headquarters here are thousands of volunteers quietly going out after the people. These silent workers hope to swell to 100,000 the crowd to cheer their candidate to town. He is due to arrive at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The word being used for this gigantic planned welcome is "spontaneous" among the idea men for the Massachusetts Senator. The turnout, the shouts, the hands and the banners simply will be proof of the grass-roots popularity of the front runner, they say.

But both paid and unpaid workers are sweating behind the scenes over the arrangements for the "spontaneous" welcome.

Kennedy clubs all over the Los Angeles area are going all out to make sure that the Senator's greeting is a big one. And Alan Reed Enterprises, a Hollywood advertising and gift firm which has also been hired to help stage a massive demonstration in the Sports Arena on Wednesday, when Senator Kennedy is offered for the party nomination is providing professional assistance.

Of the arena demonstration, Mr. Reed, an ex-actor, promises: "I can tell you that it will be like New Year's eve in the spades." And the airport welcome promises to be just about the same.

For some days, Mr. Reed has been sending banners, posters and noisemakers to two volunteer offices tucked away some two miles from the plush front offices for Kennedy at the Biltmore Hotel. They'll be used at the airport and in the arena.

In preparation for tomorrow's welcome, some 200 drivers were to pick up thousands of handbills at one of the volunteer offices at dawn today. The fliers, announcing the time and place of Senator Kennedy's arrival, were to be handed to factory workers as they checked in at plants all over the metropolitan area.

This technique was designed to draw a lot of workers and their families to the Kennedy reception, which will be on most workers' day off.

For a week, chain telephone calls by volunteers have spread the word that the Senator would come to the convention city Saturday. The Democratic National and State Committees

furnished lists of all party members. Kennedy partisans divided up the names. Each worker dialed five other Democrats and asked each of the five to call five more.

When Senator Kennedy steps off his plane he'll be greeted by a small contingent, including some 30 "Kennedy girls," mostly college students, decked out in chic red, white and blue dresses, white shoes, white gloves and white chokers and straw hats with bright blue satin ribbons. A California dressmaker designed the outfits.

Then, the Senator will head toward the mob expected to jam past capacity a parking lot reserved for welcoming crowds.

In Open Car

He doesn't plan a speech. He'll answer reporters' questions. And he plans to ride in an open car at the head of a caravan routed the length of Wilshire boulevard to the Biltmore Hotel, headquarters for the convention.

The 100,000 rooters are expected to line the boulevard all the way to the hotel, with more to cheer him across the sidewalk and in the lobby.

The Kennedy headquarters is cagey about preparations for the nomination display at convention hall next week. Mainly, Kennedy workers are afraid over-sealous Stevenson supporters might ruin plans if they could find out about them.

What the Kennedy camp hopes the Stevenson camp doesn't find out is that balloons are the key to the demonstration.

Forty-five hundred balloons, some a foot in diameter, some five feet and some snake-shaped rocket balloons, are in storage at Mr. Reed's place.

They will be spirited down to the grounds of the Sports Arena probably on Wednesday, the day Senator Kennedy's name is placed before the convention. There, inside to closed

vans, they'll be inflated by machines.

The danger of sabotage, as the Kennedy people see it, will come when the inflated balloons are carried from the vans into the arena itself.

Also packed in boxes at volunteer headquarters and not to be opened until the nomination are packets full of noisemakers. Reed Enterprises has painted hundreds of eight foot poles for Kennedy posters red, white and blue. In preparation, too, are 150 triangular Kennedy banners, 80 State posters of white cardboard to be hoisted by Kennedy delegates.

There are six giant roll-down signs, presumably to be released from the balconies around the giant domed roof of the arena.

Kennedy men report they're getting new ideas every day for the demonstration. Their major aim is to draw spectators into the play begun by delegates on the floor. They insist they can't estimate the cost. The men being paid agree with that.

Meanwhile, Back in Chicago GOP Has Big Plans Afoot

Huge, 'Spontaneous' Program For Nixon Is All Set to Roar.

Republicans already have a few things lined up for a "spontaneous" demonstration when Richard M. Nixon's name is placed in nomination in the International Amphitheatre.

They include a team of acrobats who will bounce on a trampoline doing flips for Nixon.

Five bands will be standing by to provide music.

Seventy-five drum major-ettes, "The Young Republican Lassies," will lead the traditional tom-tom and placard march.

And an army of men on stilts will be towering above the rest of the marchers.

* * *

"FROM THEN ON," said Barney Jones, who makes the demonstration plans for the entire GOP convention, "the people on the floor will take over."

Jones of River Forest is in charge of putting together a week of entertainment here that is a brew of the best of a circus, a state fair, New Year's Eve, and Disneyland.

Just to provide music, he has more than 20 bands lined up.

There is going to be a water ski show, an elephant, cowboys and Indians, beautiful girls, and parades, parades, and parades.

* * *

THE FESTIVITIES will begin Friday, July 22, with a wa-

ter ski show on the Chicago river.

"We may switch to Lake Michigan because we're having trouble getting skiers to perform in the river," Jones said.

Later in the day there will be a parade of antique cars.

While the show is starting in Chicago, an Abe Lincoln motorcade will be getting under way in Springfield.

It will make stops in Lincoln, Bloomington, Pontiac and Oak Park before winding up with a rally Saturday, July 23, at the Sherman hotel.

* * *

ALSO SCHEDULED for Saturday is a sports car parade and a clown show at State and Randolph.

Another parade with 10 bands, marching units, and an elephant will be held Sunday, July 24.

The biggest event Monday, July 25, will be the arrival of Vice-President Nixon.

He'll be welcomed by one band at O'Hare field, and

another when he debarks from a helicopter at Meigs field.

"We expect a half-million people to show up at the Sheraton-Blackstone hotel, where he will go by motorcade," Jones said.

* * *

SCATTERED throughout the downtown hotels will be girls in old-fashioned bathing suits, handing out badges and pins.

A band concert at Buckingham fountain will be held at 8 p.m. Monday followed by a torchlight parade through the Loop to the Sheraton-Blackstone hotel.

"We'll have at least 500 torches," said Jones.

At 2 p.m. Wednesday, July 27, a band of Indians is scheduled to attack a stage

coach in front of the Conrad Hilton hotel.

Jones said the locations and times for many of the events are still indefinite.

* * *

OTHER GOP convention planners are preparing an enthusiastic reception for President Eisenhower when he attends the conclave in its second and third days July 26-27.

William Rentschler, heading the committee in charge of Ike's welcome, said the President will arrive at O'Hare airport at 11:30 a.m. July 26 and at Meigs field about an hour later. A Presidential motorcade through the Loop will be held if the President is willing.

The President will address the convention the night of July 26.



UPI TELEFONICO

VICE PRESIDENT IN INDIAN HEADDRESS AT MINOT, N. D.
Carl Whitman, Indian from Fort Berthold reservation, made presentation

Kennedy's Advance Man SA EXPRESS 9-9-60 Didn't Want LBJ Along

By JAMES McCORRY

The advance man for Democratic Presidential Candidate John Kennedy's San Antonio visit didn't favor Vice-Presidential Nominee Lyndon Johnson's accompanying Kennedy on his Texas tour.

Paul Reddam, 44 years with the Massachusetts' senator and himself out of Boston, believes Kennedy could do as well or better going it alone.

Reddam revealed his opposition to Johnson's presence on the trip at a dinner party earlier this week given by Mrs. Kathleen Voigt. At that party, which broke up early after several differences of opinion, Reddam said he had been over-ruled by party strategists.

If Kennedy alights from his Convair plane at International Airport Monday for his two-hour, five-minute appearance in the Alamogordo City armed with a machine-gun, it will probably be on Reddam's advice.

Rough Encounters

There's no question Reddam has had some rough encounters in the short time he has been in San Antonio doing the spade work for Kennedy's stop.

The night before his experience with Mrs. Voigt he had been exposed to another highly volatile Bexar County woman Democrat, Mrs. Mae Tuggle.

After his abruptly ended meeting with the two women, Reddam ruefully confided to Maury Maverick, who brought him to the first party at the home of Atty. Herschel Bernard:

"I thought Mrs. Tuggle was rough on me, but by comparison with Mrs. Voigt she's like my sainted mother."

Admittedly, Mrs. Tuggle was easier on Reddam than was Mrs. Voigt. Where Mrs. Tuggle restrained her comments to the opinion Reddam was doing Republican Presidential Nominee Richard Nixon more good than Kennedy, Mrs. Voigt termed him a "two-bit,

ward-hoeling, machine politician with the air of royalty dealing with peasants."

Dislikes Criticism

Present at the first party also were Dist. Atty. and Mrs. Charles Eick.

At the Voigt dinner session, Dick Meskill, editor of the Alamo Register, Bill Sinkin, and two teachers were present.

The guests report Reddam does not take too well to constructive criticism of the boss, and his reaction, coming wrapped in a Boston accent, rubbed them wrong.

Reddam actually tried to avoid conversation on policy matters, but when he's the candidate's personal advance agent, the subject's bound to come up.

Apparently, the subject came up too much at the Bernard-Voigt soiree. Maverick, who piloted Reddam to the first party, and Meskill, who brought him to the second, took him back to his hotel as soon as the amenities allowed.

Services Not Wanted

The major crisis at the dinner party apparently developed over the plaint of some of the liberal Democrats that their services weren't being utilized by the county party machinery. Reddam noted the county hadn't carried for the Democratic nominee in 1952 and 1956, and the diners got the distinct impression their services were not only not needed—they weren't wanted.

Another Kennedy advance man, Bill Stinson, is working completely independent of Reddam. Stinson, working out of the Austin headquarters, is a Johnson man who amalgamated when Kennedy won the nomination. It's no secret he still prefers Johnson.

Maverick, who has been squiring Reddam about town and down to the birds, denies the persistent report that Reddam, after the reception he received from Maverick's friends, begged him not to introduce him to any of his enemies.

Chris -
My file.