

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel #1 of 2 - PATRICK BUCHANAN; RAYMOND PRICE (GUESTS)

BU:

The idea is to discuss some of the problems faced by a new Chief Executive, and to that end we have guests two special assistants to the President, Mr. Patrick Buchanan, though even younger than Mr Price has been with Mr. Nixon longer. From the beginning of 1956, indeed, he and Miss Rosemary Woods were the whole of Mr. Nixon's political staff as recently as two years ago. Mr. Buchanan is said to be the Conservative in Mr. Nixon's entourage, and one supposes the major security risk to liberal interests. He is a native of Washington and a graduate of Georgetown University, who went to St. Louis as a reporter ~~for~~ the Globe Democrat, and rose quickly to the post of editorial writer before going to Mr. Nixon, who has called him quotes one of the most brilliant analysts in the nation today. Mr Raymond Price confesses to having engaged, while at Yale University, in the late forties, in some nefarious activities of a Conservative nature in collaboration with the host of this program. But he labored hard during the ensuing years to shrive himself reaching the climax of apostasy when as Chief Editorial Writer for the Republican Herald Tribune, he wrote an editorial denouncing Senator Goldwater and calling on the readers of the Tribune to vote for Lyndon Johnson. Johnson won the election and New Yorkers lost the Herald Tribune.

(LAUGHTER) Before that, Mr Price had worked for Collier's Magazine and for Life, having served with distinction with

©1969 W. F. Buckley

The copyright laws of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. If a user makes a request for, or later uses a photocopy or reproduction (including handwritten copies) for purposes in excess of fair use, that user may be liable for copyright infringement. Users are advised to obtain permission from the copyright owner before any re-use of this material.

Use of this material is for private, non-commercial, and educational purposes; additional reprints and further distribution is prohibited. Copies are not for resale. All other rights reserved. For further information, contact Director, Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-5010.

© Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 2

the Navy during the Korean War. I should like to begin by asking Mr. Price how much it matters that there should be an ~~xxxxxx~~ ideological compatibility between the staff and the President.

PR: Well, I suppose, Bill, it depends on what you mean by ideological compatibility. We generally share with him, as situation
I ~~xxx~~ think one has to in a ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ like this, a certain set of basic beliefs, basic values. On the other hand, he feels, and I think most of us feel, that there is an enormous value to having a fairly wide diversity of view, and especially a wide diversity of approaches, within the staff, so that when a ticklish question comes up -- and most of them turn out to be ticklish ~~xx~~ in one way or another -- you do get the benefit of the various perspectives on it.

BU: Well, now, is this a peculiarity of Mr. Nixon's so far as you know, or has this been so of his predecessors? For instance, did Mr. Kennedy have any Conservatives around?

PR: I don't know if he did or not, as a matter of fact. Certainly in the Johnson

BU: Certainly didn't have much effect, did it?

PR: Certainly in the Johnson years, the emphasis seems to have been much more on ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ conformity than it is uh

BU: Personal or ideological?

PR: I would say well, personal certainly, and to the submergence of any ideological differences, and I'm taking ideological

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 3

here in its narrower rather than its broader definition,
assume you mean
that is, I ~~simply mean~~ not in a dogmatic sense, but rather
in a sense of differences in the way one approaches the
construction of a policy.

BU: I see. Well, I, I've found, Mr. Buchanan, ~~xx~~ that Americans,
a lot of them, tend to take ideology on over to personal
relations in a way, for instance, that Englishmen tend not
to do. It's perfectly, uh, it would be perfectly con-
ventional in England for the editor of the most Tory
newspaper to be the godfather of the editor of the more
~~se~~ socialist newspaper's son, and that kind of thing. But
that doesn't happen much in America. Now, do you find from
your experience with Mr. Nixon that you tend to size
people up, or they tend to size you up in terms of where
you fit on the ideological spectrum, or is it all completely
dissolved?

BUCH: No, I think within the staff it dissolves a good deal.
I think that, for instance, when Ray came with Mr. Nixon,
and others like Lynn Garment (?), for example, ~~xx~~ of a more
liberal bent, we realized that we had a common objective,
which was the election of Mr. Nixon, and I think that, while
we argued these things out on the basis of our particular
beliefs and where we thought Mr Nixon ought to go, once
the arguments were done, ~~and~~ we continued to back the
candidate and we continued to ~~give him~~ ^{get along} quite amicably

FIRING LINE - #148 - ~~xxxx~~ Reel 1 of 2 - page 4

in our social ~~xxxxx~~ relationships, and we continue to do so now. I think if we ~~xxxxx~~ hadn't done this, for example, I don't think Mr. Nixon would really have been elected. I'm very high on the kind of advice, frankly, I think, the broad spectrum of advice that Mr. Nixon received for the last year, for example. I think that having individuals of a different ideological position, enabled him by throwing out a proposition to get the viewpoints of various different viewpoints on just how this proposition would settle, these particular groups of Americans, I think, and it enabled him to run a campaign, which was essentially a centrist campaign, yet at the same time he was aware of the various reactions ~~xxxxxxx~~ I think ~~xxxxxxx~~ as they would strike/particular segments of the American people, and this is a diverse ~~xx~~ people.

BU: Well, I can see where that would be so, where surrounding a President you wanted to be aware of the spectrum of opinion; but at a certain point, presumably, advocacy is all in order, right? And at that point, then, do you/lock in to your own dispositions, and attempt to bring him around? Is that the way it works?

PR: Ordinarily we do. Ordinarily we do. Our dispositions are not always the predictable ones, in that, of course, as I suppose you would expect, when you're dealing with problems that do so cut across the traditional ideological definitions boundaries, and so forth, and we don't approach from a

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 5

liberal, centrist, right point of view so much as ~~xx~~ we do an individual point of view on the question.

BU: ~~Wkky~~ Although presumably whatever it is that I got to identifying you as a liberal Republican over the years, and Mr. Buchanan as a conservative Republican is the result of a collection of your positions, which end up as sort of a syndrome of Left and Right, correct?

PR: And certainly the advice the President receives from me
end
tends to be more quote liberal ~~unquote~~ than he receives from Mr. Buchanan.

BU: I see.

BUCH: I think that's true.

BU: Can we do anything about that? (LAUGHTER) The, on the matter of, an issue of the New York Times Sunday Magazine, recently, in discussing the two of you, and a few other members of the President's staff, said, well, the President has two speech writers, one liberal and one conservative. Now, on the matter of speech writing, I notice that there is much less diffidence about acknowledging the fact of it, now, than there was oh a few years ago. So that people point to John Jones as the author of that particular speech by the President, whereas ~~xxxx~~ these used to be, as you know, highly regarded secrets, back in say Roosevelt's day. Now, is this because the professionalism of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Presidency is such that it is no longer worthwhile attempting to maintain the fiction that a President can

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 6

begin to write all of his speeches? Is that the case?

PR: Well, I would be interested to see how it develops over the next year or two. We do have a somewhat different situation now, in that we have a President who ordinarily does not give prepared speeches. Since he's been President, he's given, at this moment, three, beginning with the inaugural. And he much prefers not to have a text, or even have notes, but simply to speak live to an audience, or live on a news conference in which he can respond to questions himself.

BU: It gives it that extra dimension.

PR: It ~~xxx~~ does. And it makes it more immediate, more (LAUGHTER) more immediate and more personal, more real.

BU: Which is slightly evasive. Let's try it on Mr. Buchanan. What are the protocols involved? Suppose you write a speech for the President, and he delivers it, is it very secret that you wrote it? Is it something that the New York Times is gonna find out about, if not from you from somebody else? Because there have been a number of speeches given during the past year in which people simply say this ~~xxx~~ was written by Ray Price, or this was written by Pat Buchanan. And I ~~gather~~ gather the President doesn't mind that, because otherwise, presumably, it would cease happening.

BUCH: Well, the way the President has ~~done~~ done it, and as Ray pointed out, he doesn't do a great deal of speechmaking,

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 7

since he's been President; but during the campaign, ^{what} /he would do was he would ~~would~~ select a subject or topic, and one of us was better researched, or felt more strongly about that issue, and could put a good deal more behind it. And he would dictate the outlines for the particular writer, and let the writer submit a draft to him, and then he would work back and forth ^{there} ^{from} in a process /that went through /some five, six up to nine drafts, and I think he would just select the writer by the what he felt would be his particular issue in strength. For instance, I had done a good deal of ~~xxxxxx~~ research on the issue of crime and law and order, and I felt perhaps more strongly about that as an issue than Ray did, and he would tend to direct these drafts to me.

BU: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) you never minded disorder very much (?)

PR: As long as it was creative disorder. (LAUGHTER)

BU: Well, having gone through that process, though, and assuming ^a that he approved of ~~the~~ /draft that you gave on crime, would you feel free if somebody from the New York Times, say, asked who wrote ~~xxxx~~ the speech, or who drafted, would somebody around say, oh, Buchanan did?

BUCH: Well, ~~xxxx~~ what you would say, candidly, is that Buchanan worked with the President on that issue. If you wanna know the background of the speech I would talk with him on it. I think it's uh, we don't ~~xxx~~ try to maintain some subterfuge, ~~xx~~ as though, ~~xxxxx~~ especially late in the

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 8

(campaign when the President is delivering a speech a day, And these speeches which he can't devote a great deal of time and care to. We don't make any effort to maintain the subterfuge that he sat down and drafted each one. On a speech like that, he would call in a particular writer and say, I want a speech for example on the Social Security, I want you to make the five or six points we've made, during the campaign, on Social Security, and I want to submit a draft, at which event you'd write the draft for him and you'd go in and then he would dictate certain certain guidelines and changes, and pretty much go with it. This was ~~xxx~~ at the end of the campaign where you had fifteen speeches in fifteen days, ~~xxxxxx~~ But you take a speech where the President is deeply concerned about it, and where he feels a great deal depends upon it, like the acceptance speech, and the more important he feels it is, the more involved he becomes. And the acceptance speech, for example, was done at Montauk, himself, and neither Ray nor I nor any of the others who were supposedly the quotes speechwriters, even got a look~~xx~~ at a draft before it was delivered. Only he and his secretary looked at it. So, I think it depends on the occasion and the particular speech just how much time and effort he can devote to it.

(BU: I see.

BUCH: This is the way it goes with the

BREAK

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 9

BU: Well, may I ask you this, then. So far as you know, with Mr. Nixon, it's not likely to get to be a completely automatic process? The reason I ask that is because Mr. Hoover once told me, Mr. Herbert Hoover once told me that he got very sore because he had been doing a lot of favors for President Truman and in the 1948 campaign, he picked up a newspaper and read in it, Truman Blasts Hoover for Hating the Poor, and that kind of business, and he was real sore. a few So he went down to see him ~~xxxx~~ months later, because President Truman asked him to do so, and he decided that before he sat down and talked business with him, he'd say to him what he thought of him for giving that speech. And President Truman started in by saying, oh, he said, I was furious about that, too; I almost didn't read it.

BUCH: Didn't read that line, yeah.

BU: That's right. In other words, he hadn't even bothered to read the speech that had been prepared for him.

BUCH: Well, that's not the case, that's never the case with Mr. Nixon.

BU: That would be the case?

BUCH: No. He would go through even your last draft that you came up with. And ~~xxxx~~even in cases, late in the campaign, where he did one a day, he would look over the final draft, and he would mark that out, this is too strong. He looks very closely at these things because he's quite aware, having been in the business a long time, that whatever he

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page ~~100x19~~ 10

says can be used against ~~him~~ you, so to speak, either now or subsequently.

BU: Yeah.

BUCH: So, he would, even with those speeches, take great care in making sure that's precisely what he wanted to say and how knowledgeable he wanted to say it. He's also very ~~knowledgeable~~ in how the news, newspapermen would play a particular speech, what you know, would be the leading phraseology, /more so than any other person I've dealt with, you know, and he'll strengthen a line, for example, and that will be the lead. He's very, very good at this.

BU: I see, I see. Would have made a good editor.

BUCH: That's right.

BU: Well, Mr. Price, you have a reputation for being a sort of a belletrist, an ornate writer, do you conceive it as part of your responsibility to change your style so as to fit more naturally with the style of the person for whom ~~wh~~ you're writing?

PR: Well, yes and no, in that ~~when~~ I am writing for the President, or working with him on something which will be his, naturally, I want it to be his and not ~~somebody~~ somebody else. and to flow naturally, and organically, as his. But we now especially are, this is an interesting aside (?), this gets into a thing (?), one of the things that we are quite consciously trying to do stylistically, and I mean in what the President says, he is trying to do, and others

FIRMING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 11

or us, in what comes out of the White House, is to get rid of a lot of the old governmentize and the cant, and the exaggeration and the posturing, and so forth

BU: Jolly good.

PR: And to strike out those exaggerations, rhetorical exaggeration which have flourished and flown for decades in Presidential prose, and get it down to something which is believable basically because it's true, which is not as it has always been. And we do, as a part of that, try to keep the prose on the simpler side.

BU: Umhm. Uh, to change the subject slightly, about a year ago, Professor Kissinger gave a speech at UCLA in which he said, as a general rule, I believe a new President in the areas where he wants to effect change, must do so within the first four months. He need not complete it in this time, but he must give enough of a ~~sh~~ shake to the bureaucracy to indicate that he wants a new direction, and he ~~was~~ must be brutal enough to demonstrate that he means it. He's saying three things which are interesting, and which I'd be very much interested in your comments on. First of all, do you both agree with him, that a President has to establish his authority within the first four months?

~~XXXXX~~ PR: Yes, authority. If it's authority you're speaking of, yes.

BU: Well, is he, by authority I mean it in the Kissinger sense, his authority to superintend a change in policy.

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 12

BUCH:

Uh, my own view is that it take s^a/much more longer time, frankly, to get your people into the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth ~~xxxxxxx~~ eschelons of ~~xxxx~~ bureaucracy to really, to get ~~xxxxx~~ control of it, and to get it to ~~xxxx~~ move at your orders. I don't think it can be done with the person, just with the number o f ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ personnel we've put in there now. I think it's gonna take a longer time, and I would hope, as a matter of fact, for eight years to do it.

BU:

Yeah. But isn't Kissinger's point that in order to move the bureaucracy, you've got to have stamina, and that the man who has stamina is a person who has a considerable clout ~~xxxxx~~ in those first four months? Would you

PR:

Not necessarily. And I haven't talked with Dr. Kissinger about that since he's been in the White House. I'd be interested in to learn how he feels about that now. It, of course, from the time we came in, we've been running ~~xxxxx~~ up against the hundred-days syndrome, for example, which is something that for a third of a century seems to have become fixed in the American mythology, that in his first hundred days, the President must do this, must do that, must do the other in order to establish his administration. Now, ~~xx~~ we are trying to do things quite differently. Quite consciously trying to change the processes of decision making, uh, and we're trying to slow things down a bit, in the sense of cooling the country off, and introducing a

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 13

greater deliberation into the process of decision-making. getting away from the myth that to pass a law means to solve a problem, for example, and that the important thing is to make a commitment. We're interested more in performance than we are in commitments. The commitment is there, but we're starting with the proposition that to make a commitment is not enough. You've got to be able to deliver on it. And it takes time to work out the means of delivery, for example. Now, in the first four months of the administration the President can establish his authority, and I think that President Nixon has done that, quite effectively. I think the people now consider him as ~~the~~ their president and their leader, and Congress the same, and the administration the same; but ~~xx~~ establishing authority is one thing, exercising authority is another. He has exercised it, but not to the full extent that he probably will as the processes which have been set in motion occur (?) further.

BU: I see So, in other words, you really believe that Mr. Nixon has programmed things other than by such ~~as~~ a scenario as Dr. Kissinger was talking about? Where~~in~~ in the first four months, you do and say a lot of spectacular things, establish your public personality and then collect the reins of power. He's collecting the reins of power is that correct ~~is~~ leading in certain directions, in what directions?

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 14

PR: The aim has not been to, ~~if~~ it has not been ~~spectacular~~ spectacular, it has not been splash. It has been to build the means by which an effective administration can be run. He moved organizationally, for example, to establish the to reestablish the National Securities Council, establish the Urban Affairs Council, and so forth. And to get the processes of decision~~x~~shaped up so that when the decisions were made /they can be made in the best possible manner. And he has been going on from there to try to insure that we don't do things as a nation that we will very quickly regret, and that we do^{do}/the right things.

BU: Umhm. How do you handle the argument that one hears more frequently now, that the reason Mr. Nixon is absorbed with procedure is that he really has no (you understand I'm quoting) essential convictions, that is to say that he is ^{that} figuring out a way to get accomplished whatever it is/he wants accomplished, but he hasn't (UNINTELLIGIBLE) what he wants accomplished? How do you handle that?

BUCH: Well, I think that, if you take for example the President's mandate, I think, ~~xxxx~~ from the voters that put him into office, it's quite separate from the mandate of John F. Kennedy, for example. I think there was a mandate to move forward in various social areas, to begin with the hundred days. I think the mandate that Mr. Nixon got was to take a look at what we had done, to review what we had done, to

FIRING LINE - #143 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 15

review what we had done to cull out the bad and proceed perhaps with the good. In other words,

BU: That's kind of funny, because Mr. Nixon got more votes in 1960 than in '68, didn't he?

BUCH: Well, we had, there was a third-party candidate, as you recall, got ten-million votes. I don't think that was a mandate for new social programs, those votes at all.

BU: No. So, you understand, then, that he is implementing ~~xx~~ that ~~xxx~~ mandate?

BUCH: I don't think, as I say, I would ~~xx~~ see it as that. Right. /I don't think the people elected Richard Nixon to come up with more social programs than Johnson did in '65, or Woodrow Wilson in 1913, or something of that nature. I think it was really to review what had been done, and as I pointed out, really, a consolidation.

BU: The Washington Post says that there is now continuing evidence that the administration is having difficulty arriving at firm conclusions on policy, and even in some cases, ~~xxxxx~~ firm deadlines. Do you see this from where you sit?

BUCH: No. Did they give ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ any examples?

BU: Uh, I don't know whether they did or not, come to think of it, because somebody sent me that excerpt. Can you think of any examples?

BUCH: No, I can't, that's why

BU: You mean to say

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 16

BUCH: Well, no, but Ray pointed out, what they're doing, is true, perhaps feel there's a great deal of study, /some ~~xxx~~ people might ~~xxxx~~ we might be ~~xxxxx~~/studying things too long, ~~xxxx~~ before decisions are made, but I don't know that there's any lack of willingness to make a decision once the President feels he's got all the information at hand.

PR: And there's a great deal of internal ~~xx~~ debate that does go into that process though, that may be what inspired the Post to make this comment. And it may seem this way, I think, at times, simply because we have exposed to the public more of the internal debate that goes into decision making than others have before.

BU: Umhm. Good point. Good point, yeah. But it has, for instance, taken a long time to decide how to retaliate against the North Vietnamese ~~xx~~ for attacking the cities, right? I mean that was quite a long while ~~xxxx~~ ago that he issued that warning.

PR: Well, I don't know what's going on ~~xxxx~~ in that

BU: Actually,

BUCH: We don't have enough knowledge or information to recommend would

BU: No, but I'm sure that our war correspondents ~~wxxx~~/advise us if (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

BUCH: Well, the ABM's an example though. I think they indicated that a lot of time had been taken before he made that decision, yet there were a number of , there was a lot of

FIRING LINE - #148 - ~~xxxx~~ Reel 1 of 2 - page 17

advice from council, and he came to the point and ~~xx~~ he made the decision. I think this would be true, but again it's his own time, ~~xxxxxxx~~he's gonna take his own time to do it, I think, but I don't think there's any hesitation to make decisions in the Office of the President right now.

BU: Well, then those decisions that are unmade are unmade because he's not through studying the situation, correct? Or because he considers that the agenda places ^{them} behind other ~~px~~ more prominent problems?

PR: I'd say it's a combination of both. In the first place, you don't make all your decisions on your first day in office. It's a simple mechanical fact. Second, a lot of the decisions are necessarily postponed, if only because -- we're talking on domestic, social ^{programs} ~~xxxxxxx~~ now, for example -- if only because of ^{the necessities} ~~the xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ imposed by the budget. Inflation, fighting inflation, of course, has a compelling priority, as it must, now, and this makes less money available in the coming year. And, therefore, a number of the things which might be tried later on will have to be tried later on, and therefore you'll have more time for decisions.

BU: Well, couldn't ~~xxxx~~ you (UNINTELLIGIBLE) ^{he} them? Couldn't ~~xxx~~ say when I get more money here's what I want to do ~~x~~ with it?

PR: You could, but on the other hand, in most of them, the studies are going forward, and another key ~~kd~~ difference, I think, from past administrations, here, in the decision-

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 18

making process is that we are not starting with a set of dogmatic assumptions about what we feel must be done. Rather, we're starting more nearly with a set of questions, which we feel need to be answered. One of the essential ~~xx~~ truths that we have discovered is how much, how little we know, not we as an administration, but we as a country, about a lot of these problems that we're facing. About the sociology~~xx~~ of ~~the~~ the urban ~~xxxxxx~~ crisis, and so forth. About the process of learning, for example. One of the ~~xx~~ essential ~~xxxxxxxx~~ commitments has been to the first five years of life, where we feel that a great ~~big~~ deal must be done and can be done and yet we know that science is on the threshold of a lot of conceptual breakthroughs on this, but they haven't quite been made yet. And we're trying to find out ~~why~~ more. We, and at the same time, we're trying to make clear what the limits of knowledge are in a great many of the areas, so that when problems are developed they can be couched more realistically and expectations can be adjusted more realistically for what they'll achieve.

BU: Of course, if I were a Democrat I guess I would have been tempted to say why didn't you do that thinking before you became President? Right? But, of course, I'm not.

BREAK

BU: Mr. Buchanan, I note that your colleague, Mr. Price, said a while ago to some reporter that he thinks that we have gained something during the first few months of the Nixon

FIRING LINE #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 19

administration, namely, a lowering of our voice. I think the way he put it was that there's been a restoration of decency by which we mean that the Nixon haters have called think, a moratorium, how long that will last, I ~~thinkxxxxxx~~ is an interesting matter of speculation. Now, do you think that this would have happened no matter what, or is it something that is testimony to a reserve in Mr. Nixon's strength that one had no reason to suppose was there?

BUCH: I think it's a combination of things. One of course is the traditional honeymoon, which is really the willingness of the American people I think, the vast majority of them, to give an ~~xx~~ individual a chance. The second, I think, is the manner in which the President has handled the office, since he's taken over in January. I think that there was a number of myths about Mr. Nixon that had been, come over from the years of the fifties, which a lot of Americans had accepted, and Mr. Nixon, the way he's handled himself in office, I think, has gone far toward destroying those myths. I think, so, it's a combination of the two, both his conduct in office, and the willingness of the American people to give him a certain amount of time in which to demonstrate, well, to demonstrate certain things. I think this is right now what he has, this 65 or 70% support, and 9% against, right now, is really ~~xx~~ the capital on which he has to build. He's gonna have to make decisions which are gonna anger and

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 20

many
antagonize/people and I think this is going to be reduced
as a result of it. Inevitably, it is.

BU: My own notion is a little bit different. I'd like to
try to bounce it off ~~xxx~~ for you. It's this: that so many
people predicted the end of the world if Mr. Nixon were
nominted, that when he was in fact elected, and it became,
~~xx~~ well, it always was manifest that it wouldn't be the
end of the world, they had to sort of retreat from the
inertia of their own rhetoric, and if they continued to say
that the kind of thing was about to happen that they had
predicted, all along would happen, and it didn't happen,
is
it was sort of self-discrediting. Who ~~wax~~ that baseball
~~xxx~~ player that I can't stand, the, I can't stand him even
though he is ~~xx~~ a Negro, Jackie Robinson. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

BUCH: Robinson.

BU: Robinson, Yeah. You know he was going around all last summer
saying that there would be a general strike, a famine,
anti-intellectualism, the end of baseball, or whatever,
and obviously he isn't saying that every day. And the
reason he isn't saying that every day is because, as I say,
it would be self-discrediting. People, Floyd McKissick,
I notice, the other day, said Richard Nixon does not have
rhetoric
the ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ of a Hubert Humphrey, but he does ~~xx~~ have the
basic qualities that can be relied upon to make him a good
President, I predict that Nixon will make many changes
for the good of black people in this country. And this

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 21

would have been absolutely heretical, oh, let's say in the presence of Jackie Robinson down in Miami Beach. Or any of the number of people whose names he signed on to that anti-Nixon ad. Now, could it be that this is one of the principal reasons, or is it mostly the old honeymoon idea? The restoration of decency, as you put it?

PR: I think that is part of it. I think part of it, too, is a change in national ~~xxx~~ mood, which has been to my mind quite dramatic over the last 6-8 months, If you just sit about back for a moment ~~xx~~ and think/what America was like last year, when everybody, but everybody was beating everybody else over the head. Practically. Kicking, screaming, tearing hair out, calling names and now it has calmed down substantially. Not on the campuses, at least not on all of them. There are a few

BU: Of course, they don't hate Nixon on the campuses, curiously. But go ahead. Yeah.

PR: But the people are becoming more reasonable, I think. Quite ^{was} substantially so. And this/ especially ~~xxxx~~ what I was referring to when I spoke of the voices having been lowered. And I think this is in part because of the example that has been set, from the White House, by the President of non-inflammatory discussion, self-effacement, uh, speaking in a rational, reasonable way, when he, for example, when he went for an hour on television to talk about foreign policy, after his European trip, what he did basically then was

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 22

to each, with each question asked, to explain what the considerations were, what the ramifications probably were, to go to the outside limit of what could be discussed and could be told, but principally to let the public in on the processes of decision-making. So that there became, so there has been a greater understanding, I think, of what goes into this.

BU: Yes, but that's ~~xxx~~ I think on the part of the public, but the public was never the great abuser of Nixon. The abuser of Nixon was the intellectual class, the opinion-making class. And even they have been ~~xxxxx~~ strangely silent.

PR: But I think/^{if} we have a public ~~xxxxx~~ climate that is less shrill, then the person inclined to be shrill is

BU: A little self-conscious.

PR: looks a little sillier.

BU: Yeah. Yeah. The, Professor Harry Jaffa, ^{on the West Coast,} ~~whom I suppose~~ who will immortalized if only because he composed that wonderful phrase in Goldwater's speech -- extremism in defense of liberty -- told a ~~xxx~~ friend of mine recently that the personal contribution of so far, he's not being ironic, by the way, is that he's lowered the level of public expectations. Now, a lot of people can snicker over that, ^{you see,} and say well, ha, ha, he's the man to do it, and that kind of thing, but he doesn't mean that at all. He means, of course, that people can now go for five, six hours without wondering

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 1 of 2 - page 23

about the White House, you know, which is rather nice, ~~xxx~~
to
for ~~xx~~ those who would like, you know, /pay attention to
their own lives. And it may be that Mr. Nixon has subtly
given the people to understand that their problems are
outside the competence of his government or any government
to dispose of. Do you think that's intentional?

PR: Certainly to some extent. He does recognize that there are
a great many problems, which are either wholly or partly
beyond the competence of government. And one of the things
that I think he would like to see more widely recognized
in the country is this, that is, that while there is a great
deal ~~xxx~~ that government can do, there also is a great deal
it cannot do, and that it, if this is going to get done
you've got to staff with a ~~xxxx~~ recognition by the people
that they have to do it themselves.

END OF REEL #1

#148 ----- REEL #2 of 2 ~~XXXXXX~~

BU: Is it too late, do you suppose, to put, because in one of,
in a speech that I suspect you wrote, I won't raise the
question, he said about the, that the days of ~~xx~~ the
passive Presidency belonged to a simpler past. He must
articulate the nation's values, define its goals, marshal
its will, now, maybe they are past. I wish they weren't
past, because I think it would be very nice to articulate

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 24

your own goals, rather than have somebody else doing it in loco parentis; but do you think that Mr. Nixon does feel that the President has got to mobilize Americans out of it (?) always in behalf of this or that corporate objective?

PR: Not always. Often, yes. But not always. But there

BU: What would be an example of something he'd let us handle by ourselves? ~~Shxxxxxxx~~ Student riots?

PR: Uh, to some extent. To some extent, it may be necessary for him to

BU: ~~To~~ To write Ted. (?)

PR: do it all, but obviously this sort of thing/^{is, if} it can be handled on the campuses, it most effectively is handled on the campuses. But, of course, one of the problems today is that there simply is so much more on the plate, there is so much more to be done, there is so much more to be ~~done~~ decided; and there's more for government to do, and there's more for everybody else to do also. And/^{if} the President is going to handle the government ~~xxxxx~~ portion of it, he's got to be an activist President. A lot of other people, of course, look to him for leadership, and he does have a role as a moral leader, not as a moral dictator, But as a moral leader to point out some of the things which

BU: Well, now, what made him a moral leader? Out of curiosity. Because, seriously, I don't mean that he isn't moral, for heaven's sake; but who elected him moral leader of anything?

PR: Well, it isn't that, of course, we have this peculiar and sometimes very difficult situation in the U.S. where unlike almost any other country in the world, the President is both the Chief of State and the Head of Government, that is he's the King and the Prime Minister. ~~xox~~ And from the Chief of State, who in Britain ~~would~~ would be the King or the Queen, people do expect at least a symbolic leadership. Uh, moral leadership, I mean moral in its broader sense, here.

PR: Exemplary personal behaviour, and also

PR: Also, people here have at least come to expect from their President at least an articulation of values, which they can ~~ex~~ accept or not; but at least to have them there, to have something they can turn to and argue about.

BUCH: I believe he does. He spoke in the ^{Teddy}imes about ~~Teddy~~~~Teddy~~
Roosevelt used the Presidency as a bully pulpit, I think was
has
his phrase, and he/indicated his intention to do likewise.

BU: Umhm. And you're talking about morals in the extra-ideological sense, presumably? You're not talking about moral leadership of a kind that would appeal to conservatives, as distinguished from ~~liberals~~ liberals, or whatever?

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 26

BUCH: Well, I suppose that would depend on what the issue involved was.

BU: Well, say, race.

~~XXXXX~~ PR: Yes, I think he would see the need for a moral leadership there. This of course is a question that goes far beyond the reach of law, as you have very eloquently pointed out yourself. And that you are dealing with (UNINTELLIGIBLE) intangibles, emotions, attitudes and opinions, and I think he would feel that there is a moral leadership to be exercised here. And, of course, if the moral leadership can be effective then there is less need for legislative remedy.

~~XXXXX~~ BREAK

BU: We've read an awful lot about the difficulties that Mr. Nixon has had in attracting to Washington people he needs to launch whatever it is he's gonna launch, and ~~xxx~~ a very provocative comment was made in a journal here saying that there a number of reasons for Mr. Mitchell's prediction and why Mr. Mitchell's prediction did not come out -- he's talking about the Attorney General who had said publicly that your aim was quickly to bring in 1700 people in the crucial posts, in order to put a distinctive Nixon stamp on his administration. For one thing, ~~xxx~~ this writer said, Republicans almost by definition do not seem to have the same zest for government as Democrats, is that

FIRING LINE- #148 -~~xxxx~~ Reel 2 of 2 - page 27

correct?

BUCH: I would agree.

BU: Why?

BUCH: Well, I think the Republican Party is more conservative than the Democratic Party, and I think that many of your most capable young people in, who would normally, if ~~xxxx~~ they were Democrats, go into government and ~~xxxx~~ politics, wind ~~xxx~~ up in the business community, and I think this is one ~~xxxxxx~~ reasons, and ~~xxxxxxxx~~ another reason is that the Republican Party has really been out of power for the last eight years, and I don't think there's that ~~xx~~ many, at least it ~~xx~~ didn't seem to ~~xx~~ me that there was quite as many young people in the colleges, let me give you another example. In the colleges and universities, I think the prevailing ideology is liberal, and the liberals tend to gravitate to the Democratic Party and not toward the Republican Party.

BU: Uh, and is it then because of the fascination for exercising power that brings them to Washington in such ~~xx~~ numbers?

BUCH: You mean liberals?

BU: Yeah.

BUCH: ~~XX~~ No, I don't think so. I don't think so. I think their interest, they gravitate toward the academic community, they gravitate toward the media, they gravitate toward politics and government, and as I mentioned the more

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 28

conservative of the young people in high schools and colleges, I think, tend to move toward the business community. This is what I've found, anyhow.

BU: Well, why can't one reach into the business community and get competent people?

BUCH: Well, you can, we~~xx~~ have gotten a number of competent people, but it's difficult to bring them in. There's a number of them, reluctance on their part to come, ~~xxxxxxx~~ and they're not experienced, as I say, in government, or politics, usually.

BU: He goes on to say for another the group that has come seems largely to be with limited contacts, and without the contacts that reach out ~~xx~~ to the universities which staffed the past Democratic administrations. The point being that when you do get people, if it had been a Johnson or a Kennedy, you would have gotten somebody who himself knew 10, 12, 15, 20 people, each one of whom knew 10, 12, 20 people who were highly qualified, but that when you pluck somebody out from wherever, he sort of comes in knowing nobody. Is this a problem you've experienced?

PR: Mr. Mitchell knows a great deal more about the staffing problems than (BOTH ~~AX~~ TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY)
quoting

BU: I'm not ~~xxxxxxx~~ Mitchell, you understand, now.

PR: than either of us who have not been intimately involved in recruiting. My impression is that at least to some extent

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 29

Pat

it has been true, and I would agree with ~~xxxx~~ on many of the reasons why the people who naturally tend to be Republicans tend naturally not to be attracted to government, but we hope to change all that.

BU:

By making the ~~Nx~~ Nixon administration ^{an} ~~xx~~ attractive ^{one} ~~xx~~ ~~xxx~~ to work ~~xxxx~~ in?

PR:

Yes, making it an attractive one to work in, and also by demonstrating, as there of course has not been the opportunity to demonstrate in recent years, on campuses for example, that the, what the Republican Party represents, what the Nixon administration represents, and so forth, is not what it has been portrayed as being in the past, that it in fact is a place of ideals and a commitment to a ~~xxx~~ better world, and so forth, and once, I think once a lot of the people on campuses get to seeing, as they will, not only that the idealism is there, but also that it actually can accomplish something, under these approaches that we're taking, that they will find it a much more attractive place to work.

BU:

~~XX~~ Umhm. Incidentally, what I said a moment ago, that students weren't all that much ~~xxxx~~ against Nixon, I didn't mean to offend Mr. Nixon, I simply meant that they view him pretty much as they would/a Martian, just completely out of this world, you know, part of ^{you know} ~~xx~~ the, in the ganglion of the Establishment, so they don't get sore at him the way they would at Pat Moynihan, you see, or somebody like

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 30

that. Mr. Burrs, do you have a question?

 BUR: I'm very interested in one thing. Last Spring, or early last summer, we heard that Mr. Nixon had a plan for Vietnam, but that he wouldn't ~~xxx~~ release it, due to the ^{administration} conflict with the Johnson/still being in office. This weekend the Washington Post ran a very large article discussing projected pull-out of troops, gradual pull-out of troops, ~~and~~ in the course of the summer and early in the fall in Vietnam, ^{and} assuming that ^{if} I was wondering if/the exact plan, ~~if~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ it exists, can be discussed at this time, if you could press-relate (?) the ideas of the President as to gradually decreasing the United States military in Vietnam?

 BUCH: Well, let me take the second part of that first. Mr. Nixon, I don't believe, ever said that he had a plan for ending the war. What he did was in New Hampshire, he said that I pledged ~~to~~ you that new leadership will end the war in Vietnam, and this gradually evolved in the press to Nixon's plan which was then picked up. I don't think the President indicated he had any specific set plan, which he was withholding from the people, for ending the war in Vietnam. With regard to withdrawal of troops, he's committed really to replace American troops with Vietnamese forces, I think, as soon as the Vietnamese can handle the job themselves. But he ~~hasn't~~ hasn't given any deadlines on that. He hasn't

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 31

given any program for doing this, because I think he feels it would be counter-productive as far as reaching some sort of agreement~~xxxx~~ that is worthwhile at Paris.

BU: Miss Reese.

RE: Mr. Price or Mr. Buchanan. Do you feel that the President's powers as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces are too broad, especially in line with the Vietnam War which was discussed, and would you describe Senator Fullbright's sense of the Senate Resolution dealing with the deployment of United States ~~xxxx~~ troops, in foreign lands.

PR: I would not say that his powers are too broad as Commander-in-Chief, They have to be broad as Commander-in-Chief, and especially

BU: They don't have to be too broad.

PR: But ~~xx~~ especially in a period in which reaction times necessarily often have to be very quick, but I haven't myself gotten into the Fullbright resolution, I'm not that /familiar with the arguments on that.

BU: Well, I take it the Fullbright resolution aims to avoid
elision
the kind of ~~xxxxxxx~~ into a Vietnam situation that happened
(BOTH TALKING SIMUL.)
over the summer of 1964. That's not variable, we're/not
against that, are we?

~~RRX~~ (UNINTELLIGIBLE -- ALL TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY)

BU: Mr. Nadler.

NA: Mr. Price and Mr. Buchanan, you've been described
 ~~XXXXXX~~
 you can ascribe by Mr. Buckley,

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 32

with different ideological viewpoints. I'm wondering is this responsible for certain different viewpoints ~~xxxx~~ within the administration? ~~xxxxxxx~~ Particularly, I'm thinking of the difference between the response last summer to the Pueblo incident and the response in recent in days to the incident ~~of~~/the plane down in North Korea.

BU: Which one of you would like that?

BUCH: Well, ~~with~~ ^{with} ~~regarding~~ ^{to} the Pueblo, I don't think that/any at time Mr. Nixon indicated precisely what he felt ^{resident} _n Johnson should have done once the boat was seized and they had begun towing it into port, and I don't think he critized his actions once they began towing it into port. It is true I think that we did make political ~~xx~~ capital out of the fact that the boat had been out there, that warnings had been given repeatedly by the North Koreans, that the boat had been harrassed. I think there's a different situation when you have an aircraft and they've made 190 flights along the coast without any incidents, and without anywarning from the North Koreans, and they've shot it down. I think there is a difference there. At least I see it pretty clearly.

BU: Does that satisfy you? I have a feeling it doesn't, does it?

NA: No, it doesn't. There were several statements during the campaign about the Nixon administration would not allow a fourth-rate power to take such action as they had against

FIRING LINE - #148 - ~~xx~~ Reel 2 of 2 - page 33

the Pueblo. Yet then we see the incident with the plane

BU: Same power.

NA: a very parallel, it seems, incident, and an absolute, it
And
seems, a lack of action, one way or another, / I'm ~~xxx~~
saying

BUCH: Well, ~~xxx~~ there has been some action taken. ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~
~~xxxxxxxx~~ force right now, and the, there hasn't been any
specific retaliation taken against North Korea, that's
true. I think the President ~~xx~~ looked over the situation
when he got the reports, and evaluated the pros and cons
of taking this action, and just decided not to. I don't
think there was any point in the campaign in which the
President said that Lyndon Johnson should (A) go in and
tow
~~xxxx~~/that boat out of Wonsan Harbour~~xx~~ or (B) he should
strike North Korea. It is true, as I have said, that we
did make political capital out of the fact that North
Koreans had taken this boat after provocation and after
harrassment and after warnings.

BREAK

BU: Mr. BURNS, Mr. Burrs (?), sorry.

BUR: I think Mr. Buckley referred to the fact that perhaps
the President was having ~~xxx~~ a bit of difficulty recruiting
especially young people, getting people on the campus
perhaps interested ~~xxxxxx~~ and destroying his image as a
Martian, as you ~~fx~~ referred to, and also ~~xxxxxx~~ bringing

FIRING LINE _ #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 34

these younger people who seem to be more interested in getting active right away and have a tendency to move towards the Democratic Party. And I was wondering what you people are doing in the way of recruitingxx these two groups.

BUCH: Well, to start out, We ~~xxxxx~~ have what I think is the youngest White House staff in history including a number of very, very bright fellows, 22, 23 years old, who have quite responsible positions and are fresh out of college, and very actively involved in the legislative programs and so forth. The, as far as specific recruitment policy, beyond this, I don't know how the plans are shaping up. Do you?

NA: Maybe this will help. The idea of a youth affairs department, a ~~xxxxxx~~ Department of Youth Affairs.

PR: Cabinet Department of Youth?

NA: Yes.

PR: Well, what we have, we have a office in the White House that focuses on youth affairs. And it's under the general direction

BU: That would be under the Pentagon I should think. (LAUGHTER)

PR: Well, we're going for a voluntary army, though.

BU: I didn't mean to interrupt you, sorry.

PR: And this has a staff and again a very young staff, people who are maintaining contacts with ~~the~~ youth organizations,

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 35

and youth, generally, and so forth. Trying not only, not
just to recruit, but also/^{trying}to bring their ideas in. And
this will be I expect an expanded operation.

BU: Miss Reese.

RE: Continuing with this, if you feel that there is a lot of
work being done now, the youth, I'm not aware of such work
being done. Don't you think that a Cabinet position
would make this more public, and in turn aid the rift that
now exists between youth and what ~~xx~~ you call the
Establishment?

BU: Would the Cabinet member be a teenager?

RE: Not necessarily.

BU: That would be ~~xx~~ very participatory, wouldn't it?

RE: I'm sure there are qualified youths in our country ~~that~~
to
~~xxxxx~~/take a Cabinet position.

BU: How do you like that. Mr. Price?

PR: Well, I personally would be against. Now, this is a personal
rather an administration reaction. Mainly, because a
~~xxxxx~~ Cabinet has to be of workable size, and there are
all sorts of problems that one could recommend the
Department
Cabinet ~~xxxxxxx~~ solve, or to handle. Youth affairs, for
one thing, I don't want to see youth ghettoized, all that
recognizing there
~~xxx~~ much. I would rather, ~~xxxxxxx~~ that ~~xxxxx~~ are young
points of view to be heard, and special interests of young
just
people, I don't want them to be/seen as completely a class

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 36

apart, to be dealt with, the special interest thing, you have
and you have
farmers, /laborers, and you have youth, and so forth.

And I would much rather see a broader involvement than you
have with this special compartmented group (?)

BU: Mr. Nadler.

NA: In ~~xxxxxx~~ referring to the image~~xx~~ of, I guess you would
call it, inaction, in the first hundred days, you stated
that the President did not have a similar mandate for change
as had been in previous administrations, but rather a
mandate for reevaluation. I would challenge that in light
of the statements made during the campaign, on the law
and order issue, and the pictures that were shown of
tends
~~xx~~eviolence. I would ask what the administration ~~plans~~
to do or what plans it does have in light of this.

BUCH: Right. That's very true. I meant in terms of social
programs and large spending programs. It's apparent I think
that the administration was really given a mandate to do
a number of things. First, it was given a mandate to end
the war in Vietnam, I think it was given a mandate to
end inflation, and/end to the degree possible the violende
and crime in the country. Todate, the President has fulfilled
his commitment with regard to D.C. crime in terms of the
proposal. He does have a proposal out last week in ~~xx~~
regards to organized crime. One is coming out with regard
to narcotics, and I think the Justice Department is the only

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 37

department that's exempt from the strictures on spending. All the others were cut back, and the Justice Department is the only onewx where they can increase funds. So, I think he really has fulfilled his commitment here, and he intends to do so. (1) Because he believes this is right and necessary for the country, and, secondly, and the lesser consideration, is the fact that he's got to do it politically. We've got to make some ground in this area of law and order and justice, I think, if we expect to last more than four years.

BU: Do you predict that Mr. Nixon, as President, is going to define a new kind of President, one that harmonizes with the requirments of the managerial age without necessarily being the kindof President who comes out of ones romances of which John Kennedy is put forward as the epitomy?

BUCH: I think that he would be a different kind of President who would be given his own personality, and his own stamp upon the office. I think the tendency to judge Presidents in recent years has been really the scoreboard approach, in other words, how many pieces of legislation they send up, and how many they pass. ~~And~~ They ~~ix~~ used this to judge Roosevelt, and to judge Kennedy and to judge Johnson. I think you would need a different criteria to judge President Nixon.

BU: Thank you very much, Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Price, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, from George Washington

FIRING LINE - #148 - Reel 2 of 2 - page 38

College in Washington.

THEME

END OF REEL #2