

The original documents are located in Box 44, folder “11/9/75 - "Meet the Press"” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

PERSONNEL CHANGES

- Q. In your press conference last Monday, just about the only experience or background that qualified Donald Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense is that he was once a Naval aviator. Do you really think being a former pilot is adequate preparation for heading the Pentagon?
- Q. You say you don't want to talk about personalities, and that makes good sense. Nevertheless, you also say that there were no policy differences involved in firing Schlesinger and hiring Rumsfeld, it was just being able to work better with one rather than the other, which sounds to me like a mere matter of personalities. Is it right that the change was a matter of personalities, not issues, and if so, why shouldn't journalists talk and write about it that way, as they have been?
- Q. Now that you have your own team in place -- changes in Defense, State, National Security Council, and CIA -- what changes for the better can we expect to result? Mr. President, what does all this furor and commotion mean to the people?
- Q. How do the personnel changes affect such major international concerns as our relations with China and the Soviet Union? Do they signal anything to our allies in Europe? What is the impact on our role in the Middle East? How will it affect the progress of the SALT talks? These are questions that are being asked all around the world, Mr. President. What are the answers?

- Q. Even if there is, as you seem to be saying, no policy significance in these changes, it is understandable that allies and potential adversaries are reading significance into them. Shouldn't some of them, at least, been advised in advance, in an orderly way, about these impending changes, so that the shock and puzzlement and misunderstanding could have been lessened? Wern't we damaged around the world by the way these changes became known?
- Q. Isn't Kissinger going to continue to control the NSC through his loyal, hand-picked deputy and protege, Brent Scowcroft?
- Q. Why didn't Mr. Schlesinger fit on your team? What did Mr. Schlesinger do wrong that you did not like?
- A. Mr. Schlesinger served with distinction during difficult times in a number of important offices. But it is important to my ability to lead this Nation that I have people on my team who work well with me personally and who work well with their colleagues in my administration. I reluctantly came to the conclusion that the process of making and carrying out national security discussions in my administration will be more effective by replacing Mr. Schlesinger with Mr. Rumsfeld, with whom I have established a frank and close working relationship.
- Q. How will Mr. Rumsfeld strengthen your team?
- A. Mr. Rumsfeld is intimately acquainted with the Congress, with the problems of our defense and foreign policy, and with the operation and major policy discussions in the White House. He will be a more effective advocate of a strong defense on Capitol Hill and in the highest councils of the government.

- Q. Why were you unhappy with Secretary Kissinger's dual role?
- A. The Secretary has done an outstanding job. But I concluded he could serve even more effectively by devoting his full efforts to his job as Secretary of State. Under the new arrangements for making and carrying out national security policies, I will seek on a regular basis the views of Secretary Kissinger, Secretary Rumsfeld, Director Bush and NSC Advisor Scowcroft on foreign policy, defense questions and intelligence. I believe these new arrangements will best serve my leadership needs in these areas.
- Q. Does this mean that the Secretary's influence has been significantly reduced?
- A. Secretary Kissinger will continue to have the dominant role in foreign policy. Just the other day, he indicated that the influence of a Cabinet officer depends on whether the views he advocates serve the interests of the country and the needs of the President.

GENERAL

GENERAL

- Q. What is your strategy for winning a majority in the election when less than 20 percent of the voters say they are Republicans?
- Q. What type of man do you want for your Vice President? What are your criteria?
- Q. How do you expect to get elected when you turn your back on special interest groups and recommend programs against their interests, such as: the farmers, the poor, the elderly, etc.?

GENERAL

Q: In your State of the Union Message you said the State of the Union was not good. Is it any better almost one year later?

A: It's better, but not as good as I would like. I want to lead this Nation for the next five years so that my successor can stand before Congress in 1981 & declare: "The State of the Union is Great."

Q: In your State of the Union Message you promised "communication, conciliation, compromise, and cooperation" with Congress. In what ways have you lived-up to that promise?

Q: In your State of the Union Address you called for restraining the growth of some existing federal programs. Has any progress been made? Which programs do you want to restrain?

GENERAL

Q: What have the major achievements of your Administration been?

Q: What are your major disappointments?

Q: What are your Administration's major strengths?

Weaknesses?

NEW YORK

NEW YORK CITY

Q: How can the United States provide assistance to developing countries when you refuse to provide aid to New York City?

A: We are not dealing with an either/or proposition; the two are completely different issues. I have made very clear my views with respect to the issue of New York City. With respect to foreign assistance, we provide such help not as a favor to another country but because we have an important relationship with that country to which aid contributes. Our relations with any given country and the means chosen to strengthen them reflect important U.S. interests in each case. It is erroneous to assert an analogy between these interests and unrelated internal issues. Thus, we should not see the question as a choice between New York and a foreign country, but rather whether the aid we are providing serves our interests.

IMPACT ON BANKS

Q: How many banks will be placed in difficulty in the event of a New York City default? What are the names of the banks?

A: The federal bank regulatory agencies have conducted an exhaustive review of holdings of New York City securities in our banking system and the potential impact on that system of a default by New York City. They have concluded that no major bank would be materially affected, as a direct consequence of a default by New York City.

While the impact on a handful of smaller banks could be more serious, the Federal Reserve and the FDIC have adequate mechanisms to protect bank depositors and the banking system.

RIPPLE EFFECT

Q. What ripple effect do you expect on the financial community from a New York City default?

A. There are two risks in any major financial reversal: financial and psychological.

We have carefully assessed the financial risk--the impact on the markets, and the impact on the banking system--and we believe these risks are manageable. Markets tend to discount future events and to some significant degree a potential default by New York City has already been discounted. These conclusions have been confirmed by many disinterested observers.

The psychological risks cannot be measured. However, it is clear that the dire predictions and alarmist rhetoric employed by those who seek to force a Federal bail out for New York City have enhanced the psychological risks. It remains of utmost importance that all who concern themselves with the affairs of New York City view the situation objectively.

In short, if all those concerned act responsibly, the ripple effect would be minimal.

CREDIT INVESTMENTS

Q: Are the creditors going to lose their investments?

A: Major states and cities have defaulted before -- for example Arkansas and Detroit -- and in all these cases the creditors have received 100 cents on their dollar. Accordingly, if New York City acts responsibly, eventually all creditors could be paid if New York City officials act responsibly in handling the city's fiscal affairs.

SOCIAL
ISSUES

INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE

Q: What is the proper role of intelligence in foreign policy?

Q: Has the Constitution been abused by our intelligence operations?

Intelligence - SHAMROCK

Q. Senator Church has released details of the so-called Operation SHAMROCK. Why did you try to cover this up?

A. I do not condone the activities which have become known as the "SHAMROCK operation". In fact, this activity was terminated in May by my Administration after having been in operation for over twenty years.

In order to fully investigate these alleged abuses, I have endeavored to make all the information concerning SHAMROCK available to the Senate Select Committee and the Department of Justice. In order to ensure that appropriate legislation could be developed, if that is necessary, and prosecutions could go forward, if warranted, I ordered this information to be provided in classified form to these appropriate officials.

At no time did we seek to make this public or to take credit for having terminated this practice. In short, we have tried to act responsibly by taking effective actions to stop possible abuses and preventing any recurrence. We have done so without seeking publicity.

11/6/75
M. D.

Duane

INTELLIGENCE

Q. You have been dealing with the intelligence community problem for some time. Where do you think this should all end up in terms of structural changes?

A. My first priority in this field has been to take firm steps to stop any possible abuses, and to make certain that they do not reoccur, as long as I am President. This has been done through instructions I have given to the appropriate officials and the investigations undertaken by the Rockefeller Commission and other internal investigations within the Executive Branch. In addition, I have endeavored to make available all the relevant information in a responsible manner to the appropriate Committees of Congress and the Department of Justice.

I have also given great priority to maintaining the integrity of our intelligence community and the ability of this Nation to develop and use foreign intelligence. This is one reason why I have insisted that much of the information I made available to the Congress be kept secret, so that ongoing foreign intelligence operations, which are critical for the national security, can continue effectively.

I've also ordered a great deal of study on some administrative actions I can take, such as steps to strengthen the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, by providing some oversight role.

I am mindful that in considering the structure of the intelligence community, we are dealing with an asset that is critical for this Nation's survival. I have closely watched the investigations in both Houses of Congress, and within the Executive Branch there is an intensive review underway to determine whether new legislation should be proposed which would modernize the 1947 National Security Act.

I do not intend to address piecemeal the alternatives available but, rather, will deal with this subject comprehensively after my review has gone forward in a serious and disciplined manner and I have made my final decision.

11/7/75
M. D.

- Q. You have obviously embarked on a course of changing some of the key players in the intelligence community and bringing one, at least, George Bush, who has a strong political background. There is a tradition of the United States intelligence agencies being run by people of stature who do not have a political background; and furthermore, some of the best leaders, such as Allen Dulles, stayed with their agency for a long period of time. How do you justify your approach?
- A. In my judgment, the intelligence community needs new leadership, more as a result of events than of anything the current leaders have done. Our intelligence community is basically organized in accordance with the National Security Act of 1947. That Act was passed in the context of the Nation's experience of World War II, and our determination that "no more Pearl Harbors" would occur. In the twenty-eight years that have passed since then, the world situation has changed dramatically, and American's perception of the role of intelligence is also undergoing change.

A recent commission, who has studied the organization of our conduct of foreign policy (the Murphy Commission) recommended that the intelligence community should be led by a person "...of stature from outside the intelligence career service..." who has the President's confidence and "...sensitivity to the constraints within which an American intelligence service must operate..." He must have independence and high integrity.

In my judgment, Ambassador Bush possesses these qualifications.

INTELLIGENCE - GENERAL

Q. What have you done to clean up the intelligence community and prevent future abuses?

A. The intelligence community has served this Nation with distinction. It performs a critical function which is absolutely essential for our ability to maintain an effective national defense and for the President to conduct foreign relations.

Legitimate questions have been raised concerning some past practices of the intelligence agencies. I have moved quickly to stop abuses and prevent any reoccurrence. For example:

- I created the "Rockefeller Commission" to investigate the domestic activities of CIA;
- I collected materials concerning allegations of assassination plots by the intelligence community and made it available, under appropriate safeguards, to the Congress and the Justice Department;
- I have taken steps to implement administrative changes to prevent further abuses;
- I have ordered an intensive and comprehensive review to determine whether new legislation is needed;
- I have made it clear that I will not tolerate illegality or impropriety by any Executive Branch official while I am President, and
- I have endeavored to provide the appropriate Committees of Congress substantial information concerning the intelligence community under procedures designed to facilitate the Committees' investigations while maintaining the confidentiality of ongoing foreign intelligence activities.

11/6/75
M. D.

CIA - BUSH/Politics

Q. You have said you want to clean up the intelligence community to prevent abuses. Is putting a former Chairman of the RNC in as Director of CIA the way to do this?

A. I have nominated George Bush as Director of Central Intelligence and head of the CIA because I believe he is the best man for the job.

The intelligence community needs new leadership. The Nation must have an effective intelligence capability.

George Bush brings excellent qualifications to the job. He was formerly Ambassador to the United Nations and currently is our envoy to the Peoples' Republic of China.

I do not believe that a qualified man should be denied public office just because he served, with distinction, as head of one of our political parties. The two party system is a fundamental and important part of the political process - it helps make our democratic system work.

In fact, I believe the intelligence community will benefit by having a leader with a background in elective politics. He knows the importance of being responsive to the American people.

I will hold the entire intelligence community to the highest standards of integrity and legality. Ambassador Bush reflects these same standards.

11/6/75
M. D.

INTELLIGENCE - LEGALITY

Q. Are the current activities of the intelligence community being conducted in a legal and proper manner?

A. I have given unambiguous instructions that all members of the Executive Branch -- including the intelligence community -- must conduct their activities legally and in accordance with the high ethical principles I hold.

Attorney General Levi, in testimony before the Senate Select Committee, pointed out that, at my instructions, the personal approval of the Attorney General is required before any non-consensual electronic surveillance may be instituted within the United States without a judicial warrant. He went on to stress that there are no warrantless taps or electronic surveillance directed against American citizens, and none will be authorized unless the target is an agent or collaborator of a foreign power.

It is the Attorney General's view that the Justice Department's present policy and the actions taken under that policy are unquestionably in full compliance with the law.

11/6/75

M. D.

INTELLIGENCE - COVER-UP

Q. Why are you trying to cover up the intelligence community abuses in the areas of the assassination reports, covert actions and NSA?

A. It is not a question of withholding information required by the Congress to carry out its inquiries into the intelligence community. On the contrary, I have endeavored to make all of the information available to Congress so that legislation can be proposed, if necessary, and to the Justice Department to facilitate any investigation indicated. However, we must distinguish between disclosure to the Congressional Committees of sensitive information and publication of that information which is harmful to the national interest and may endanger the physical safety of individuals.

There is no question about access to these materials by appropriate officials. The only issue concerns publication which obviously cannot be limited to Members of Congress and other American citizens.

Public release of some of these official materials and information will do grievous damage to our country. It would likely be exploited by foreign nations and groups hostile to the United States in a manner designed to do maximum damage to the reputation and foreign policy of the United States. It would seriously impair our ability to exercise a positive leading role in world affairs.

11/6/75

M. D.

INTELLIGENCE - CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Q. Do you agree with Vice President Rockefeller's assessment that the current Congressional investigations of the intelligence community have harmed the Nation's ability to defend itself?

A. There is absolutely no doubt that leaks of highly classified intelligence information are adversely affecting our ability to conduct foreign intelligence activities.

It is possible for Congress to conduct its inquiries and consider legislation without publishing materials which should remain classified in order to permit our intelligence community to operate effectively.

11/6/75
M. D.

FOREIGN
POLICY

November 5, 1975

PALESTINIANS

Q: What is the United States' position on the Palestinian issue?

A: We have always maintained that a Middle East settlement must take due account of the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people. The manner in which this can be done is not clear, nor is the timing. A major obstacle is obviously the fact that the PLO refuses to acknowledge Israel's right to exist, thereby removing any basis for its participation in the Geneva negotiating process. Those negotiations are predicated upon United Nations resolutions clearly establishing Israel's right to live in peace as an independent state.

FUTURE US ACTION ON MIDDLE EAST NEGOTIATIONS

Q: How do you propose to proceed in your efforts to achieve a Middle East settlement in the aftermath of the Sadat visit?

A: Our objective remains one of seeking a settlement within the framework of the Geneva Conference, in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Our position on the means to this end has always been to pursue whatever realistic course was acceptable to the parties and we have said we will not tolerate stagnation or stalemate in the peace process. As to next steps, we have made clear our willingness to help facilitate progress on the Syrian front and have indicated that eventually there must also be a resolution of other problems such as the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people.

Q: Will Israeli Prime Minister Rabin also be coming to the United States?

A: I invited Prime Minister Rabin by phone to come for another visit the same day I invited President Sadat. We have not yet worked out the details and the timing.

Future US Action on Middle East Negotiations

- 2 -

Q: What about a meeting with President Asad?

A: As I have said before, I want to meet with all the key leaders of the Middle East, but there is nothing agreed on a meeting with President Asad.

PRESIDENT SADAT'S VISIT

Q: Why has President Sadat received so much high-level attention from you, the Vice President and others?

A: The question of peace in the Middle East is one of highest priority for the United States and the entire world. I believe that personal contact is essential for progress toward an overall settlement in the Middle East, an objective shared by this Administration and President Sadat. I have met frequently in this country with key Israeli leaders, including two visits by Prime Minister Rabin since I became President, and they have often visited the United States in the past. This is the first visit by an Egyptian President, and it symbolizes the evolution of the developing bilateral relationship between our two countries, as well as our common desire to bring peace to the Middle East.

Q: What about Sadat's attacks on Zionism and Israel?

A: President Sadat has stated publicly and privately his desire for peace in the Middle East and his recognition of Israel's right to exist as a state and live in peace within the context of a peace settlement. The representatives of Egypt and Israel recently signed a formal agreement concerning the Sinai

in which they pledged their efforts to work for such a peace. Concerning Zionism, my position and that of this government have been clear. We believe that the resolution introduced at the United Nations is a tragic mistake and President Sadat is fully aware of these views.

(FYI: If it appears useful, you could recall Sadat's opposition to moves last summer to suspend Israel's UN membership.)

Q: What about US arms for Egypt?

A: This was among the questions discussed during President Sadat's visit, but there was no consideration of a list of specific equipment. President Sadat has made it clear that Egypt is interested in diversifying its sources of military equipment so as not to depend exclusively upon the USSR. He has explained to Members of Congress why he would like some military equipment from the United States as part of this process. As relations between our two countries continue to evolve, assuming the situation in the Middle East remains favorable, we will be consulting with Congress and talking more specifically with the Egyptians about the possibility of Egypt buying some military equipment from the United States.

Q: What about the Egyptian-US agreement on nuclear reactors?

A: The Agreement which we are negotiating will include the most complete and careful safeguards we have ever devised. Among the number of other features the material produced in these reactors will be processed and stored outside of the region. Moreover, there will be a prohibition on the manufacturer of nuclear explosives, even for peaceful use. With these careful controls I do not believe the arrangement involves the risk of introducing nuclear weapons into the Middle East. The agreement in principle concluded November 5 must still be negotiated and submitted to Congress for approval.

Q: What about Israel, will they object to this arrangement or will they be offered a similar one?

A: Israel has been assured of our readiness to conclude a comparable agreement with them and it is my understanding that they are definitely interested in such an arrangement.

Q: We understand this reactor sale may involve as much as \$1.2 billion. How will the Egyptians pay for this?

A: There are a number of potential sources of financing which could be considered, and this matter has not yet been worked out with the Egyptians. However, there is no intention to increase the amount of the AID request which I recently sent to the Congress.

SITUATION IN LEBANON

Q: What is our policy toward the situation in Lebanon and has or will the US offer assistance to the Lebanese Government? Do you fear possible Syrian military intervention and the risk of counter-involvement by the Israelis?

A: The recent tragic events elicit our deepest sympathy for the people and the Government of Lebanon. Our strong friendship with the people of Lebanon and our policy of support for Lebanon's territorial integrity and independence are well known. We also support Lebanon's internal cohesion and unity and hope that it can be restored to its former situation of harmonious relationships between different religious and ethnic groups. We are naturally following events there closely and consulting with the Lebanese and other governments on what could usefully be done to help. We are working urgently to respond to Lebanon's relief needs and are encouraging the Red Cross to do likewise.

We would obviously be opposed to military intervention by any other state in Lebanon, but I do not want to speculate on a hypothetical situation.

As you know, we have advised non-essential Americans, including official US personnel and their families, to leave

Lebanon because of the present situation there, but our Embassy continues to function as a channel between our two governments.

We hope that eventually the situation in Lebanon will permit all Americans to return.

PANAMA

Q: What are the prospects of concluding this year a new treaty for submission to the Congress?

A: As I recently noted, discussions with Panama relating to the Canal have been conducted during the last three Administrations. The goal of these negotiations is to reach an agreement which would accommodate the interests of both nations while protecting our basic interests in defense and operation of the Canal. We believe this should be possible, and we are now in the process of discussing with Panama the possibility of arriving at such an agreement. There are a number of difficult questions remaining to be resolved and the negotiations are continuing. At this stage it simply would not be useful or possible to predict when agreement on a treaty might be reached.

I have no intention of proposing to the Congress any agreement with Panama, or with anyone else, that would not protect our vital interests. Naturally, any treaty we reach will be submitted to the full constitutional process, including Senate approval, and we will be consulting closely with Congress as the discussions continue.

26.

Q: Secretary Kissinger and State Department officials have said we are ready to begin conversations with Cuba to normalize relations. Have contacts already been made or do you expect them soon?

A: As I have said before we see no advantage in perpetual antagonism between ourselves and Cuba. However, improving relations is a reciprocal business, and the process was not helped by the Cubans when they recently took the lead in hosting a conference on solidarity with a tiny fraction of the Puerto Ricans which is in favor of independence. There are a number of complex problems at issue between us and the Cubans which will require careful consideration in any process of improvement of relations. We would be willing to enter into discussions about these issues but only on a basis of complete reciprocity. I wouldn't want to speculate on when or whether it might prove possible to begin to work out these problems.

SALT

Q: Mr. President, there are a number of reports that the United States and the Soviet Union will not be able to conclude a new SALT agreement by the end of the year. Could you describe the status of the negotiations, including the likelihood of an agreement by late December, and how this will affect General Secretary Brezhnev's visit to the US?

A: As you know, following up on the understandings reached in Vladivostok last year, General Secretary Brezhnev and I spent some time discussing SALT at the CSCE Summit in Helsinki. Foreign Minister Gromyko and I also discussed SALT during the Foreign Minister's visit to Washington in September. During these meetings, we made some progress on several outstanding issues.

While progress is continuing to be made, realistically it is getting late in the year. It will take about six to eight weeks to work out all the technical details of an agreement even after agreement is reached in principle. Thus, an agreement may now slip beyond the end of the year, and I think it would be un-

likely for the General Secretary to come to the United States before a SALT agreement is worked out.

In this connection, I would point out that the real issue is not whether this timetable or that is being met, but rather whether a SALT agreement in the best interests of the United States is negotiated. We have made progress and will continue to work in good faith toward such an agreement.

CHINA

Q: Is it true that Secretary Kissinger received a cool reception in Peking in October because the Chinese are unhappy with our "detente" policy toward the Russians?

A: We and the Chinese have never obscured the fact that we have views which differ fundamentally on a range of issues. Our philosophies and our respective positions in the world are quite different. At the same time, we share common perspectives on some fundamental issues affecting the security and interests of each of our countries. We believe it is in our mutual interest to exchange views periodically at the highest levels.

We firmly believe that our interests are served by the various policies we pursue.

Despite our areas of difference, I intend to seek to strengthen our relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis

~~of those aspects we share in common. We would be remiss in~~

~~our responsibilities to the American people if we did any less,~~

~~just as we would be remiss if we did not seek to lessen the~~

~~dangers of nuclear confrontation throughout the world.~~

CHINA

Q: Can you clarify the Administration's general approach on China policy?

A: It is a cardinal element of the Administration's foreign policy to seek the further normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China. The Shanghai Communique details the basic perspectives which the Administration brings to the normalization process. We remain committed to strict implementation of the Shanghai Communique.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Q: Has Henry A. Kissinger bought the SALT and Mid East agreements at too high a cost?

Q: How can you conduct foreign policy if the Congress continues to balk at the high price tags on the agreements and assert its rights to play a role in policy discussions?

Q: How can you continue to spend so much for defense when the unmet needs at home are so great?

Q: Are you still going to China? Is it true the Chinese don't want you to come now because of your soft position toward the USSR as signaled by the Schlesinger firing?

DEFENSE & FOREIGN POLICY

Q: What are you going to do if the UN passes the anti-Zionism resolution?
Will the U.S. withdraw from the U.N.?

FOREIGN POLICY

Q: How far can we afford to go in our SALT concessions before endangering our security? Have we passed that point?

Q: What is the appropriate role of the Congress in the conduct of foreign policy?

Q: Is the country becoming more isolationist? Is this good or bad?

PERSONNEL CHANGES

1. You have always had a reputation for honesty and candor. Haven't you now ~~demanded~~^{restored} your credibility by your incomplete and evasive answers at your news conference on why you made these personnel changes?

2. Are you now ready to tell us the real reason you fired Secretary Schlesinger and Director Colby, and who was behind this shake-up? Can you answer the question you wouldn't answer the other night, namely what did Schlesinger and Colby do wrong which persuaded you to fire them?

3. There have been all kind^s of interpretations of who won and who lost in the shake-up. Can you tell us whether Secretary Kissinger has gained power or lost power? Was this really a maneuver by Don Rumsfeld to gain power for himself and knock down his rival, Kissinger? Was this a successful move by Kissinger to get rid of his rival, Schlesinger? Was Mel Laird really behind this shake-up?

4. Does the departure of Schlesinger mean that you have adopted Kissinger's policy of going all out to seek detente with the Soviet Union? With Schlesinger gone, who is left now in your Cabinet to argue against giving away too much to the Russians in such matters as the SALT Talks?

5. Is uncertainty about the policy implications of this shake-up the reason why China now seems reluctant to have you visit?

6. Why did you act in such a sudden and disorderly way in making this personnel change? Doesn't it further the impression of disorganization in the White House and the inability on your part to give steady and careful leadership?

7. Did you expect all this adverse reaction to the staff shake-up? What did you expect the reaction to be?

8. What qualifications do Don Rumsfeld and George Bush have for these jobs, other than the fact that they are your friends and people you feel comfortable working with? *All you mention about Rumsfeld is his career as a Navy pilot.*

9. Why did you put George Bush, a highly political man with a strong political ambition, into the extremely sensitive CIA job? Don't you think George Bush should make a public pledge not to seek the Vice Presidential nomination in 1976 before he is confirmed for the CIA job?

10. If you were so anxious to get rid of Bill Colby that you fired him early on a Sunday morning, why did you turn around and ask him to stay on until George Bush is confirmed?
- ~~11. What changes of policy will be brought about by this staff shake-up? If there are no policy changes coming, then why did you make the personnel changes? Have you given any assurance to allies and adversaries overseas that these personnel changes do not mean a policy change?~~
12. Why did you chose such a bad time to announce these changes, when just before the China trip, when the SALT Talks were at a critical stage, and when Congress is in the final stages of considering your defense budget?
13. What is the real reason you fired Jim Schlesinger? Was it his attack on your friend Chairman Mahon? Was it his tough line on detente? Was it his disagreements with Secretary Kissinger? Was it his personal manner in dealing with you, his colleagues in the Cabinet, and Congress?
14. How do you justify firing Bill Colby, who has tried to be open with Congress and who has tried to clean up abuses at the CIA, and not fire Ambassador

VICE PRESIDENT
ROCKEFELLER

ROCKEFELLER

Q: How do you interpret Nelson Rockefeller's withdrawal?
What effect will it have on the rest of his term as Vice Pres.?
What effect do you expect it to have politically on your own
candidacy?

Q: What does the Rockefeller withdrawal do to the Reagan campaign?
Senator Goldwater urged Reagan to reconsider opposing you.
Do you think he'll go ahead now that Rockefeller is out as
an issue?

Q: If you have such a high opinion of Rockefeller, if you
think he is doing such a superior job as Vice President,
why didn't you try to talk him out of withdrawing for '76?
This seems to be like the Schlesinger firing: He's a great
guy, he has done a great job, and he's fired. Why don't you
tell us the real story?

ROCKEFELLER

Q: Will you continue to advocate the \$100 billion Energy Independence program that was Rockefeller's brain-child, or will you let it die quietly now? If you still support it, how do you reconcile it with your call for reduced spending and holding down the federal deficit?

GENERAL
POLITICS

General Politics

1. An NBC poll shows Reagon is more popular than you are with Republicans and Hubert Humphrey would beat you if the election were held today. In addition, two of the top officials of your campaign have resigned. Doesn't all this mean that your campaign is in serious disarray, and that you are very likely to lose next year's election?

2. If Ronald Reagon does well against you in the New Hampshire and Florida primaries as now seems likely, will you withdraw from the race for the Presidency, as Lyndon Johnson did?

3. Is Secretary Morton going to have a role in your campaign? Is he going to become Financial Chairman? Are you going to fire Bo Callaway and replace him with Rog Morton?

4. How can you stick with Bo Callaway as your campaign manager when two top campaign officials have already resigned because of disapproval of Callaway, and Republican leaders all over the country are saying Callaway should go?

5. How can you possibly appeal to the independent and Democratic voters you need to win the election when your campaign manager is a conservative Southerner and your policies are moving steadily to the right?

6. Why is your campaign having so much trouble raising money? You have collected less than a million dollars, instead of the \$5 million Packard thought you would have by now.

7. Almost all your campaign contributions so far have been from fat-cat big contributors. Doesn't this prove that you are just like Nixon, and only appeal to big businessmen and rich people?

8. Do you honestly believe you can win the New Hampshire and Florida primaries?

9. How do you expect to win election when the public image of you is a nice guy but not smart enough and not forceful enough to really lead the country for the next four years?

10. The Wholesale Price Index and the unemployment rate both went up sharply last week. Doesn't this mean that your economic policies are failing, and that you have no chance of election unless the economy gets better fast?

11. Your own campaign manager in Florida, Lou Fry, says he personally supports Reagan. How do you expect to win the primary and the election when you have that kind of person running your campaign? Isn't that an example of your inability to recruit dedicated and effective people for both your administration and your campaign?

12. How do you explain the fact that after more than a year in office, and a series of major steps designed to demonstrate your leadership ability in both foreign and domestic affairs, you still have an approval rating in the polls of less than 50%?

13. All your travel around the country campaigning has made no significant impact on your standing in the polls. How do you explain that?

14. Why have you decided to spend so much time campaigning around the country, more than a year before the election, and giving so little of your time to the important problems of the country you should be dealing with as President?

15 Why do you pretend that all your campaign travel and hand-shaking in the crowds gives you any real opportunity to hear the views of the people?

16. How do you expect to be elected when you veto all the programs the people want, like food stamps, better meals for poor children and pregnant mothers, jobs for people, help for the housing industry, and money to improve education?