

DIARY  
Orville L. Freeman  
Secretary of Agriculture

Volume #8



D I A R Y

Orville L. Freeman  
Secretary of Agriculture

VOLUME #8

(June 6, 1967 - March 29, 1968)

June 6, 1967 -- 10:30 pm at home. Things are mighty exciting around here. Connie and Mike are home from school full of life and cheer. We've had a couple of delightful evenings, visits before dinner, happy hours on the back porch. The flowers are beautiful this spring. The dogwoods were magnificent, the azaleas lasted for weeks, the rhodendums were magnificent, and now we have the roses. With the war in the near East, the kids are home and full of questions and interest, and want to discuss what goes on. Connie is mighty literate. Her foreign service school courses and her college exposure have alerted her. She's normally critical, is alert and intelligent. She's really been burning up that American University with fine grades and a lot of leadership positions. She's in a happy state of mind, preparing to go to Africa where her friend Gary is -- mighty thrilled about the trip -- mighty mature, too, about going to determine what the future holds, whether there is romance or what she should plan to do. She resolved to get a minor in teaching which I highly approve. She certainly is over the hump and doing well. We had a long discussion tonight about the Near East war. I know little about it except what I read in the newspaper and my own conjectures as was the case in the Cuba affair. When one of these blows the President works with the National Security Council, those people who are in the decision-making process and the rest of us in Government are pretty much left out. I was gone last week when he held a Cabinet Meeting for we spent the weekend in Minnesota and I gave a speech in Duluth. John Schnittker went. They apparently had a pretty good review of the situation. Yesterday morning when Israel attacked I got up rather late and crept out of here quietly and only when Rod Leonard met me at the Hilton Hotel where I was to speak to the American Meat Institute did I know that the Israelis had actually attacked. Nonetheless the picture it seems to me from reading the newspapers and general discussions is pretty clear. I've related it this way -- that the Russians took advantage of the situation in the

Near East, calculating that the United States would force Israel to back down and that Nasser was stronger militarily than now appears to be the case. They supported Nasser in his move to take over the Straits and Gulf of Aqaba. They must have felt they could frustrate any decisions in the United Nations and Nasser might be able to carry it off -- he would then be highly obligated to them and his prospects for building a strong friend in the Arab Nations and completely dominating if not destroying Israel would be pretty strong. The United States in turn, heavily committed in Vietnam, was hung up, and as Mr. Big we couldn't be too aggressive. We undoubtedly restrained Israel seeking to get United Nations action. Israel finally broke out -- whether we encouraged it or not I don't know yet, but I'm sure to find out soon. In any event as of tonight, Israel seems to be really clobbering them and on the move and the Arabs are weaker than anyone could have expected. Russia appears to be running now. The radio said the Security Council agreed on a cease fire resolution, but left open the question as to where withdrawal should be made and what should be done in connection with the Gulf of Aqaba. In the meantime the Israelis will I hope continue their offensive and completely decimate the Arabs. I hope they don't have to kill too many of them, but I hope they destroy their military resources and complete discredit them and eradicate the power of Nasser and make it clear once and for all that Israel is around to stay for a long, long time. If they do that some kind of a sensible sort of agreement which recognizes their legitimate aspirations and necessities of Israel and the Arab States can be negotiated and conceivably made clear that that's it for the long time future ahead and this cancer set right. There has to be a lot of power applied by Israel, the elimination of any real power in the Arab countries, the assurance of their weakness, the demonstration to them for all times that they can't prevail by force if what appears to be the strong overwhelming emotional



nationalism of the Arab countries is going to be restrained in the near future. The encouraging thing of course is that the Soviet apparently at this sitting is not ~~prepared~~ <sup>prepared</sup> to intervene actively and to take on the Israelis themselves. I pray to God it stays that way. If the shoes were on the other foot at this point and the Arabs were prevailing over Israel, we would certainly be in bad straits here. I don't think we could do other but intervene to protect Israel and what that would bring no one can tell. Seemingly we're spared that choice now for the Israelis seem to have the power to prevail and we need only to sit on the sidelines and pass resolutions calling for a cease fire while the necessary ground work is laid so it eventually can be a sensible settlement. Hopefully the Russians will not want to blow the world up and as such they can do little but make noises and then hopefully we will go a long way that they will go too to working out the settlement. Egypt's loud screams at this point violently challenged by Dean Rusk that the United States has given active air cover and support to Israel seem to be <sup>a</sup> blind striking out to save face. Anyway that's my analysis, we'll see what further developments, when I can worm my way into the know, disclose.

Our Memorial Day weekend trip to Northern Minnesota was an experience enjoyed in part, frustrating in some ways. Jane had a cold and wasn't feeling well when we left. The result was that she got in one of those kind of picky moods where the limited facilities, some of the dirt, and some of the crudeness of the Heaneys and even Marjorie Bangs particularly grated on her. This irritated me and although there wasn't any serious problem, the good time that we might have had with a full participation on her part wasn't forthcoming. Over the weekend when we talked about it, it was clear to me that she really was bitterly conscious of this fact and most unhappy as she made it clear she didn't care to go there with the Heaneys again. Perhaps I wasn't as patient as I might have been

about it, but after all when you're in Rome you ought to try and do as the Romans do and this was the Heaney's party not ours even though we own part of the cabin. It was kind of too bad because it was a glorious four days. We loaded up with all the rain gear and heavy clothes but didn't need them. The sun shone brightly, as a matter of fact I got more sunburn on my face than I can ever remember. The weather was so good, the fish weren't biting very well really, although we did catch eight or 10 lake trout including a big 15 pounder that Gerry caught that was most exciting. We were right there. He played it beautifully and was thrilled to death. We found a pot hole at the exit of a stream from Kawawia to another lake where just at dusk we were able to catch walleyes almost as fast as we could put a minnow on the hook and we must have caught close to 100 between the six of us, eating about half of them while we were there and carrying out our limits. I got three good sized Northern Pike, one of which actually bit me when I tried to get the hook out of his mouth and I had a pretty well chewed up finger. I caught him on my light spinning gear and it was a real thrill. The last morning Mike went out by himself and picked up an 8 pounder which thrilled him no end. One day Jane, Mike and I portaged over to a lake called "Mang" and had a perfectly delightful day. We went over about 11:00 in the morning with a picnic, fished different parts of the lake, had an hour and a half lunch lying on a warm rock with a cool breeze enough to keep the bugs away, a lovely view, read, dozed and really enjoyed it. All in all it was a good four days, but as I say it could have been much better. Crudeness, dirt, hurried meals, bad table manners, Jane just doesn't go for these, at least not when she's not feeling well and with people who she thinks ought to know better and who she knows well enough to be critical of. Anyway that's history now and it's behind us and there are better days at home.



We spent last weekend here which was delightful really. Worked in the yard, went to the Afghan Embassy for a dinner party for their Minister of Agriculture -- all relaxing and enjoyable. As I say the yard is beautiful and this has been a cool, perfectly delightful spring. Today the first really warm day.

I testified this morning before the Congress on the Rural Area Development Program. Joe Resnick started hearings. I gave a series of 60 slides outlining the progress in Little River County Arkansas which were really quite impressive and well received. I then sought to outline the dimension of the problem, both urban-rural balance, the importance to city and country alike of holding people in the countryside, the problems of poverty and at the same time improving the quality of rural living. I think it was a good statement. I had a lot of fussing to do at the people in the Department before I got a comprehensive presentation. I'm going to show the slide thing at Staff tomorrow, hopefully this will step up again our focus on Rural Development. We're now planning a week long trip the last week in the month that both Jane and I will make, seeking to publicize what we're doing, but equally to find out what we're doing and what more we can do. It's an awfully slow, tough struggle when the sharp responsibility is broadly diffused and interest runs in other directions because there isn't a sharp, clear lobby in this area. There is one however where food is concerned and it promises to continue to give me a lot of trouble. I think I related earlier the results of the Senate Poverty Committee including Joe Clark and Bob Kennedy and their visit to Mississippi and subsequent demands that we declare an emergency in the area for food purposes. They have completely oversimplified this issue, demanding all kinds of action because they saw a few people who allegedly weren't getting food. They haven't given much thought to what Federal intervention and actual program operation would mean. In the meantime I have been thwarted in my efforts to drop the minimum Food Stamp purchase requirement 50 cents by Jamie Whitten who

denies that there is anyone who doesn't have \$2.00 in Mississippi for food. We sent him names, as I think I've related before, to check himself. He hasn't reported the results of his check but has hinted to me that they found they did need to do some things in Mississippi. Anyway I had a call from Bobby Kennedy about this yesterday asking what I had done in connection with their recommendations and being quite insistent that we get food to those people. Any effort to ask who those people are or to deny that some of the people he saw might not be in exactly the circumstances as was related to him goes nowhere. Jack Conway and the United Automobile Workers folks have set up an office here and they are agitating up a storm, too, and have as much as said they're going to select a county or a place and dramatize it to such an extent that they will get action. All of this is understandable, the lethargy, the inability of the established agencies to act, the resistance of local people, gives enough credence to their complaints to overwhelm the more reasoned analysis which recognizes the problems are more deep-seated than suddenly saying to people, here's all the food in the world, come and get it. If it were only that easy. Anyway Bobby was most insistent. I called in our fellows and directed Rod Leonard to have a complete food plan for me, setting down alternatives and what we could do, by Thursday of this week and made an appointment with Bobby Kennedy to go over and review what we are doing on Monday. What I need to do here is to set down now a major program which really will involve our going in to do the actual distribution if the local Government won't, or if they are doing it poorly. This has serious political implications in the country at large and also before the Congress. Testifying today Joseph Resnick made the point that it was a big step for the Federal Government to do this and take it away from local people. As he said there were two of his counties in New York that simply refused to go along with the Food Stamp plan and he couldn't in good conscience urge that the



Federal Government go in and administer it. I'm going to send that testimony to <sup>Bobby</sup> ~~Bob~~ Kennedy and hope that he will read it. Anyway, the testimony went well and I'm going to try and give strong emphasis again on the Rural Development, a big Department target.

I've also moved in strongly on the International Food Situation. Some months ago I directed the task force to review the total world food availabilities and potential because of the differences in opinion in the Department between some of our economists with Les Brown on one side and most of the economists on the other. The report came out and its most interesting for it does show a very adequate world food supply situation for the next 15 years. This is contrary to the understanding which has been developed in this country which some places is approaching almost hysteria in connection with world food availabilities. The truth is that the developed countries production potential has increased enormously and if the less developed countries do as well as they have over the past 10 years that the status quo will roughly be held even with increasing population. Actually the likelihood is there will be substantial grain surpluses in the developed countries if no more than a reasonable amount of grain is made available consistent with self-help demands on the developing countries. If we put this report out now the out cry would be that we don't know what we're talking about for the deduction from earlier remarks including some from the President would be that we faced imminent catastrophe. Yet we've got to clarify now the basic understanding about this issue. On the one hand we might have gone a little too far in ~~inducement~~ <sup>inducement</sup> it to develop interest, understanding and support for some action. Now we have to bring the support, in some cases the deep concern, even hysteria, into line in support of a sensible policy which recognizes a supply management problem for grains in the developed countries which the United States can't and shouldn't solve alone, a commercial market problem where we must have a fair share of markets, and the need for a sharing in connection with the need for food

availabilities in the less developed countries. I've been sweating this week then trying to develop a speech for I'm going up to speak to a Lutheran Seminar at Gettysburg on Friday which will relate the nature of the problem and the need for a balanced, careful, sensible policy going down the road. Then I'm going to need to educate our people in Government first and then reach out towards <sup>the</sup> ~~to~~ public. All of this will come to a temporary head when we have to set wheat acreage allotments in a few weeks here. I've already got a copy of a memorandum the Vice President sent to the President insisting that we shouldn't cut back those acres. I think we're going to have to do that although the current Mid East situation may cause some differences. Anyway this is a toughie and of course it relates to the basic agricultural problem with our own farmers. Despite the fact that prices have turned up some, it continues. This is a terribly tough and depressing one. As a matter of fact I let it get me down somewhat over the weekend. As I read the mail and the clippings I sometimes feel almost hopeless. After all we have done, with the progress that's been made, to get the kind of bitter resentment, the lack of confidence ...

(end of tape)



Saturday, June 10, 1967 -- Last night at 11:00o'clock the phone rang. It was Jim Gaither in the White House. The President had called a meeting for budget purposes for 12:30 today. There went my plans for a day at home and in the yard. I was up fairly early, did some paper work, had a nice relaxing breakfast with Jane and Connie and off to the White House. As usual, the President came in late. However, he was in good form. The magnitude and complexity of a President's problems and the scope of the grasp of this man on those problems and the techniques he uses came out rather clearly. He pointed out that we faced serious budget problems down the road. The first problem is to try and get under our budget in the three weeks to come before the close of the fiscal year. He pointed out with some pride and with a mimeographed sheet that Eisenhower in his last 4 years missed his budget estimates by 15.2 billion dollars -- Jack Kennedy in his 3 years by \$22.8 billion and that so far LBJ had missed only by \$500 million. He then remarked, "And we are the ones that get attacked because of the credibility gap. In any event, we were instructed to go back, get together with our operating people, postpone, redo, and eliminate any thing that we can so that we will get as close as possible to that budget figure.

Then the President jumped to 1968 fiscal year and pointed out that we are in grave trouble. Incidentally he also made it clear he expected our personal involvement, the Secretary's initials on it, that it would be hard at this point to get one and <sup>half</sup> ~~have~~ billion dollars out, but that Defense was instructed to try and do so, and that we should make a maximum effort. He then talked about the serious situation. He reminded us that the estimate initially was for an \$8.1 billion deficit. That initial estimate is now up official \$3 to \$4 billion more because revenues have dropped, primarily because of lower corporate profits because of a soft economy; expenditures of civilian agencies have gone up primarily because a number of items from the previous year which were held back as a part of the inflation battle have been released pursuant to promises made and also because of the demands of the

Congress for the vote of different members on the tax fight primarily on the tax credit matter. Then, of course, the participating sales legislation was stuck and this could mean that we would have to borrow \$2, or \$3, or \$4 billion more if we couldn't sell that paper. He then switched to a long dispassionate but compelling description of doing things for people in Congress and urging better and closer relations with them. He said he had met last night with all of the Congressional Liaison people and had assigned each of them three or four people to whom they should go in Congress and ask them what we could do for them. He stated that he had learned in a long life and particularly in dealing with Congress that we should try and do more for people than they do for us. That that is the essence of making friends. Particularly, with people who disagree with you. So he urged us to do everything we could and go out of our way without compromising our principles or programs to do things for people in Congress. He cited several examples where he's concerned and it's clear without a doubt that he spends an enormous amount of time on a personal basis with Congressional people. For example, he said he had had Joe Clark in and had him talk to the Near East Task Force which is chaired by Bundy. Clark, he said, is a good man with a yearning to do some good and make a contribution to the world who has gotten crosswise with the Administration. After a 30 minute talk with him the President said everyone felt better and he thought much good would come of it. He then told the story about a Texas Congressman whom he had gotten a job on NYA when he was a 19-year old penniless boy who had voted "no" on virtually every piece of legislation that had come before the Congress. He instructed the staff to find out why and they dragged out the fact that a woman lawyer in an agency around town had been denied several promotions to which she was entitled and this Congressman had taken it personally. The case was checked out with John Macy. It was discovered that the promotion was justified. It was forthcoming and now the Congressman in question is voting right. I can't help but add at



this point a number of Texas Congressmen have made it quite clear to me that they understand this game and that one of the ways to get things out of LBJ is to do exactly this, to vote wrong, sulk, and wait, and then people come around and you finally get what it is you want.

He told the story of his father who apparently was a County Commissioner, or some such, and in an area where he got every vote, he lost several. He ran into an old friend on the street and asked him if he voted for him and the old man said with great rage "absolutely not". On inquiry he discovered that the farmer in question felt alienated because LBJ's father had the first new car in town and in driving up a country road passed this man then plowing, failed to wave at him and the man in question felt he was being ignored. Of such things, the President said, good relations, friends, and votes are made.

He then went on to say that if the tax bill does not pass, and it looks like it has little likelihood to, why there we would then be running close to a \$25 to \$30 billion deficit and he said that is impossible. The country simply won't tolerate it and we will have to start cutting programs -- that the Congress is real tough came through as this discussion went on. He pointed out that they had run over John Rooney which had never happened before and put a 5 percent cut on his appropriation. We survived that. Jamie Whitten was most effective in carrying our appropriation bill through and apparently his argument of the need for agriculture in a world short of food, incorrect as it is, worked.

He also said in connection with the debt limit that Wilbur Mills was completely shaken up, this is only the second time that he has lost a major bill on the floor, that he came to the President and said that he, Mills, was to blame, that he should have known better, that he would never make that mistake again, that he really didn't have the votes but felt that it could be "lucked" out. So the President said we've got to get to our supporters, we've got to work on them, we've got to carry forward the tax bill and the debt limit bill, the program

of each and every one of us is at stake and then added parenthetically in his own unique way, "If you've got any horsepower, use it; that is if you're not a ~~unique~~<sup>even such</sup> or a gelding." He then referred to the fact he had sent back a whole bundle of AID personnel application forms with an inquiry whether these people knew their Congressman and Senator. He said that he is shocked to find again and again that the people in the \$25,000 and \$30,000 year job brackets don't even know who their Congressman and their Senator is.

He repeated through this session a number of times what he said to the Congressional Representatives last night, that he had called some Agency head asking him to go to someone about the debt limit bill and the Agency head in question had said that he couldn't do that because he didn't want to get involved in politics. This obviously galled him right to the bone. At about this time he repeated the story about Dean Acheson again, attributed to Sam Rayburn, when he said when Acheson declared he couldn't turn his back on Alger Hiss that Acheson was the greatest Secretary of State in history, but he sure wished some times that he had run for county sheriff. At that point he switched and said that we must tighten up on our low priority projects, we must increase our efficiency, if we can't cut expenditures by cutting fat why then we'll have to cut programs.

We then turned to legislative programs and he described the poverty program as similar to the Quie amendment, that the Republicans are merely making political mileage and trying to embarrass us and strike us down wherever possible. He acknowledged mistakes in the poverty program but said none comparable to the old days of PWA, WPA, NYA, and CCC, that there is no corruption, no politics now but yet they tried to divide us and carve us up. By this he meant the move to split up the poverty program and send chunks to various operating departments. Whether we should do it this way, he said, had been resolved after long and

careful thought down at the Ranch by a Task Force which included Walter Heller, Kermit Gordon, and others. They had decided that the program should be held together, should be dramatized and carried forward -- that sometime in the future after that had been done, it could be split up, but that for the time being it should be continued. He thanked all of us in the Cabinet that there had been a minimum of backbiting and bureauconfuse in this operation, that he knew it was a tendency of all, and he had heard much of it which he described as "gimme, gimme, gimme" between Departments; making the analogy to Cortland Valenti, the little girl of the Valentis of whom he is so fond, saying the other day he had said to her, "Cortland, give me that glass of milk you have", and she had said "No, no, no -- mine, mine, mine." That, he said, is like the Departments. Then he said with a smile, if you will cooperate with me on this, for this is the President's program, this is the way we want it, then I'll do the same for you when you get to be President.

He then switched off into the business of telling the story of our accomplishments, relating that Harold Wilson had told him that he, Wilson, had not known what we have done in the poverty program, education, and other programs until he heard Hubert Humphrey tell it to the British Parliament. Wilson said that a handful of writers in Georgetown tell the British writers and they write what they are told. The President added that most of those reporters are seldom in the White House, don't know what they are talking about. Wilson, he related, was enormously impressed with the magnitude of the revolution that we are carrying forward, but most people in Britian and elsewhere feel that only Vietnam concerns us and that all other programs represent a standstill.

Then he switched again to the Congress, speaking about how tough it was, telling a story that after the Los Angeles convention, Jack Kennedy returned to the Senate and sought to carry forward a minimum wage bill and that the Senate clobbered and ran all over him, even though he was the Presidential Nominee when



he tried to include some of the low income people in that bill. This by way of reference to the District of Columbia program which he asked us to help in every way we could, that he wondered what the world thought as it watched the shenanigans of American Democracy and reflected that he often wondered how and what he would feel and do if he were a leader of another country watching what goes on in this one during this crisis period. At this point the meeting seemed to be drawing to a close, he apologized for talking too much, for coming late to the meeting, said that he had been up virtually all night about the Near East matter, that the U.S.S.R. was apparently not moving militarily but they certainly were threatening.

At that point he suddenly decided to go around the table and did after he related once more how important Congressional relations were, that Manatos and Barefoot Sanders were working at it all the time, they were having in Members of Congress for rice and shrimp, and the cocktail party where they ate on their lap, if for no other purpose than to get a quorum. He then made the comment that we were all his "Mickey Mantles" and that the question was when to shift him in and out of the game, stating that Darrell Royal down in Texas knew when to substitute and jerk players or not, that maybe he'd kept his players here too long, yet he said he felt the experience and judgment were important and commented that in the last few days that we had avoided several serious mistakes in our foreign policy because of the experience and the judgment of Rusk, and he thanked God that Rusk was there. Hardly know what to make of these asides -- it almost seems like he throws them in now and then just to kind of keep people on edge. There has, of course, been a good deal of criticism around that many of us have been here too long, that we're stale, that we're old, that we don't have zip, get up and go, hence the analogy to substitution. Yet also his <sup>pendant</sup>~~pension~~ for not making changes and for using experience. There's some truth in that criticism as

I've related before, but on balance I think the experienced judgment pays off. The first few people around the table were relatively uncommunicative, merely promising him that they would do their best to cut back spending. Then he got to GSA and Booten. And after some little conversation, he began to bore in as to the numbers, and it was clear that he knew a good deal about what was going on over there, discovered they were some \$200 million short in sales from the stockpiles and finally got down to the question of nickel and found out that \$50 million had been refused in Congress and then that Booten didn't know who had voted how. He didn't get into a rage on this, but he stayed with it for some time making it clear that this is an example of the kind of legislative breakdown when the head of the Agency did not even know the names of people and how they voted. He didn't push too hard for, of course, Booten is a career man but he made the point very strongly with the rest of us and I'm sure it was a good reminder. In the course of this he used the expression "tail em up", explaining that in Texas when they have a drought or bad weather and the cows get very weak and can't eat and are laying down, why the cowboys go out and take the cow's tail and they circle the tail around and around and around, after a while it gets most uncomfortable and forces the cow to her feet so she can eat. So he said if we're that weak we need to be "tailed up".

When it came to me around the table I commented on our successes of the last week in both the budget, including participating sales, and also in Food Stamps of which he was aware. He asked me about the wheat acres. I told him I was postponing it and he laughed and said I was like the old lady who was trying to avoid her operation, that he knew how that felt, and that we ought to perhaps put it off as long as we could, as he would do. He then -- then Joe Fowler got into the act, the last one at the table, and read names of people who had voted wrong on the debt ceiling including some liberals who obviously were doing so to express their disdain about Vietnam. We went around the table, read the names,

everyone agreed to do what they could with certain particular names and on that note the meeting broke up with the repetition that we should expect to be called back on roughly July 15 and as of that time we should have the story of what we have done in connection with our budget, setting out some specifics, to wit, (1) how much we had saved in June in dollars, and what percentage that is of June spending. In terms of 1968 (1) how far below the 1968 budget we could get and what percentage of the total budget that would be; (2) what major investments and projects, such as buildings and things of major investment could be dragged out, and (3) what we would do if we had to reduce by 15 percent the controllable items. He made it clear he hoped these steps would not be necessary, but by the same token they might be thus keeping the pressure on us all to do something about new taxes and upon the debt ceiling. Through it all he was relaxed, gave absolutely no evidence of panic, under undue pressure, great tiredness, or irritation. He was generally soft spoken, in complete control of the situation, occasionally jocular. It was on balance a superior but typical LBJ performance.

Friday, June 9, 1967 -- 10:00 o'clock, at home. Just finished dinner. A relaxed long conversation over coffee and a cigar with Mike and Jane. Mike's got a bit of a school problem. He got his grades which were really pretty good but he ended up with a "D" in Spanish which has given him great trouble. He feels it very keenly. Mike is insecure, suffers a bit from a feeling of inferiority; not making it in football has hurt him, now the low grade troubled deeply. Especially by way of contrast to Connie's almost straight "A". He fears that he is the dumbest one in the family. He is certainly the most attractive one in the family too with the long time sunny disposition, big, handsome, personable, awfully good kid. He was wonderful up at Kawawia and just so he doesn't over use the blarney stone, he'll do all right. The question was whether he should not go to Alaska this summer as planned and try and arrange



for tutoring for Spanish. It's the phonetics and the speaking that they insist upon that he can't quite handle. I expect he should do this, but I hate to see him miss the opportunity for a change, a new experience, a new exposure in people. Anyway, we'll try and work it out and he'll probably be staying home.

I'm a little frustrated myself and have been this week. No good reason for it. Always when a key event, to wit, the great event of the times like the Near East Crisis comes up and one is not a part of it you have that somewhat left over feeling. Also, despite the vital importance of agriculture it does get tiring and frustrating. There's really nothing new on the agricultural front. I have a little feeling that things are improving a bit, prices are stronger and the screaming of the opposition is losing its cutting edge. That's just a feeling.

I saw the President today briefly, made a presentation of an excellent Conservation booklet "Conservation/2000". He was rather perfunctory about it. The Press came in, made pictures, but they didn't make too much of it. We talked briefly. He commented about my report of activities, mine and Jane's, and of course our "shirt sleeve" meetings and wheat referendum discussions and said that I was doing the best in the Cabinet of getting around the country. I tried to open the question about talent search and this person he wants to do the work on P.L. 480 on a staff basis. He said it ought to be someone like Jay Taylor from Texas or Tom Mann who would really be tough and who knew agriculture but he put it, they're making too much money. He went on to say that he is having trouble now because of sales of grain to Egypt, because of people like that always want to give it away. He was obviously kidding, but it disturbed me because he doesn't want one with a real deep concern and interest in the other countries to be at the switch on this. Actually he's probably right.

I did a good bit of work this week on the international agriculture problem for I flew down to Gettysburg this morning to a Seminar held by the American Lutheran Church. The essence of my remarks was that there's no real food shortage nor will there be for some time around the world, the problem is to get the food to where it's needed in such a form and fashion that it doesn't discourage the development of the less developed countries' agriculture which is the key objective. This is often hard to do for the very drama of food availabilities on the one hand and hungry people on the other leads to an immediately and simple response "start spreading that food around". Currently the country is of a mind that the world is very short of food. This is my fault in a way. Lots of others, too, but I think it has been necessary because we needed to make the country conscious of this great need and that we must meet it. Now when you try to put on the brakes and point out that we have to use this food with care, and must take into consideration domestic prices and commercial markets, and the necessity of other countries pitching in and assist, it's difficult to do. The Vice President, for example, is out on Cloud Nine about supplies, which is nothing new. He's got Dwayne Andreas and the grain trade at his elbow all the time. He sent a memo to the President saying we should not cut wheat allotments without talking to me about it, although he sent me a copy. He bugged me some months ago to increase feed grains which wasn't necessary, which I didn't do, and I was right. I now have a memo to the President suggesting a discussion of grain and the World Food Situation at the next Cabinet Meeting. I sent it over to him with an urgent request for his reaching me about it, prior to sending it on to the President. Anyway, I made that point today down in Gettysburg and I think it was fairly well received although I suspect that it was over the head of most people there. There is a book out by the Paddock Brothers that I read some months back in proof form which is really alarmist and says the world is going

to run out of food by 1975. It's well and cleverly written and is going to get a lot of attention and upset a lot of people. If I have to cut wheat acreage allotments why I will look like Mr. Scrooge. If we don't, we'll have too much wheat, it will be too costly to move it. If we did move it, it would undoubtedly discourage efforts in the receiving countries and so it goes. In a sense this is an extension of the basic agricultural problem itself. One where you almost can't win and where I feel like I am spitting gravel here a good bit of the time. All of this is a bit discouraging and depressing. I do wish the President had let me go on the African trip, that would have been a new horizon, a new stimulus and a new sense of import. But, so be it.

We are now planning for the week's Area Development Tour the last week in June. The task force approach of functional programs and targets and goals seems to be accomplishing its purpose. We're doing a lot of very important things.

I sent a letter to Bob Kennedy tonight. He was in this week bugging me real hard on food in the Southland. He's getting pushed in turn by some of the way out liberals. Their solution is simply declare an emergency and see to it that the people who are hungry get fed. That sounds easy, but we've got to have on going programs that reach people who want to be reached, that are administrable, acceptable, and that can get support. And it is not as simple as merely saying "declare an emergency and do it." He was pretty sharp with me. Now we have a meeting on Monday and we have worked out an overall program to review with him, and I've sent a copy out to his home late this afternoon. The Food Stamp Bill passed the House. The requirement that came out of Committee of State matching was successfully defeated on the Floor. The extension was limited to only one year, but we ought to be able to take care of that in the Senate. The President knew it had passed. He asked me what it would do to the budget.



He also asked me what about the program in Texas and told Marv Watson to find out why they weren't using it more. He also had a ceremony where a Mexican-American was put on the Fair Employment Commission and another named the head of a Cabinet level committee to review Spanish American problems. The development of the statement he issued with that appointment is illustrative of our problems in agriculture. As I've said before, we're just a bit off the main stream on a number of these problems and therefore unintentionally usually we bring up the rear and get very little attention. This instance, they had sent over to us the statement two or three times asking for comments and we sent back a lot of material and they didn't put in a word about agriculture. I finally had to call Joe Califano and tell him I was disturbed and angry and to quit sending me material if they weren't going to use what we sent back. They went to work, took what we had drafted, put it in the statement and now everybody is apparently happy but it's illustrative. The same thing on the International Food Situation. The working party in the State Department that has been staffing out various contingencies in terms of what should be done now that there is a cease fire considered food P.L. 480 Titles I and II, etc. We weren't invited. I called Rostow about it. He called Katzenbach who called me and said that they wanted us in, but we still haven't been asked in, so they sent over a memorandum to the President, making certain recommendations tonight saying that Agriculture concurred. I sent it back saying that I had no objections although I had not been privy to the discussions. Now they are not anxious to send that forward. I guess we've just got to make ourselves a little bit unpleasant now and then, but as Humphrey told me some months back, AID and State simply will not let me play a key part in the International Agriculture Front. He's right and in a host of ways they are trying to elbow us out now. It's not hard for them to do this for the legal responsibility directly runs to them. Naturally the President

thinks of them on a day to day working basis as does his staff and that leaves us on the fringes.

The President called me in and used me on India, but that wears itself out after a year or two and we are now kind of supernumerary. The same thing is true about Vietnam. I met with and made a farewell address to 30 Extension Agents that are going out there this week. It was very impressive and another evidence of the solid things we're doing, but still we're on the way out fringes of Vietnam now, just in terms of nutrition. All this could change of course if the President would keep me in the mainstream on this but hasn't done that now for almost a year. I don't know why. Maybe he thinks I'm too much of a go-gooder, although I try to be pretty tough minded about it. He's right of course I am, and someone as tough as he wants in connection with this well I guess I wouldn't fill that bill. Nonetheless, it is a bit frustrating to be left out. On the other hand, goodness knows there's enough to do and important things in this very Department in which I work and now that I've got the big charges outlined I ought to enjoy not having quite as much pressure for a while while I catch up on all my reading and other things that pile up here, but yet I kind of fret which of course is nonsense.

Back to the world food situation again, it is ironic but true that the President's instincts on this are sound. The consortium for India, now a consortium in the mill for Pakistan, the joint AID agreement as a product of the Kennedy-Round has come about simply because he has been tough on this, has done it personally and has ladled it out bit by bit. Otherwise, we would be going much further and would not be in a position where we are forcing other countries both developed and less developed to begin assuming some responsibility in this area. As I say, now we're going to have to turn it around so that people at home understand this and with the "let's produce more" red hots that's

kind of difficult. Anyway, it's been a fairly uneventful week. Really a fun one. The weather has been fine, spring here at last, or rather summer. Both Connie and Mike are at home and so the house is jumping. It's great to have them here and rather than fuss I ought to enjoy every minute of it. Anyway I'm going to stay home and work in the yard and at the desk tomorrow instead of going down to that salt mine. So be it. Enough for now. I must get at the mail.

Monday, June 19, 10:00 pm, home at the desk. Shuffling papers again here getting ready to depart in the morning for Canada and the joint Cabinet meeting of ourselves and Canada. Connie is finishing up her packing -- tomorrow she's off to Africa. Mike is home for the summer. He landed a job in the Capitol with Tom Marshall's father in the document room and will be tutored in Spanish. It's been a busy and kind of gay several weeks with the kids at home. It's good they could have an interval here.

Otherwise, things have been relatively quiet although busy. As usual I've been fighting the paper, maneuvering the Congress and trying to get squared away with the Task Forces and strengthen our overall Department posture. The same frustrations with income and abundance continue. Our series of meetings "shirt sleeve" meetings are completed, also the wheat acreage allotment question. I am going to meet with that task force some time this week and see if we can't do some forward planning for the summer. John Schnittker went up to Camp David over the weekend to see the President with Prime Minister Holt of Australia about wool imports. In the course of it the President commented that a poll showed the Department only about 24 percent approved and that we were better than that and could do better than that and that he wanted to see the plans for the summer that would involve the activity of all of our top people around the countryside. John Schnittker is working on that now. It's not a very gay prospect.



I must say that where domestic agriculture and farm prices are concerned I feel rather grim. It seems impossible to get approval. Farmers are dissatisfied. As a matter of fact, the whole countryside is dissatisfied. I describe it sometimes as "ugly". But we must do our best and we will continue to bang away. I'm fearful that I don't have quite the zest that I used to have for this and I would guess neither am I as acceptable and perhaps not as effective. Yet there is a limit to what anyone can do. I've given some thought to trying to have hearings on the Curtis Bill, but haven't broached Poage on it yet and I must review that with the Task Force. Last week there were a group of about 200 wheat farmers from Minnesota here. I spoke with them but there really wasn't much that I could say but to detail the problem of making our decision on wheat allotment acreage and trying to give them a pep talk based on the premise that all our farm programs are threatened by the Farm Bureau and the Curtis Bill. It's hard to tell how they took it. They didn't say very much. They are my friends from Minnesota and seemed warm, but they're all being whipped up with McGovern demanding a 65-cent export certificate to increase income. Frankly I can't really get behind that because I think it's excessive. With \$2.15 wheat and virtually unlimited planting these fellows are doing darned well even though costs for them have climbed sharply. We are staffing out and trying to carry forward the whole bargaining issue and might make that the real thrust for the next 18 months. I do wish the President hadn't squelshed the African trip. It would have given me a bit more inside, some zest, and a change of atmosphere, but he's undoubtedly right and we'll do the best we can at home.

Currently I'm involved in a rather nasty business in connection with food stamps. There is a Subcommittee in the Senate chaired by Joe Clark with Bob Kennedy on it that has gone around the country holding hearings. They held one in Mississippi and saw and heard some things that distressed them. Without really examining what can be done about it they have been lashing out

with any direct recommendations. Both he and Clark refused to say what we should do, refused to consider the need to replace the local authorities if we're really going to get anything done. Yet, they make their demands and now additional hearings are being held by the Committee. Clark wrote the President another letter, not released yet, describing frightful conditions and demanding action by myself, Gardner and Shriver. Shriver has gotten awfully choppy and some of his people are saying that we in the Department of Agriculture are unwilling to move and that we're really not for the poor. Jamie Whitten and Governor Johnson keep insisting that there really aren't hungry people and anyone who really wants food can get it through relief, work, or some way. Whitten qualifies to say that anyone who is neat and clean and willing to work will get by fine. Obviously we are in an impossible position. The criticisms made are not fair, they don't give adequate credit for progress, nor do they state how to improve. Yet something needs to be done. Finally I did go to Whitten today. We had a long talk and finally he tacitly went along with dropping the food stamp minimums. Joe Califano called a White House meeting today for OEO, HEW, Budget and Agriculture. We mulled it over. He wants to put out some kind of a statement to anticipate the Clark committee actions and releases. I prefer doing nothing until we get started down there for we might rock the boat. It is my position that they have been making charges all along anyway, so what? -- it's hardly sharp news any more, instead we should go forward with our plans which include dropping to 50 cents the minimum amount, giving staff and supporting assistance administratively, setting up a system of food stamp aides to work with the poor people and educate them about the program, reinstating direct distribution temporarily if wanted, and in the last analysis taking over and running the programs ourselves. This probably won't satisfy Clark and Company. I'm trying to reach him on the phone now,

since what a terrible thing it is that such poverty and malnutrition could exist in the United States. I agree wholeheartedly but there are limits to what we can do unless the Federal Government is willing to move in itself. Progress is being made. Every county in Mississippi has a direct distribution or food stamp plan. It does go forward slowly. There are local prejudices. Mississippians tend to feel that there are a lot of people unwilling to work and that treating them too generously will have an overall bad effect. They cite with some justification situations around the country elsewhere that are equally bad.

Clark came to my office about a month ago -- Bobby Kennedy, too. I asked for time. I've sent Hod Davis and Bill Seabron down to Mississippi to review the cases they had and accelerated our own survey of about 350 names. The results are inconclusive. Most of these people seem to be on food stamps. On the other hand they are having difficulty getting the minimum \$2.00 payment and apparently in many cases have no money at all. Their basic problem is health, sanitation, jobs and generally education. But food is easy to focus on and they continue to hammer away. There is a crusade to abolish poverty in Washington sponsored and financed by the U.A.W. and they have been banging at us too. Now about six doctors under a field foundation grant are reporting severe malnutrition and bad health. In the meantime I have waited to inaugurate a broad based food stamp stimulant program including dropping the minimum payment on stamps to 50 cents until we could get a food stamp plan through the Congress. We won a fight on that on the floor where the committee had recommended requiring a 20 percent matching fund locally. Jamie Whitten and a number of Southerners voted with us. It will not soon go to Conference.

We got the appropriations bill through the House better almost than ever before. In the meantime, Bobby Kennedy was over to see me again last week making demands that we do something about the food situation but not coming up



but it is the best immediate step. Anyway I'm going to follow it and try and hold the lid down. I'm afraid I was a little bit ill tempered with Shriver's boys today for I jumped on them accusing them of stating that we in Agriculture were not trying to really help the poor and stating quite clearly that if anyone had prevented action so far it was me for Congressional political reasons. Anyway it's a kind of depressing miserable situation for here we are really doing some things and making some progress, but yet the amount we can do is limited, the alternatives are impossible, and all you get for your efforts and concern is a lot of abuse and criticism. People demand more. Politicians try and make the most of what they think can be an issue and you just do your best to carry on. Well no sense complaining that's the nature of power and responsibility in the political process and if anyone, I ought to know it.

I was in Minneapolis last week. Flew in on Monday night. Went through the Mayo Clinic on Tuesday and got a complete and good bill of health. Then I spoke to the Lutheran Brotherhood who gave me a Distinguish Service Award and participated in the Victory Celebration. Art Naftalin got re-elected by 3,000 votes. Hopefully it will stimulate the political situation in Minnesota. The Keith and Rolvaag forces seemed to work harmoniously on that campaign and that's encouraging.

I was deeply concerned that Mother had a heart attack the night before I got there. By the time I saw her, she was in the hospital. That Bill Proffitt let her drive from his office home and then into the Hospital instead of calling an ambulance. In all fairness, she probably wouldn't cooperate. I saw her last Tuesday night and again on Wednesday morning and Merritt who was there over the weekend reported that she is doing well. We talked to her yesterday.

Friday I was in New York and spoke to a Hayden-Stone investment house forum and discussion group about the world food situation and the challenges.

with any direct recommendations. Both he and Clark refused to say what we should do, refused to consider the need to replace the local authorities if we're really going to get anything done. Yet, they make their demands and now additional hearings are being held by the Committee. Clark wrote the President another letter, not released yet, describing frightful conditions and demanding action by myself, Gardner and Shriver. Shriver has gotten awfully choppy and some of his people are saying that we in the Department of Agriculture are unwilling to move and that we're really not for the poor. Jamie Whitten and Governor Johnson keep insisting that there really aren't hungry people and anyone who really wants food can get it through relief, work, or some way. Whitten qualifies to say that anyone who is neat and clean and willing to work will get by fine. Obviously we are in an impossible position. The criticisms made are not fair, they don't give adequate credit for progress, nor do they state how to improve. Yet something needs to be done. Finally I did go to Whitten today. We had a long talk and finally he tacitly went along with dropping the food stamp minimums. Joe Califano called a White House meeting today for OEO, HEW, Budget and Agriculture. We mulled it over. He wants to put out some kind of a statement to anticipate the Clark committee actions and releases. I prefer doing nothing until we get started down there for we might rock the boat. It is my position that they have been making charges all along anyway, so what? -- it's hardly sharp news any more, instead we should go forward with our plans which include dropping to 50 cents the minimum amount, giving staff and supporting assistance administratively, setting up a system of food stamp aides to work with the poor people and educate them about the program, reinstating direct distribution temporarily if wanted, and in the last analysis taking over and running the programs ourselves. This probably won't satisfy Clark and Company. I'm trying to reach him on the phone now,

facing the private sector of the economy. There was a good reception and I think it was worth doing but it certainly was a mess getting out of New York on a hot afternoon with the traffic both in the air and on the ground as congested as it was.

We had a delightful Friday night on the Sequoia. Four African Ambassadors plus some Congressmen were our guests and it really went along excellently. They were most attractive and a good time was had by all.

Saturday night we went to the big 17th Anniversary Bob Kennedy party. We started at the Averill Harrimans for dinner and then out to Hickory Hill. It was a lavish and expensive party. The women in extreme gowns of various kinds, some in mini skirts to the long ones, fast music, lots of liquor and food, and all the "best" people there. I saw and had a chance to talk with Kenny O'Donnell who confirmed what a complete jerk and how inaccurate Manchester was in writing the book. Kenny's general favorable remarks about Lyndon Johnson were I thought timely. He expressed no love but said he's our President and shouldn't get cut up by such a disreputable bastard. I also saw Ted Sorensen and had a nice visit with him. The Bundys were there. Ted White of "The Making of a President" fame. We spent some time with the Galbraiths and took them back to their hotel. Ken has come out with a new book and is very proud and happy about its reception. We didn't get home until almost 4:00 o'clock and yesterday Father's Day I was a little bit hung-over. It was a rainy day. I worked a bit in the yard. We went to Church. I lolled around most of the day and really didn't accomplish a very great deal. So life carries on. Nothing too spectacular at the moment.



June 19, 1967

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Hughes  
From: The Secretary

The enclosed correspondence with Herb Plambeck is self-explanatory including the second letter circulated by Les Starnad and Anderson.

Do you have any reading as to what effect these letters have had? So far there certainly has been a minimum of public attention. We ought to watch it however. At some point it might be useful to point out that the effort splattered into nothing and that there was evidence of strong support among farm organizations. If this was handled right it could strengthen our hand in a number of areas. It does, of course, have some dangers.

In the meantime we might consider shooting these two guys down. I've been informed, and you might check confidentially with Jack Brooks, that Briscoe protested to these men after the first letter and that he most certainly is not available as Secretary of Agriculture. If that's the case, he might be prevailed upon to make a public statement charging them with irresponsibly using his name and expressing his strong support for the current Secretary of Agriculture.

Anyway let's watch this, be alert as to any possible action and equally to any opportunities that might present themselves to turn it around to our good use.

Attachments

No file copies or reading copy made

OLFreeman:rby

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12356, SEC. 1.1(a)

BY JTW ON 7/29/84



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON

June 19, 1967

Mr. Herb Flambeck  
Farm Service Director  
Station WHO  
Des Moines, Iowa

Dear Herb:

Your letter in response to the "Dear Friends of Agriculture" message calling for my replacement was brought to my attention by Harold Lewis.

I just want to say, Herb, I appreciate very much your taking the trouble to pass your sentiments on to those who are stimulating this effort. I appreciated even more your kind sentiments.

I have no complaints. I knew that this job was well nigh impossible when I took it. However, I'm determined to see it through until I feel that I have lost my initiative here and can no longer serve the cause. I have been tempted many, many times to leave and there are easier ways to make a living. Nonetheless there's a job to be done. I think we've made striking progress. I believe we are on the right course. Change hurts, but we do accommodate to it. I hope in the recent weeks we have turned an important corner and things will be better in the days immediately ahead. In any event, we're doing everything in our power to make it so.

Thanks again, Herb, for your thoughtful letter and for taking the trouble to respond. It's a source of real encouragement to me when the real professionals give me a "favorable" on my report card.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

cc: Tom Hughes

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION  
WASHINGTON

June 14, 1967

To: John Obert

From: Harold Lewis

*H. R. L.*

John, here is a letter from Herb Plambeck, Farm Service Director for WHO-Des Moines, which I think the Secretary would like to see. Herb is one of the old "pros" in the business.

Attachment



*Lyne - This is my reply to  
the letter sent her. Huh*

May 29, 1967

Dear Sirs:

The duplicated letter you have circulated has come to my attention. I am not in sympathy with your effort even though I am not a member of the Democratic party.

Personally, I feel Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been the hardest working, most dedicated secretary we have had in a long time, as well as the least appreciated and the most abused. While I am not in agreement with all of Mr. Freeman's policies by any manner or means, I would hate to see him moved out in favor of someone who could not have the background of Freeman's years of experience.

It is my humble opinion that some of President Johnson's economic advisors have short-changed agriculture badly, but I am equally certain that were it not for Freeman's determination to stand up for farm producers that we would be in worse shape than what we are now in.

Yours very truly,

Herb Plambeck,  
Farm Service Director

HP:dg

*Layne - This is the letter that has been circulated in this area. It is unsigned. H*

Dear Friends of Agriculture:

Whether you are aware of it or not, since receiving the first letter concerning replacing Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, movements have started all over the United States to get this job done. "Operation Excited" is now taking shape in the majority of the farm states.

Up to this time hundreds and hundreds of telegrams and letters have been sent to President Johnson and many of our Senators and Congressmen. Some of President Johnson's friends and associates have personally discussed this matter with him, so he is now very aware of our plight. Secretary Freeman has and is continuing to make appearances throughout the Mid-West trying to calm this movement down and keep his job.

Now is the time for us in the industry to renew our efforts to get a new Secretary of Agriculture appointed. We must let President Johnson, our Senators and Congressmen hear from us again with a renewed vigor, that we need and are expecting a change in the very near future.

Both Mr. Dolph Briscoe, Jr., of Uvalde, Texas, and Mr. Kenneth T. Anderson of Emporia, Kansas, have confirmed that they would serve as Secretary of Agriculture if requested to by President Johnson.

With everyone in our industry working toward this common goal, we will be able to get a man appointed to the Secretary's post from within our industry, who will be qualified to meet the challenging problems of agriculture today.

Thank you for your time and effort taken in behalf of the Agriculture Industry, and your renewed efforts to help solve this most serious matter.

I've gotten pretty seriously behind in this diary. Here it is July 15; it's 9:15 in the morning, and I'm alone in the office. I had a breakdown of the dictet and now I've replaced it with this new IBM machine. Hence the big gap.

I have before me on my desk, and will include in this dictation, three pieces of paper which rather summarize what has been taking place since I last dictated.

The first is an editorial in the Greenville, Mississippi, Delta Democrat-Times called "The Freeman Paradox" which reviews my trip in the recent Rural Area Development Tour to Mississippi very favorably. I am quite pleased with it.

Rural Area Development and poverty have rather dominated the last two weeks. More of that in a moment. I also have an editorial in the Des Moines Register entitled "Refilling the Granaries" which reviews our commodity decisions on corn and wheat to cut back production.

Then I have a letter from Senator John Stennis commenting very warmly and in a friendly way on an exchange that I had before a Senate Subcommittee on Labor last week.

As I say, the poverty Rural Area Development field has rather dominated our attention these past few weeks. Jane and I spent four days the week before last on this tour. Prior to going a good deal of preparation was done and we had to do some very careful public relations work with Congress for the Alabama delegation violently opposed my going into Alabama at all, mostly because of the racial problem and particularly because of a controversial cooperative which was funded by OEO on our recommendation.



Mississippi, Monday, July 10, 1967

Guest Editorial

## The Freeman Paradox

It was the right place and the right time. Orville Freeman was the right man. He adapted smoothly to the unique task which brought him to Mississippi last Tuesday.

The visit by one of Washington's less noticed cabinet members seemed routine at first. But as the itinerary developed and the quick tour of the Northern part of the state got underway, its complex implications became more visible.

He found "more evidence of activity and momentum in community development, economic development and anti-poverty programs" than he expected, reported the Agriculture Secretary.

PART OF the activity he found his visit itself will affect favorably. It may have been a first for a federal official — or anyone else — to speak candidly with and receive enthusiastic receptions from Negro leader Aaron Henry, wealthy Delta planters, Mound Bayou Head Start workers and the mayors of half a dozen small Mississippi towns all in one day.

Freeman, with his cordial, sympathetic personality and "something for everybody" verbal agility, accomplished in a day what most far-sighted and benevolent of state political leaders have seldom been able to do in years of public life.

While in Greenville, Secretary Freeman told poverty stricken Delta families that the price of surplus food stamps would be cut to ease privation and hunger. In Clarksdale, he was the guest of the owners of a large mechanized cotton plantation. Then he listened sympathetically to Henry's complaint of segregation in some county Agricultural Extension agencies.

AT BATESVILLE he toured a modern federal housing project, and then met with a group of small

farm owners whom he encouraged to organize co-operatives to improve marketing techniques and stabilize prices.

At Oxford for dedication of a new plant site, he told local leaders and visiting industrialists that Mississippi has about come the full cycle — "from rich resources to despoliation and back again to the edge of prosperity."

In Tupelo, Freeman again confronted civic and political leaders and congratulated them on "the concern for human need I find here."

People usually sensitive about some of the sights he saw or groups he visited didn't seem to mind last week that one facet of the trip seemed to overflow into the next. No one seemed displeased that Freeman was subtly shuttling messages, ideas and problems from audience to audience, no matter how ethnically or economically diverse the groups with whom he met.

LOCAL Negro and white leaders rubbed elbows at the Oxford ceremony which Freeman keynoted, as they did at other stops on his trip. And that, happily, seemed to cause no discomfort for civic and political leaders. Nor did it bother county and district office seekers who were taking advantage of the gatherings to mingle with influential voters.

"Change is always painful," Freeman told newsmen, "but I think Mississippi is striving mightily to shape change favorably for all concerned." The Secretary, himself, seemed to provide the antiseptic which erased any such pain.

He was the right man, and he had come to the right place. And for Mississippi, the right time seemed last week to be closer than ever before.

(The Mississippian)

(9)

As it now stands, this law allows farmers to act together, but does very little more than that. Once a farmer-organization is successful in acting together -- once it achieves some control over the supply of its commodity -- it runs a grave risk of violating the antitrust laws. If these bargaining organizations are ever to become effective, this risk must be removed.

These are some of the ways this might be accomplished:

1. Writing into the law a provision that producers have the absolute right, alone or with others, to withhold their product from the market. This would be balanced with the existing proviso that, if prices were "unduly enhanced", the Secretary of Agriculture could issue a cease and desist order to enjoin the group's withholding activity.

*anti trust laws*

2. A declaration <sup>that</sup> of the already-existing Capper-Volstead provision that empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a cease and desist order is the exclusive remedy to deal with "improper" bargaining activities by agricultural associations.

3. A provision that bargaining agencies may obtain premerger clearance from the Justice Department, with weight being given to a recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture, in each case, that such merger is in the public interest.

#### Marketing Agreements

Another set of ideas under study now is broadening the scope and authority of the marketing agreement and orders program authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

As you know, marketing orders are already in effect in many areas and for many commodities. They could and should be in effect for more commodities, and they should be able to do more things for the commodities already under the program.

✓

# The Des Moines Register

Founded in 1849

An Independent Newspaper

Thurs., July 13, 1967

## Refilling the Granaries

The July 1 crop report of the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that the nation will have plenty of grain and soybeans to meet domestic and foreign demand, plus commitments for foreign food aid, while adding comfortable amounts of these vital commodities to national reserves.

Corn production is now estimated at 4.5 billion bushels, compared with earlier projections in May of around 4.1 billion based on acreage planted and average yield alone. The July report includes an estimate of yield based on early season conditions. This could change substantially during the growing season, of course. But it seems likely that corn output will be the largest ever.

Wheat production is sure to set a new record. The July estimate of 1.5 billion bushels is based on early season yield calculations and will be close to the final harvest estimate.

Soybean production is practically certain to rise again this year, to well over a billion bushels. The July crop report places acreage at a new high of 40 million, 9 per cent above 1966, and some private trade estimators think the figure will be higher than that. Yields will not be estimated until next month, but prospects now indicate average yield at least as high as last year.

The carryovers of feed grain, wheat and soybeans seem likely to increase during the next marketing year. The corn carryover is now estimated at 840 million bushels for Oct. 1, 1967. The figure may rise to around a billion bushels for Oct. 1, 1968. Wheat reserves may go up from around 400 million bushels now to 485 or 500 million next July. The September carryover of soybeans this year is projected at 100 million bushels. This might double to 200 million bushels a year later

if growing conditions for 1967 remain favorable.

\*\*\*  
The crop outlook reflects the mighty production power of American agriculture.

A year ago, with grain reserves diminished as the result of heavy food-aid wheat shipments to India and large commercial exports of both wheat and corn, a mild sort of hysteria set in among certain farm groups. The Department of Agriculture itself began talking about "depleted" reserves and called for increases in wheat and corn plantings.

During the winter the export situation changed as the result of large crops of wheat in Russia and of corn in other countries. Corn exports, after rising for several years, declined about 30 per cent. Soybean exports did not rise as much as had been expected. Farmers, taking all this into account along with a decline in prices, did not respond all the way on plantings.

This was prudent. It now appears that substantial output increases will replenish the granaries to a safe level, maybe even a bit on the long side. Partly because of sensible acreage planning by the Department of Agriculture and partly because of luck, the crops this year seem likely to be about right to maintain a good reserve position.

Those farmers and farm leaders who were saying that farm production should be turned on full blast, because world demand would absorb all America can produce, should take another look.

All-out production would quickly throw agriculture into a surplus situation again. Farmers are demonstrating that they can meet increasing world demand as it occurs. There is no sense in producing first and then trying to get rid of the surplus. It is better to keep the surplus in the soil.

THE SAME PAPER, THE SAME NEWS

COPIES BY THE DOZEN, BY THE DOZENS, BY THE DOZENS, BY THE DOZENS

DELIVERED BY THE DOZEN, BY THE DOZENS, BY THE DOZENS, BY THE DOZENS

8



particular processor, much as a single negotiated wage level now covers all industrial workers doing similar work, and represented by the same bargaining agent.

The ~~bargaining~~ association could be empowered to bargain with ~~a representative~~ of several processors, so that a single contract could be negotiated industry-wide, rather than a multitude of individual contracts.

Third, present legislation could be adjusted to provide for greater muscle in the marketplace for farmers. One such attempt is now underway with S-109, which would specifically prohibit any handler or processor from:

- interfering, or threatening to interfere, with a producer joining a cooperative,
- discriminating, or threatening to discriminate, against a producer because of his membership in a cooperative,
- coercing a producer to terminate such membership,
- making false reports about, or interfering with, cooperatives,
- ~~and~~ <sup>or</sup> conspiring with any other person to do any such act.

Capper - Volstead

In my opinion, the Capper-Volstead Act should also be examined with a view toward strengthening farm bargaining power.

JOHN STENNIS  
MISSISSIPPI



United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

7-13-67

Dear Mr. Freeman:

I was proud of you yesterday  
as you came under attack; but  
not at all surprised. You  
handled yourself and the  
situation perfectly and  
effectively and at the same  
time with calmness and  
propriety. I knew as soon as  
he started that my Colleague  
was shooting at an eagle  
rather than a dove as he  
seemed to think. Truly,  
John Stennis

They argued that if I got in there and called attention to what the Federal Administration was doing, I would subject them to attacks by the groups on the right and they were having enough trouble as Democrats anyway.

Well, I had them over here. Lister Hill came. Armistead Selden was the most vociferous but Bill Nichols, from the Agriculture Committee, too. They got Jamie Whitten to call me and suggest that I shouldn't go, even though I had reviewed this trip with him earlier and had followed some of his suggestions as to some of the areas to be visited. Anyway, I told them firmly but pleasantly "no". I tried to adjust the trip to meet some of their problems and we took off in a Convair with about a dozen from the press, plus our staff people.

We began the trip in Iowa and went through the TENCO area. It was an interesting and very hectic schedule, but nothing new. Rather an opportunity to draw attention to progress made in rural area development. I was impressed with the pasture improvement program. I was verified in my feeling that over-all long range planning by professionals is needed. It was impressed on me, too, how important training is for everywhere I went I found there were more than enough jobs for people who had some kind of special training, but no jobs or very few intermittent jobs for those who were just common laborers.

The high point was the town called Centerville, where the banker, a Mr. Wilson, said that that town had been on the rocks and had been gloom and doom, but it was now zoom and boom. That they had been furious when they were labeled a distress area five years ago and required to develop an over-all economic development plan, but that that was truly the best thing they had ever done.



We flew late that Monday night to Mississippi, landing at Greenville, Mississippi, where we first reviewed a training program running all the way from illiterates to automobile mechanics. It was held at the air base there which had been abandoned by the military. Then to the hotel and at about 9:30, plenty tired, I had a meeting with Negro leaders, mostly concentrating on food. This was the follow-up of the Clark-Kennedy Subcommittee which held a hearing in Mississippi and dramatized all over the country the fact that there were inadequate food availabilities and literally starving children in Mississippi.

Their demand was that I eliminate the minimum charge for the food stamps. I was alerted for this and told them that I would not eliminate it but we'd reduced it to 50¢ and I announced there a program to strengthen the food stamp system, provide more administrative help, employ food stamp aids to reach poor people and that we had been in touch with the Mississippi authorities and they had agreed to get the 50¢ for people who had not been spending that amount for food.

The meeting went on for several hours. There were a lot of other complaints, too, about the fact that our programs were not reaching the people who really needed them. However, people although tense and somewhat demanding were not unpleasant and on balance it was a useful meeting and if not completely satisfied, it did, I am sure, a lot of good.

Well, for the next two days we traveled in Mississippi and in Alabama. We saw some very frightful poverty, shacks with a dozen people crowded in one or two rooms, very limited sanitary facilities, very limited water, very little opportunity. Cotton chopping, cotton picking are about through because of technological progress, to wit, herbicides and the cotton picker and there are thousands of people without jobs and no future. It's pretty grim.

We saw too, however, some real efforts toward improvement and progress. Homes built by FHA, loans made by OEO with resulting new businesses such as a little barbershop where I had a haircut. A co-operative which was building a fine recreation complex. A cooperative which had bought farm machinery and was giving assistance in production and marketing to its members. Headstart and OEO programs in a number of places that had a big head of steam. We had in ~~Clarksville~~, *Clarksdale*, Mississippi, what was said to be the first luncheon which was completely integrated in a big motel there and it went off very smoothly. The letters and comments and press have been very complimentary.

The trip into Alabama didn't work quite as well. There was a certain grimness about it and tenseness that we didn't find so much in Mississippi. We did see some of the same things, reviewed food distribution points, participated in opening a new Commodity Distribution Center.

The extent of the problem in Alabama is dramatized rather well by Red Bamberg, our FHA Chairman, who attended the open session in the hotel in Tuscaloosa of the State TAP Committee and then told me he had a meeting he had to come to in Washington. I more or less insisted that he come with me at least as far as the first stop. He did and then disappeared. I later found that there wasn't a meeting at all, that it didn't come until two days later and he came to Washington merely to avoid going along. None of the heads of our agencies actually accompanied me on the Alabama tour. I didn't notice particularly at the time, but this was typical of the situation.

At the first stop we were met by a group of negroes with signs and placards demanding that they should see me. They had come in with that request only a day or so before, after the schedule had jelled, and the boys had tried to avoid it because in putting the schedule together we wanted to see everything and be exposed to everything but to avoid anything that might get a bit out of line.

I immediately said, of course, we'd see them, and sent Jim Thornton to arrange it in the local church. We then went through a food stamp office and talked about procedures there and then the local judge, that's the probate judge who actually is the administrative head of the county, took us down to see a new little business in town and then was insistent that we should see something else that seemed kinda fuzzy. He refused to go to the church, and I discovered later that the Minister of the Church had run for Sheriff and that there was a contest in the courts about that election.

Anyway, he took us in his car to the small business and then over to the church where I went in and the people were really quite sweet. They were crowded in this very hot little church. Jane and I sat up front and I got up, took off my coat, and talked to them about 10 minutes and answered questions for a little while and left Bill Seabron there to answer more when we went out to get on schedule. The questions were the usual, and I told the press that the people there were a lot nicer to me than the farmers were at Ames, Iowa.

This local judge then took us out in the countryside and he was really quite nice and even in a way complimentary to Gilmore the Minister who he said was a man of his word, but he insisted on showing us what turned out to be nothing but a concrete block building. It seems that



a self-help housing project had been dreamed, some money had been gotten, apparently from Walter Reuther's citizen crusade, some \$40,000, and they started this cinder block construction process out there which allegedly was to be the foundation for a self-help housing program. Well, of course, the thing failed. He merely wanted to make the point that these people have strict limitations and you can waste an awful lot of money if you don't know what you're doing.

He wasn't a bad fellow. Actually he apparently was instrumental for arranging food stamps in that little community and told me he was urging other probate judges around the state to do the same.

We had lunch at a place called Demopolis which was a lovely Southern town but the session there was very tense -- power structure on one side of the community building, and the Negroes, and our party, on the other. I was told that it was the first time in this beautiful community building overlooking the river built by the local manufacturing concern as a gift to the city and then used for integrated meetings.

There was real sullenness and the session was a little difficult until an extension girl, really a lady, and very Southern and very attractive told a story of her research program and contacts with the very poor in the countryside, including women who married at 13 and 14 years of age, some of whom had never been to the small town nearby except when they were married and couldn't conceive of such things as education for their children. It was a dimension that they just didn't understand at all.

We concluded our tour with a long drive on the bus in the rain and a drive by SWAFCA, the controversial Co-op. We picked up the Manager and the President of the Co-op and they rode with us for sometime and reviewed what they were doing and asked for several kinds of assistance. I thought they

were knowledgeable and intelligent and effective.

The Mayor of Selma is the one who screamed all day that I shouldn't be there, that I should investigate this Co-op and I just cut it off short and said that I didn't come to get in a dialogue with him. He said at one point for me to come to Alabama and not investigate SWAFCA would be like the President going to Vietnam and not reviewing the troops.

Anyway, we flew out of Tuscaloosa late at night and got into Indiana well after 10:00, promptly to bed, up early, and a very satisfying and exciting day in the Lincoln Hills District in Indiana where a RC&D project is working wonders in forestry, in industry, in conservation, and education, coordinated extremely well with the OEO.

We returned late that night, everybody marveling at how much mileage, how many meetings and what an effective trip it had been. I gave the press plenty of chance to talk on the way back and critiqued it with the members of the other Departments; HEW, OEO, Labor, Commerce were all along and I have since followed up and hope to have a meeting with all of them to review what we saw sometime soon.

I just checked the press clippings on it from around those States generally and they are, on balance, extremely favorable. This gave me a chance, too, to bore in hard here in the Department to get the different agencies to step up their attention and concern and investment of time in the poverty RAD programs. I have dictated exhaustive memoranda and instructions to them and John Baker now is gathering all of this together and we will have a revitalized redirected hopefully much more effective effort in that direction.

I wrote the President about it and told him that in terms of politics this is the way to move at least for the next six months. The people can't very well do anything but participate and agree with you as you praise their community and talk about its improvement, that there's a lot more political mileage and more friends to be made and people that otherwise couldn't be reached this way than through the commodity programs as such. As a matter of fact, we are now promoting Mrs. Johnson to go on such a tour and last night we were on the boat, the Sequoia, for the President for a social visit in which we got a few licks on that, and I gave Liz a copy of a proposed tour in the midwest which she had asked for after Jane had made a strong recommendation to her yesterday at a meeting in the White House.

Mrs. Johnson seems interested and this can be a very good thing and I think it'll likely come off. I'm planning some more myself and I think it will be useful and also it's really stimulating and satisfying to take these trips to see what is being done.

The sequel to this, of course, has been the Hearings of the Clark Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor. They have been pounding away on food, also on health, in the area out there.

They brought in five doctors who had made something of a study for the Field Foundation who then testified as to atrocious conditions and certainly the exist. Then Gardner, Shriver and I were supposed to appear together. As a matter of fact Clark wanted us to come and listen together which we did not do. I got up there a half day late. In the meantime I had already prepared testimony and had released it the previous<sup>day</sup> at some hazard, for I feared the Committee would resent doing this.



Actually they didn't at all, probably because they were so conscious of the newspaper headlines and the publicity involved in this, that they more or less expected me to do the same.

Anyway I didn't get up until Wednesday and initially I was due to be there on Tuesday. When I did, I did not read my statement, and incidentally it had dominated the previous day being out early enough and being positive as to things that are being done, that it gave us some initial advantage. I summarized the statement for Clark. He was the only one there initially. Bobby Kennedy came in and asked a few questions about food stamps and their cost and then suddenly Jake Javits blew in. He had a prepared statement. It was a rather violent one, charged bureaucracy and expressed all of these sentiments of concern and no action by the Government in declaring an emergency. I immediately went after him and told him in effect that this kind of emotional name-calling accomplished no purpose. And he fired back and I told him I wouldn't stand for this kind of thing and it was a pretty hot exchange. Clark then jumped in and Javits got angry at Clark for coming in and told him to leave us alone, that we knew what we were doing, that we'd been in this a long time and didn't need his help, and they had a shouting contest where upon fortunately I sat back and smiled. Well, it all quieted down and I made a very good record, outlined what we were doing, cleared the air on the emergency demands that had been made. Murphy of California was a meek as a lamb. He almost apologized for bringing in the emergency idea when I pointed out that emergency or no it wouldn't make it possible for me to do anything I wasn't doing anyway.

Well the long and the short of it was that I left about noon and figured this would get some attention but I didn't dream how much. It

ended up on the front page of most newspapers around the country and in the Huntley-Brinkley show and other television. The result has been for the last two days that I have had more comments and more attention and more praise actually and commendation than almost any time I can remember.

Jane and I went Thursday night to a, one of the Marine Corps evening parades, this one for general officers, there were quite a few people we knew, and everyone went out of their way to come up and compliment and commend. For once in one of these exchanges instead of looking like an angry young man I apparently gave a much more balanced and controlled impression than did Javits and, of course, everyone in Washington who gets abused by Congress is pleased when someone stands up.

All in all it made a very favorable impact and I am quite delighted about it. It came one day or two days after I had a nasty exchange with a new Congressman from Iowa called Scherle. This fellow was a real block-head. He apparently has abused everyone and at this particular hearing he in effect charged that we were perpetuating the Vietnam war in order to solve the farm problem. And when I told him that he ought to be ashamed of himself, he said he wasn't, and I told him he then didn't have enough sense to be ashamed of himself. That exchange got wide attention to, and here again I got away with it pretty well because everyone knew the man and therefore did not feel that I was acting excessively. I'll have to be careful next up on the Hill for now I've got something of a reputation for a bit here of kinda chewing nails and spitting on Congressmen. So I'll have to keep my powder dry for a while.

Anyway, these have been rather interesting events. Last night, as I say, we were on the Sequoia with the Johnsons and mostly people on their own staff. George Mahon and his wife, and Jack Brooks and his wife were there -- Texas Congressmen. Otherwise they were people in the White House. It was fun. We saw some pictures.

I had a long talk with Mrs. J. who was interested in the food situation in Mississippi. Her roots, of course, go back to the plantation system.

We had a chance to get a number of plugs in here and there with the President. He told me to go ahead on the strategic grain program. I'm not precisely sure what he meant by that. I've got to follow that up. He asked about the response to the dairy thing and complained that no one had said thank you to him. He again expressed his concern that we give away food around the world and then they buy from someone else except us.

My what a complex man. He completely dominates the scene. That, of course, is the nature of the office. It's very difficult on an occasion like this to just get him to listen, or really to know what he's up to. He's a great story teller. Has many anecdotes, and remembers in great detail incidents that took place years back.

He carries this enormously heavy burden, but I must say seems to do it well and seems to be quite relaxed and enjoying himself last night.

The other clipping on granaries refers to the domestic agricultural situation and the supply situation which is worrisome. We are going to have a real bumper crop this year. I have had a kinda running battle in setting the acreage allotments and conditions for next year. A lot of people in the trade in general, the Vice President who's always followed this line, and those who are interested in food for freedom have been pushing



hard not to cut back acreage. I have felt otherwise and have cut back acreage on feedgrains and on wheat. The editorial from the Des Moines Register agrees with that judgment. There was one in the Washington Post that did as well. I have been attacked for it by Felix Belair in the New York Times and Drew Pearson leaked too. AID is just terrible on this. When they don't get something they want why they run to some of these newspaper people who then proceed to write these leak stories and in this case there were a number of them, but this seems to have settled down now on a pretty good basis with more public understanding. The increase in production around the world as compared to last year is very great and the supply situation is simply a great deal different than it was. This has its price implications and I'm very worried about that and I hope we can get this strategic grain bill up before the Congress now and that might help. We're trying every way possible to pour out of here information as to what we're doing. I think we've turned a corner in the cheap food policy and the consumer image thing were so bad last Spring seem to have worn themselves off a bit. I managed to prevail on the President to drop the dairy imports significantly below the level that the Tariff Commission had recommended and the reaction to this has been very good.

Also among the agriculture groups the reaction to cutting back on acreages has been very good, and generally our bargaining power to our approach seem to have been well received. As I reported to the President last week, the Shirtsleeve sessions held by the ASCS State Committees involved these Committees more deeply than they ever had been involved before in these programs and now their morale is high. They are informed and really participating, which is all to the good.

I am pushing hard in every way on this. We hope to have the farm leaders in here soon. Farm income will be down this year, but prices have strengthened on hogs and cattle and generally there seems to be approval to what we have been doing.

I am a little concerned now that the Food and Fiber Commission Report has been interpreted by the Press as recommending a change in agricultural programs. It really didn't recommend a change in agricultural programs and it could give our enemies some ammunition. But we're going to counter that by having hearings before the House Committee on the Curtis Farm Bureau Bill to in effect abolish the grain programs. And this may give the farm organizations something to be against.

So in a sense we are just holding fast in this area, but the actions we've taken seem to be rather well received.

Connie's off to Africa, apparently doing all right. Mike is home working in the Senate Document Room and taking tutoring nights on his Spanish. Jane was in Florida the other day. He and I played squash and then we went up to see a championship socker game which was real fun. He's coming down from the Hill in a bit this morning and we're going to play squash again before going home this afternoon. We're going to have guests tonight -- the Glenn Seaborgs and the John Gardners, the Bob McNamara's coming over and we'll have an informal dinner and kinda discussion session. These frightful riots in Newark which were all over the paper today will provide certainly more than enough to talk about. This is part of my kind of efforts to get the schedule set up bringing some of the interesting people in Washington out so we can have a chance to talk about something else except agriculture all the time. This ought to be a very interesting group tonight.

Things have been relatively quiet on the international food front the last several weeks. The Near East war, of course, brought everything to a kind of standstill. Pakistan and, particularly, India have been involved in the most obnoxious kind of way. It was like the President said riding out to the Sequoia last night in the car, that every day these people take a crack at him. I mean every day, and it was clear that he was more than vexed and unhappy about it. Internally here we're getting ready to send over a program memorandum to the Bureau of the Budget. The ERS food projection for the future is a very bullish one. We've worked it over now and I'm satisfied that it's correct, and that there is more than enough food in the developing countries to feed the less developed countries for at least ~~the~~ next ten years and probably up until 1980. This then gets us in the very difficult and touchy area of how much food should we put in and what is effective demand which means enough to help stimulate the economy, enough to meet the humanitarian needs, but not so much as to discourage incentive. One gets kinda close to playing God on that one and it's really very tough.

I tried to outline the problem in a presentation at Gettysburg a few weeks back which I thought was well done. We released it but it didn't get too much attention. There's a danger that we will be made to look rather foolish for we among others have been trumpeting the world food problem and food shortages and to suddenly release a study that shows there's a lot of food in the developed countries, people immediately say well produce it and ship it to the hungry. Commercial interests holler that and humanitarians holler that and I find myself in a very difficult position of having to cut back production somewhat under this kind of outside criticism.



Well, it's part of the process and we're just going to have to educate people to it. It's a long run challenge. I do hope to get a chance to sit down soon with Bill Gaud and review our relationships and see if we can't get a new thrust where our food for freedom program is concerned. Actually AID right now is under very heavy fire in the Congress. Rusk was up yesterday with the Senate Committee and it is seriously threatening it. The President will I am sure fight hard for it. At the same time he's kinda ambivalent about it, which makes it very difficult. Witness his remarks last night that these countries kick him every day. The result is that it puts us in a kinda paradoxical position. The President is for these programs. He is a great humanist and humanitarian and is carrying forward massive programs. On the other hand there is a certain penuriousness, toughness, resentment, towards some of them, which I suppose might even be called a kinda Puritan ethic attitude. He keeps talking about someone tough enough to administer the Food for Freedom Program and has been unwilling to take our recommendation for a joint executive order for these many months. He said to me once, someone like Jay Taylor who knows agriculture and is tough. The kind of person he is talking about wouldn't administer the programs at all.

On the other hand he keeps shooting at some of us on the grounds we're too soft and that we're want to give everything away. The result is you're kinda inhibited. On the one hand you want to carry the program forward vigorously but you don't want to undermine, foreclose your ability to do so because the President feels you're too soft headed.

This is really tough. I think it permeates the Administration generally on a number of things and is, I suppose, inevitable, but in this complex man where these two different attitudes <sup>mix</sup> ~~mix~~ with each other, it makes it

hard for those who are trying to carry programs forward, seeking to be absolutely loyal to the President, but at the same time concerned that he may very well in a dozen ways curb your effectiveness in doing what theoretically and philosophically he and you both agree should be done. Hence the complexity of working for Lyndon Johnson.

July 18, 1967, 11:30 p.m. at home. Today has been a fairly quiet day. I'm at the desk trying to figure out something to say this weekend at Split Rock when I am to appear on a discussion panel sponsored by the American Political Science Association with a group of newspaper people. I don't have many very bright ideas. As I reflect on this subject mostly I am inclined to strike out on the miserable job of reporting the facts that is done by the press, radio and television as well. I wish I had better recollections and the time to dig back through old material to pinpoint examples of this. I rather conclude that media is primarily gadgetry with very little serious factual reporting when we get to the sensitive social, political and economic issues of the day. I must go off and go through some of the old scrapbooks.

Today's highlight was a very nice lunch in the White House for the President of Iceland. Karl Rolvaag as Ambassador there was much in evidence and seemed to be enjoying his new assignment. The President made a nice toast. The President of Iceland spoke very well. It was, as always, a thrill to be there.

I am angling to see what we can do about the Strategic Reserve Bill. Grain prices are soft, production will be high this year, I'm very worried about it. I've put out a letter to all the farm organizations recommending things that they should do. I'm going to make an appeal to grain farmers in general to use price supports, resale and every possible device so they do not market in a panic. We submitted to the White House some time ago proposals for strategic reserve permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy up

to a certain percentage of the total national use in a year and to resell only when the amount in carry-over stocks falls below a certain level. The Budget Bureau and Council of Economic Advisers are opposing it, mostly for budget reasons although the Council is getting more and more difficult to get along with. The President finally gave me the word to go ahead and try and get it introduced and see if we could get it through or at least started and maintain as much flexibility as possible where he's concerned. I think we're in a position to do this in the House. Purcell and Poage are ready to go I think and can probably go around and get considerable bipartisan support. The Senate presents a more difficult problem because I'm almost certain Ellender will oppose this. He doesn't want to bother with Farm Legislation this year. Further he has turned down the rice people who want a price support increase and they were in under the auspicious of Wilbur Mills pressing me today. I stood them off and said I would make further studies.

Anyway I went up to see Mike Mansfield. I don't like to go around Ellender's back but we pretty well concluded that I should get someone in the Senate to go around and get bipartisan sponsorship and he seemed to think McCarthy would probably be the best. The only real political problem on this one will be demands as to how strongly we should lock the grain up, that is not sell it under than other very stringent circumstances but we wouldn't want to do that anyway so it's not much of a problem. If I can get this rolling why it would be very helpful.

I've been reading some of my incoming mail on the engagement last week with Jake Javits and it really is pretty good. People seem to have appreciated my standing up to him. The South of course highly approved. Others around the country did. He seemed to be in the position of the attacker and me a valiant defender which is a good posture. The clips and newspaper comments and columns



haven't been nearly as good. They passed it off as a kind of shouting contest, don't pass judgment on it and go back to belaboring us on the issue itself. However, on balance I think I came out on this one surprisingly well.

Jane and I had a very stimulating evening last evening. We left Washington about 6:00 o'clock in one of these new Jets for Philadelphia. Jim O'Connor was the sponsor. We went to a very beautiful suburban home. A young couple with eight very lovely children. Their name was The Lou Fishers and he is a young very newly rich restaurant owner...quick serving restaurants specializing in chicken. He is a very attractive fellow. He has made all his money in the last 10 years and was really a very modest, very attractive fellow, apparently looking for something constructive and meaningful to do with his money now. Jim Connor is on him and wants to have him fund a St. Joseph University supplement to the Food Marketing Academy which would involve a half a dozen or so scholars to begin taking a hard look at the international food and agriculture problem.

The meeting was attended by about a half a dozen Jesuit Brothers, some of them directly there from Rome under the direction of the Father General Peter Arrupe of the Jesuit Order. They are considering seriously going into the world food problem and making it a high priority item of the Jesuits agenda. This is really very exciting. I spoke and apparently very effectively pointing out the challenge of our times is to harness the tremendous knowledge we have of the physical world we have around us, which although it is improving our way of life is creating dangerous complex problems, to wit, poisoning the universe, developing frightfully destructive armament, population explosion, and of course the communication revolution and with it the revolution of rising expectations, yet if we could agree to put nearly the concentrated effort and the proven techniques to reach an agreement on our fundamental political problems this

knowledge of the universe could be used to solve most of our social problems, and so it could. Then transposed that into the food and agriculture field, got down to specifics, ending up with the proposal that a program answering St. Joseph which would review experiences and need in the world food picture, would develop case studies of what had worked and why and where, which would seek to apply the system programming planning method which is used so successfully in the material scientific engineering technological field to developing in connection with international food and agriculture systems which would make it possible to determine the goals, methods, to establish priorities and to get this whole thing systematized. Then if the Jesuits worldwide were tied to St. Joe, which is a Jesuit College, why an extra governmental non-political kind of international food and agriculture appraisal, review, development, mobilization of talent, focusing of attention on the problem, a host of good things could flow from it. Anyway it was most stimulating and I left the meeting as we flew back to Washington, not getting here until close to 2:00 o'clock, with a good warm feeling that perhaps much good might come of that evening's session. Incidentally, this afternoon Henry Hall Wilson, now President of the Board of Trade in Chicago, formerly the Legislative Liaison man at the White House, came in to see me. He had been talking to the President who repeated again as he did to me last Friday night that we ought to do something about the countries that we were giving food under P.L. 480 so they would at least buy from us rather than buying from other countries. Actually they are not buying from other countries very much and where they do it is usually because it is cheaper, to wit, India buying from Australia. He keeps talking about some kind of tight sales so we get our share of the market. Of course there is a good deal of merit in this. Unfortunately it is a direct contradiction to an effort to get other countries to join with us multilaterally in meeting the food needs vis-a-vis the Kennedy Round. Henry knows the President, and as

he put it we can decide what ought to be done here and kind of work it around in a way that will be acceptable.

Dorothy called me at dinner tonight. Evans of Evans and Novak was wanting her to try and get some more dope on what happened to the Executive Order which was to determine the operating relationships under the new P.L. 480 between State, AID, and Agriculture. The President has been sitting on that and some of the press expose characters are trying to make something of it, and Felix Belair and the New York Times crowd who have bleeding hearts but little knowledge about P.L. 480 keep writing snide stuff about it.

The President talked to Henry about setting up a Committee to advise with him on this and some good could come of this, too. Henry Wilson is a good friend, an intelligent fellow who knows how to operate. He's sympathetic to the Department. I outlined to him the whole background of our efforts to be more effective in the agricultural international field and we may have gotten an ally.

June 21, 1967 -- 11:50. I'm about to go up for lunch with Wilbur Mills. I don't know what he wants but I expect he will be bugging me about dairy and dairy prices and also about rice. He does represent his constituents and keeps his hand well out in front of his body in the process. He can do that effectively as Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This afternoon we're going up to Split Rock for what I hope will be a relaxed and enjoyable week end.

Last night we had a party on the Sequoia in honor of the Andy and Oscar Carrs from Mississippi. It was a delightful party. They are wonderful people, so attractive and so dedicated at the same time. They are the ones that set the stage and guided us around Mississippi on our recent trip. They're giving real leadership in community development and racial improvement. Hence



it was nice to roll out the red carpet and give them a little special attention. It rained which was too bad but nonetheless it was a delightful party. Liz and Les Carpenter were there and had an opportunity to learn something about what goes on in Mississippi that will be useful. I brought Bob Dwyer along as well. After the little speeches after dinner, he stood up and blurted out that a half a dozen people had asked him why we were in Vietnam and then he proceeded to say why. Everybody was quite uncomfortable. Senator Joe Clark was quite angry, but no one exploded, and it worked out all right and it was probably a good thing for some of them to hear why a man like Bob Dwyer felt like we should be in Vietnam.

Wednesday we had a Cabinet meeting. Nothing very eventful except the President was making it very clear that there was not a stalemate in Vietnam and he emphasized strongly that the Press was the only one that really believed that and then proceeded to read from an Intelligence Report and in it observed that McNamara thought very highly of setting forth in great detail specifics in terms of the air raids and the resistance they are running into now. That the North Vietnamese are clearly hurting; the volume of anti-aircrafts and resistance is down, so is the MIG resistance down, and that the bombing is accomplishing what it is intended to do by way of tying up resources, people and hinder supply.

Bob McNamara spoke quite emotionally about the charge against him and the Government of peddling armaments around the world. There is a big flack in Congress now and a series of stories in the New York Times about him which tends to put him and the Government in general in a rather bad position as purveyors of arms. He was deeply concerned about it and pointed out that these were things we had to do, that if we didn't do it these Governments would go elsewhere, and sometimes that would include <sup>to</sup> Russia for military supplies, that very strict

criteria of the most efficient military supplies and their need plus the expenditures wouldn't adversely affect the economy were applied, and only when the Secretary of State certified that it was necessary even if it hurt the economy, were these sales made. I've never seen Bob McNamara as emotionally upset about anything. He's trying to stop the stories or make them more accurate with some success I think; in the meantime there is a lot of noise about it and hearings are being held and a number of wild statements being made up on the Hill. Ellender is apparently giving a great deal of difficulty on this one.

July 24, 1967 -- 11:45. I've just driven my way through about 3 hours of paper work. My how it piles up. There is a lot of activity going on and most of it I must pass on if it's going to keep on going.

Jane, Mike and I had a very delightful weekend. Friday afternoon we flew up to Split Rock, Pennsylvania, to a resort on a Lake called Harmony in the Glacier Country of the Pocono Mountains. There was a large lodge, lots of cabins and houses around. We stayed in one Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights. We spent Friday and Saturday nights with Jean and Evron Kirkpatrick. The Pennimans were with us on Saturday. It was enjoyable to participate in some wide and free-ranging intellectual conversations, running from a book Jean is writing on Argentina through Vietnam, attitude in the country towards it, comparisons with Korea, the attitude of the intellectual community, a wide ranging review with Kirk of things I am doing in the Department of Agriculture. It was stimulating and useful, actually a part of my current course to try and broaden horizons a bit and get into some things except plain agriculture where I sometimes feel I am so limiting my scope of interest and know-how as to become bored with myself and probably boring to everyone else. During the day we hiked, swam, read, had a canoe ride, a drive around the area by a John Adams who is the head of the operating company that <sup>owns</sup> owns about 40,000 acres of

land formerly Lehigh Coal land now being developed for recreation purposes on a very interesting basis whereby they are rather than plotting and selling lots plan to develop such things as hotels, town houses and cottages which they will then lease or rent, retaining ownership. They seem to be doing it on a very systematic and carefully planned basis which seems to make sense.

This morning I conducted the first seminar of the Newspaper Award Winners of the Political Science Association, some twenty of them.

Thursday, July 27, 1967, 11:30 pm at my desk at home. Another long, hot week is drawing to a close. It's been a hot one in more respects than one. The riot in Duluth has dominated pretty much everything. We just finished watching the President's address to the Nation tonight. I thought he did very well. It was a bit long and repetitive, but it was very firm, sincere and moving. He was very firm about the enforcement and in condemning the violence. He chartered a course of action to correct the conditions which contribute to riots. In the process he got in some sharp political points, but they were well disguised, as he pointed out the failure of Congress to act on some of his recommendations, particularly the rat control bill which was the carrier for the whole urban housing program. He appealed to the Nation in a number of ways including declaring next Sunday a day of prayer and asking everyone to provide leadership as well as public officials. All in all it was, I think, a very effective performance. I do hope it will do a lot of good.

The President got off I think on a rather bad foot earlier in the week when following a very nasty uncalled for statement by the Republican Coordinating Committee charging him with responsibility for the riots, he responded in a very pickish way by making it clear repeatedly that Romney couldn't handle the situation in Detroit before he finally sent troops there. I didn't see it but he was on television at Midnight, Tom Hughes did and he said it looked pretty bad. However, in the press and radio criticisms generally the Republicans seem



to be getting it worse than the President. I haven't seen him this week. We've had a number of calls and been working with The White House to get together a package of things for Detroit. We've already moved food in there, but we've been working through the people in Califano's office.

I'll be going to Detroit next week and am considering making a personal inspection tour of the areas where food will be distributed. I'm reserving judgment on that one.

The week has been a fairly quiet one. I'm concentrating a bit this week on our commodity programs and concerned about them. Our Crop Reports are for a very good crop, some claiming a 5-billion bushel corn crop, and that would be a catastrophe on our prices. Soybean prices are down. There have been demands to reseal from around the country. Reports are picking up of dissension and unhappiness with our current situation and I expect we'll have more. I'm going to have DeVier Pierson over next Monday to review with our Income and Abundance Task Force a number of questions he sent over which reflected some of the protest and mail he's getting. It will continue to be a miserable, tough situation on these farm prices -- no question about that for the balance of the year.

Tomorrow we go up to Vermont to spend the weekend with Ken Galbraith. It ought to be an interesting weekend. I hope to get a chance to work him over a bit on Vietnam. I called Dean Rusk and his suggestion was that I make it clear to Galbraith that some of those who are writing history now of the Kennedy period may be surprised when the facts come out -- that Kennedy had made it clear that if we had to fight it should be not in Laos but in Vietnam. He spoke rather strongly about it and expressed his willingness to sit down with the ADA crowd and discuss all this, if they wished. On the other hand Bob McNamara whom I talked with about it when we played squash was not as

outspoken. He said that he really couldn't say -- that Kennedy was a very wise man and might have figured out a way to avoid this, and of course there were a few times, such as the period of very rapid change of Governments in Vietnam, when we might have walked out, saying it was hopeless if they couldn't get together better than that. On the other hand, he said we would have paid a big price in terms of our loss of prestige and the strength of our position in the free position in the world and particularly that part of the world. His plea would be that we ought not to split the nation on this, weaken the President's position, and lose thereby his program for National progress. I told Bob I didn't think that was very effective for the people who are protesting, say let's get out. His response was that well even Galbraith doesn't say let's get out. That he doesn't support the enclave theory which Bob repeated was totally impossible and supported by no one really, that you better just walk out rather than trying to do that.

I've had an ulcer flareup this week. I don't know what it came from except perhaps I had a few drinks late at night last weekend and smoked some cigars. It's been gradually getting better but I'm kind of uncomfortable again tonight. Hope it clears up.

August 2, 1967 - 9:00 pm at my desk at home. It's been a busy day today. I went to Boston to speak to the National League of Cities, tomorrow will be Detroit and the National Association of County officials, and today I worked hard following up long conferences last Friday on the speeches. The riots have set the stage for real public interest in anything to do with big cities. I had a very interesting press conference in Boston, more questions, more interest, than has ever existed before on the urban rural balance question. My speech there was a kind of emotional one. It was Wally Lindell's first effort and he clung stubbornly to his thesis that we should deal in terms of meaning, purpose

emotion people, and make a major impact. I really think that I did. They listened very, very closely. I hammered home the point that where will we put another 100 million people by the year 2000. How will we look at our grandchildren come that date -- with pride that we prepared a place for them or with chagrin that we failed. The impact I think was excellent. The press conference far reaching. For the first time that I can remember I felt that I had made an impact on the press. While there I got a call from Joe Califano. I had inquired of the staff at the White House whether tomorrow in Detroit I should visit our distribution centers. The call was to say no -- further to cancel my press conference, and finally to get back as quick as I could, and then they censored my speech and took out some parts that I didn't think were very significant anyway.

It would appear that the President is very jumpy about the political situation with Romney. It would appear that he didn't come out too well, that his statement on the Sunday night that the riots broke, emphasizing Romney's inability to take care of the situation backfired. Romney has been hollering politics and the whole thing is kind of squirreled up. It's really hard to tell who is hurting who. The President now is maintaining a dignified silence, and that's undoubtedly the best thing to do.

Late this afternoon I went to a reception of the Democratic National Committee. They have beautiful new offices on the top floor of a brand new office building overlooking the Potomac River not far from the John F. Kennedy Cultural Site. I kind of enjoyed seeing all the politicians. On my way out I ran into the Vice President just coming in. We spoke briefly. Yesterday he was in Boston and made a very stirring speech in which he attacked the Congress for not acting. I assumed that he had clearance on that in the White House and when questioned myself, I said that the Vice President had made the point and that the Congress had acted very little. The press reacted especially to some



language in the manuscript which I had adjusted in pen to read, "not a President who cares and a cooperative Congress, but a President who cares and a Congress that cooperated until recently." A number of the reporters ran out of the room to file a story. I haven't seen it yet. Anyway, I asked Humphrey about it and he was most unhappy and disturbed. He said that he had had a call from Joe Califano saying that the President was disturbed and that he had upset relations with the Congress. The night before he had been called and told not to go to Boston and had insisted on going because he was already booked and couldn't possibly refuse to go. He told Califano that the President had told him only a couple of days before that he, Humphrey, should take on the Congress and that the President couldn't. Then the President turned around and fussed through Califano. Jane and I were talking about it tonight. I think if I were the Vice President I would tell Califano that if the President wanted to talk to me about it I would be glad to come over, but in the meantime I was following the last instructions I got from the President. Anyway it would appear that the President is mighty jumpy. I'll go into Detroit tomorrow, give my speech to the County officials and get out of there.

The encouraging thing is that I have succeeded in getting six Cabinet officers, John Gardner, Trowbridge of Commerce, Bill Wirtz, Alan Boyd, Bob Weaver, to join with me, and I so announced, to sponsor a symposium this December to review the whole urban rural balance question, bringing together people worldwide on the subject. I'm going to make this a real big thing. Try and get some Foundation money and do some real brainstorming, some deep thinking about the kind of planning, city-country tied together to meet all these horrendous problems that needs to be done. Maybe we can command some attention to this subject. I sent the President a memo outlining that I would do this. I told him rather than asked him, and at least I wasn't stopped, so it would appear

that he at least will sit still for this. Although Califano told Schnittker today that I better be careful in December that this symposium didn't call for anything that meant more money. The President obviously is very disturbed about the budget and the threat of increasing the national debt \$20 or \$30 billion for which he certainly can't be blamed.

Last weekend we had a delightful time up in Vermont with the Galbraiths. Ken is walking on air. His new book "The New Industrial State" is on the best seller list. He had with him up there Halverstan, a writer for Harper's, and Gloria Steinam, a free lance girl writer, they were typical New York arty types, but they didn't set us back too much. We went for a wonderful long hike up a rocky, rugged creek. We had a number of fine swims in their Beaver Pond lake. Wonderful relaxed lunches outside, stimulating discussions. The weather was fine -- the countryside beautiful. Mike was there listening and I think learned a good bit. It was really a most enjoyable time. Ken was his usual glib, arrogant, witty self, but he seemed delighted to have us there and I felt he really did enjoy and like us. Perhaps in a way I'm his passport . . .

August 3, 1967, 11:10 at home. Another day is about history. I've been sweating out for 2 1/2 hours now the day's mail and all the projects that are under way. It seems bottomless and I sure get sick of it. Nonetheless we do have some exciting things in the mill. Tomorrow I see the President on the Tokyo Trade Promotion big fair with the plan to invite all the Governors to participate and for me to go on perhaps to The Philippines, Taiwan and HongKong and do some trade promotion. The President flagged our report on increased agricultural exports and apparently wants to combine a Tokyo Fair announcement invitation to Governors along with the favorable trade figures. I got a message from Jim Jones that Trowbridge and I were to get together and set some targets

Resolution and its legislative history made it clear that if the circumstances demanded it we could come up with grain even though it was not matched to the 3 million ton amount that Congress allegedly authorized. The present situation in India couldn't possibly be as bad as in the United States and referred to our budget situation and to the fact that if I had to finance out of the Agricultural budget all this grain for India I would have to cut back on food stamps, school lunch, school milk, and food programs for our needy at home. I responded to that with the bumper crop this year we would probably take that million ton into the Commodity Credit Corporation and it would appear in the budget anyway. He made no comment about that. The meeting drew to a close. When we returned to our office Eskie remarked to me that he thought the President would come down on a million tons but I'm not so sure.

Today I had a call from Gene Rostow. State apparently is trying to get out a memo to the President now and to Fowler, myself and Gaud on it. I'll have to see it. I'm not sure any good can be accomplished to push him further on it at this time.

I heard snatches of Bobby Kennedy on Meet The Press yesterday and I can't say that I think he has conducted himself with any great distinction. The liberals are having a field day. It is so easy on the outside to criticize. The whipping boys are Vietnam and the money spent there, the space program and the money spent there; yet they know there is a limit to what we can actually spend and use effectively. In all fairness, Bobby did say \$2 - \$4 billion is all that could be used and I suppose we could use that if we diverted it from Vietnam. It's a struggle. His criticism, too, that we ought not to do more in Vietnam until the Vietnamese are willing to do it is legitimate. But he's been on the inside, he knows how tough it is, he's enough of a politician to know that the country certainly is not prepared at this time to sustain further heavy spending in the very areas that are spawning the current calls for



requiring each big allocation to get his personal approval. In this instance I had joined with Bill Gaud to recommend a million tons of grain to India. This baged upon the matching exercise where Gene Rostow and John Schnittker traveled around and got alleged commitments to match the 3 million tons that Congress authorized us to send to India last spring provided that other countries matched it.

Saturday he successfully attacked through the medium of George Ball his counsel, as it were. Joe Fowler and Harry McPherson played this same role and they pretty well shot down Gene Rostow and Bill Gaud's arguments particularly when they claimed that the 1-year extension by the World Bank constituted matching even though India didn't use it to buy grain. They also attacked the argument that Italy's reviving some old pledges of consortium constituted matching. The President sat and listened and pretty well agreed with the anti-India side. Finally Chet Bowles asked to be heard. It was rather pathetic. He made about as much impression as a fly on the wall with his hackney argument that India is difficult, frustrating, and how well he knew it but that they were having a difficult time, that India was in serious trouble, now the rains were better in six more months the picture could change and they'd be on their feet. George Ball made the point that there was no reason to help India, that they were not with us politically, and there was every reason to believe they wanted to be rid of us and follow their own course which was not consistent with American policy either in Vietnam or in the Near East. The President agreed. He is needled by the fact that they continually attack him and sometime gratuitously attack this country. He probably ought to give a little more latitude to their domestic political situation, but they simply do frustrate him. My contribution was to point out that we were not painted in the corner by the matching requirement, that the Congressional

in the current climate, that there is a fringe in the Negro community now as illustrated by Stokley Carmichael currently calling for revolution in the United States and Cuba and H. Rap Brown and others that want nothing less than revolution and dominance by the black community, destroying white power structure. It would appear they think they have the bit in their teeth and they won't stop until they are stopped by force.

I don't think it's quite that bleak. I think the Negro community itself will exert a strong restraining influence provided that these loud men are contained and do not completely intimidate them. The President is saying the right thing, dealing in no hysterics or extreme statements, calling for improvements and giving all forces involved a lot of line. In the meantime, hearings are going on in the Congress. Eastland's Judiciary Committee is having them now. McClelland will have them. The anti-riot bill has passed the House and the forces of white conservatism are stirring. It's reported that the poverty bill has lost a lot of support because of disturbances. It's ironic and somewhat frightening in that we find Negroes here demanding in effect what they fight and detest in South Africa, mainly two separate communities - white and black. In the meantime, the Vietnam war grinds on. There were two very depressing stories in the New York Times today - one going into considerable length documenting a stalemate in Vietnam; the other criticizing tactics which keep the Marines frozen in the hike for Northern Vietnam area when they should be in the Delta where their greater maneuverability would be better used. It's a tough, harsh period. I must say the President keeps his equanimity amazingly. He was concerned about this, demanding that we do something to increase exports, to improve our budget position last Friday, but still relatively calm. On Saturday he was interesting to observe. He kind of enjoys taking on the State Department and AID who of course are continuously pushing him to have more aid and send more food. He still holds the reins on P.L. 480

be borrowed, or \$15 billion. The \$7 billion increase over the anticipated deficit of \$8 billion.

I saw the President last Friday when he authorized our Tokyo Trade Promotion promising me a 707 airplane to transport Governors to Tokyo. We will then use them in our Trade Promotion and presumably send them out into the provinces around Japan while I go on for an independent one-day promotion stand for trade in Taiwan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Korea. I'll pick up the Governors and return after roughly a week. He was pleased with that and I had a press conference briefing the Press men about our excellent year in agricultural exports and making an advance notice of this big agricultural trade exposition. Even then he was repeating the problem in connection with the budget and how we're going to raise the money to meet the problem.

We were asked today to contact our respective constituencies and the Members of Congress and see what kind of reports we got from them and the kind of support we could raise for it.

It is a tough situation. The liberals are crying for more expenditures to meet the threat in cities, highlighted by the recent riots. Bobby Kennedy yesterday on Meet the Press criticized the tax proposals because they were not graduated. He called for \$2 to \$4 billion initially to increase city programs. This to come if necessary from holding back in Vietnam. Unfortunately at the same time the President announced the tax increase he announced 45 to 50 thousand more troops in Vietnam and the liberals and the Negroes will be screaming from the rooftops about that.

It really is a confused and difficult situation. Richard Wilson of the Cowles publication has a column in the paper tonight where he points out that the solution of the hysterical liberals, as he calls them, for clearing out more slums, more schools, more housing, more recreation, more jobs won't be enough



feeling during the game when some Negro teenagers in the late innings moved down into the front seats we held. It seemed to me that they were quite cocky and pushy. I probably wouldn't have noticed it two weeks ago. Now with the riots just passed and everyone so sensitive about it, I had a different feeling. In part it was a feeling of concern and worry that we would have riots here, and everyone has in Washington these days, when you ride through the Negro Districts and see the crowded conditions, realize how dreadfully hot, humid and uncomfortable it is, how wretched they must be, one is fearful of an explosion, sympathetic too. Yet one has a different attitude about the Negroes in a way since these riots.

Monday, August 7, 1967, 10:20 pm at home. Just finished dinner and at the desk again attacking the pile of paper. I played squash this afternoon and then a meeting at the White House with the President and other Cabinet members and heads of the Agencies concerned with domestic economic affairs. The subject was the discussion of the fiscal problem, more particularly the tax program the President sent to the Congress calling for an increase in income tax, the 10 percent surtax. The meeting dragged on. The President was in no hurry. He left for a phone call and as we were breaking up after about 45 minutes he came back and we spent another rambling 45 minutes while he examined with us in considerable detail the problem. He is and understandably so obsessed with the \$30 billion deficit which stares us in the face for the current fiscal year. Obviously this has serious overtones politically and economically. As he put it, to borrow \$30 billion would be disastrous to the economy, would drive up interest rates although no one can say how far. I quizzed Fowler about that. So he has determined to make up the deficit by increasing taxes to produce \$7 billion and he complains that no one supports that. Also, to cut back the budget enough to provide 25 percent; the tax increase to provide 25 percent of the \$30 billion deficit, and the balance to

commodity by commodity, country by country, that's not possible. The message wasn't very clear, but I'm delighted to get a crack at them on the trade thing for we've done some awfully good work on this. I hope he will back the big Tokyo thing, including the governors. If he'll provide the transportation we can put on quite a show.

I had an interesting talk with Rusk today, mostly about the FAO. He is skiddish about backing Sen for 2 more years as Director General. It is reported to him that Boerma of Holland and Santa Cruz of Latin American are campaigning hard, cutting up Sen, and Sen is losing strength. He hesitated to get into that even though he thought we ought to have an American and might win this year with one, to wit, Orville Freeman; but, as he put it that's a dead issue for the President came down hard with an emphatic "no" on that one. I told him I would likely be available in 1969, but that the real issue is whether this Government means what it says about the world food problem, and is prepared to do something about it include our commitment to multi-lateral methods. If we mean that we ought to be doing something about the FAO which is the logical organization through which to work but which will never amount to <sup>anything</sup> ~~anything~~ without strong leadership and strong US support. He told me he would check further into it as to the political possibilities and we'll have to let that one ride. I had an interesting office conference today about the Fairleigh Dickinson proposal. John Schnittker is somewhat skeptical. He thinks the University might be using us, but I think otherwise. We might be able to develop the agricultural story in that Forum in a very dramatic way and get more attention than Agriculture has ever gotten in the East. Anyway we have it launched.

The same is true for the urban rural symposium. We are organized to try and get that one moving and ought to make a big thing of it.

We had a delightful evening. Mike and I went to the baseball game and Washington won in 11 innings. It was a pretty good game. I had a strange

make this a big event. It surely is timely. They all seemed quite impressed and complimentary that I had focused the sights of the Department on Agriculture/2000 the big picture of where ~~dowe~~ we go from here.

This afternoon I spent with general farm organizations, including Roger Fleming from the Farm Bureau, and commodity groups discussing farmer bargaining power. I had Bill Abbott set down some of the principles necessary to have bargaining power -- Rod Leonard outlined some of the commodities which might lend themselves to it. I emphasized we have nothing to sell that I'm merely trotting out the idea. The response was cautious, but I think generally favorable. Oren Staley was there. He spoke a good bit. His usual valuable self. Apparently he'll see the President tomorrow. This is the result of Wilbur Mills again. This time pushed by Dave Parr and Nelson. Staley seems to have contacts with them and also with the Grange. He's really quite an operator and can be quite attractive. I had generally advised against the President seeing him because he was so miserably <sup>antagonistic</sup> antagonistic and critical as a product of the injunction on the NFO milk withholding some months back. As our afternoon meeting drew to a close Tom came in and said that DeVier Pierson had notified him that the President would see Staley. Pierson would tell him, or we could. I gave it a quick thought and decided to let Tom tell him. This was legitimate for I had a late afternoon meeting with the Assistant Prime Minister from Australia and then at the Pentagon for guess what. Whether I'll be with him when he sees the President or not, I don't know.

I also worked some today to prepare an answer to another attack on me. It was made anonymously, forwarded by Jim Jones, Marvin Watson's assistant, allegedly at the request of the President. I'm not sure whether the President saw it or not. This one was more personal and nasty than that of a few months back, but quite comparable.



He was very strong in his description of agriculture as basic in India. He pointed out that what happens is when the farmers get a little income is that they start buying some of the things they want in the way of consumer goods with resulting small processing and business enterprises popping up and in this way people can be kept in the countryside and the economy can begin to grow and prosper which is exactly what happened in this country. All in all it worked out much better than I would have thought. It's too bad that Bowles has eroded his prestige and influence domestically in the State Department and particularly with the President by getting labeled as so unalterably pro-Indian as not to exercise a firm enough hand and always advocate more and more and more without strict requirements in terms of what they should do. He is actually an attractive, very preceptive and knowledgeable man.

August 10, 1967 -- 11:00 pm at home. This has been an interesting and I think useful day in contrast with yesterday when I just seemed to fritter it away. Early this morning Paul Ylvisaker, formerly of the Ford Foundation, and a number of his staff people came in for a preparatory conference on the urban rural balance symposium. We were joined by Ed Bishop, Chairman of the President's Commission on Rural Poverty. The discussion was stimulating. I hadn't realized before that some of the resistance to my position on this is because I am taken by many to express the traditional rural agrarian viewpoint which they consider competitive for resources, such as appropriations, but also business which means jobs, and taxes as well. Ylvisaker put it well when he said we need to consider the United States, at least the eastern half of it, as one large city and plan and mesh all of our resources including land and space, accordingly. He emphasized that the symposium ought to be as specific as possible and promised to submit some specific recommendations on topic and participants. Bishop promised to do the same. I am encouraged that we can

he's right, was that in our modern world, changes coming so rapidly, communication is so extraordinary, that people are alerted to what others have and desirous of having the same and quickly. The revolution of rising expectations is true in the U.S. as well as around the world. He made the point that as conditions improve, disturbances will tend to intensify for expectations will grow more rapidly and that probably the pace will continue.

In India, he said, it would be expected as conditions do improve there will be a lot more disturbance and disruption than now. He drew an example of Madras which is one of the best governed states in India with the highest standard of living where the incumbent government was completely turned out. Basically, he said, the current political situation in India is that the new people, the young people, are joined in one objective and that is to turn the rascals, meaning the old timers, out. He emphasized that we all make mistakes, every Government, and private organizations as well, using the illustration that Ford made a mistake in the Edsel car and if any Government had made such a mistake it would have been turned out, but Ford as a private organization could and did survive it. Further, he said, the mistakes made by the Soviet Government are covered up and not known and emphasized and dramatized as in a democratic country. His overall prognosis for India was fairly favorable. He said that they are resentful of us and will never like us as long as we're giving them money. I was surprised that he was that perceptive. I quite agree. He stated that the agricultural program does have a lot of momentum and he felt it was going forward despite the replacement of Subramaniam. He described ~~Roger~~ Desi as being very loyal to Mrs. Gandhi now that he is in the Cabinet and that one of the things that he had done that was now paying off was to religiously call on and advise with Desi for the many months when he was out of office altogether. Now his relations with Desi are excellent.

now pretty well a matter of history. I just came from the home of President Rudder of Texas A&M located here. Incidentally Gerry Heaney's commanding officer in the Ranger Battalion in World War II. I spoke this evening to the Biological Institute's session, some 2000 plus people, both on science and our research program within the Department, also on the world food problem with special reference to our recent World Food Situation report which has been somewhat misconstrued. It was really two speeches, but I managed to combine them in about 16 pages, sprinkling in a few stories, and it went off rather well.

I left Washington about 8:30 this morning and flew to Dallas. I scheduled a meeting with Gene Butler the Senior Manager of the Progressive Farmer and Charley Scuggs, one of their people just to discuss agriculture. George Mahon was on the plane and ended up joining us for lunch. It was a general discussion, a kind of public relations gesture, altho there may be some good advice forthcoming. The hot topic here, of course, is cotton. We're going to have to do something about the cotton problem because we've just about got the surplus disposed of. As I've said a number of times today, it's ironic and an example of why no one would want to be Secretary of Agriculture, that beginning a year ago the commodities of which we were in short supply and where I increased production, to wit, wheat, feed grains, and soybeans, in the last year we've had excellent weather, bumper crops, strong supply response and we're fighting depressed prices and a temporary surplus situation. Cotton, on the other hand, we were in surplus; we had a definite program to cut production and not only was it cut but weather went and we really had almost the shortest crop in history. In the cotton program we have eliminated the surplus in 2 years instead of 4 -- now we need more production. Farmers seem to be rather spoiled by the program. They like the very handsome payments, not planting too much; if we would only toss in skip row planting now, which



time, there were many important people there to see him and ushered him back into the room with the other people. He seemed surprised, not offended, and I got to thinking later that probably not very often does the Shah have any one in effect conclude a conversation with him, rather he dismisses them in due course. Anyway I don't think he was offended -- maybe it was good for him. I enjoyed talking with him and being a part of the gathering. I'm going to follow up on this. There may be real development possibilities that we can use effectively in Iran.

That same night I went to join Jane at a party that the Senator Coopers were giving for George Aiken and his new wife, Lola. It was perfectly delightful. Symington was there - the Mike Mansfields - Nancy Dickerson and her husband, and a few others that I didn't know. It was a gay party with informal toasts. We were glad to be there and particularly glad to be a part of it all. This was a real exclusive group of people that Aiken himself wanted and it meant something to be a part of it.

Then last night we were on the Sequoia with Art Goldberg. He had a party for the new New Zealand Ambassador here Ambassador Horner, formerly Ambassador to the United Nations. He and his wife were perfectly delightful. The Goldbergs had people mostly outside the Government -- dentists, doctors, lawyers, public relations people, friends in the Washington Community that they had that they wanted the Horners to know. It was a very nice thing to do and a very enjoyable party.

August 30, 1967 -- 12:00 midnight. College City, Texas. This has been and interesting, active and rather satisfying day. I'm on tour again. I booked in a speech at the insistence of our scientific people at the American Institute of Biological Sciences scheduled for here at College Station, Texas. Then I determined, consistent with my efforts to carry the message of rural area development and rural urban balance, to lay on a tour. The first day is

ghettos and he had already asked his staff to bring together all my speeches and statements and to begin bringing this thing into focus. He will undoubtedly be off and running with it which is a real plus. From my own personal point of view, selfish now, I'm glad that I have been on this long enough and loud enough so that the contribution of this Department and yours truly if this does prove to be a great national issue in development, which I think it will, will not be completely lost in the bushes.

As a matter of fact, summarizing the past week it's encouraging to note that in our three primary main areas that we have come sharply to the front, to wit, bargaining power, urban rural balance, and also of course the new Food Situation Report. All of these are somewhat controversial. All of them have their detractors as well as their supporters within the Administration, but the President is well aware of each and we are for the moment at least in the position of the initiator and a rather prime mover, rather than a kind of collateral, drag along behinder which is the way we are too often.

Three interesting social events the last week -- Wednesday night I went to Averill Harriman's. He had a gathering of some of the outstanding business leadership in the Nation for the Shah of Iran. He took me aside with the Shah early because I had to leave for a party at the Senator John Coopers and I had about 15 minutes with the Shah. I was impressed. He's made a lot of progress in his agriculture, he's determined to make more, and indicated that he wanted to get big capital, big investment, big methods, big development which would be profitable and then would be made available to Nationals. He talked sense, seemed informed and positive. I may have pulled a faux pas for after about 15 minutes I said to him that I didn't want to monopolize

get real bargaining power, it could result in improved efficiencies from constant supply and also pressure on processors and handlers to improve their production. It could mean that farmers will have machinery whereby they can really compete and conceivably government can play a smaller and smaller part and be a regulator and overseer and not as deeply involved as we are today. Of course the <sup>truth</sup> ~~true~~ is that in most of the commodities that will use bargaining power and the techniques we are thinking about at the beginning aren't under any farm programs at all. There is a long way to go, but Bill now is going commodity by commodity, calling in the trade itself, producers and processors, analyzing the actual practices that are being followed. He plans to go out and spend some time with Staley and the NFO and see what they have learned which is really considerable from a practical point of view and by the end of October we will see where we are. It might be that the Administration should introduce legislation. If there are ~~too~~ many economic imponderables we can still continue to study it, discuss it, and the dialogue will surely carry us through the election year and this does provide a bit of hope in answer to many unanswerable questions for which there are no solutions at least none that are the least bit acceptable politically. So from that point of view, all of this is a plus and can't possibly hurt us. When you combine that with the possibility of some real economic advance why that puts a very favorable light on the whole thing.

I also talked yesterday with Humphrey about the rural urban balance question and the task force that the President assigned him to head, including McNamara. He's enthused about it and has assigned Bill Welch who can work with Ken Birkhead here, and asked us to plan for and set up a meeting sometime next week. We'll do this now and try and maintain strong initiative. Humphrey said it would be delightful to talk about something other than urban



August 26, 1967 -- 2:45 at the office. I just finished a squash game. I ran out of steam today playing with Jim Reynolds. McNamara and I have played very hard twice and it seems to have left a little mark. Maybe I'm getting old and I'll have to not run quite as hard, or maybe it was just too much this week, particularly because I've been watching the food intake because I gained about 5 pounds on our trip to the West last week. I've shaken about 4 pounds of it -- that's a plus.

I'm going over in a few minutes to The White House with a card for the President. It's his birthday tomorrow. The polls have been very bad and Ken Birkhead and the fellows here worked out a card which shows a graph of ascending accomplishments by LBJ with the pollsters burning up their polls and saying "we blew it again". It's really cute. I hope he likes it. This is a kind of grim time for him.

Early this morning we had a meeting at The White House in Joe Califano's office. Jim Reynolds from Labor, Gardner Ackley, Califano and myself. Bill Abbott accompanied me and presented the farm bargaining question. They explored rather deeply the overall economic implications. Gardner Ackley was quite negative, as he is toward most farm things, foreseeing all kinds of problems by way of Government regulation and restriction. It's complicated. We've got to go into it very thoroughly but in the main I left quite enthused. Califano thinks this is tremendously interesting and promising, which is a plus. Bill Abbott is on top of it and getting in deeper. His legal background in antitrust and market regulations, plus his alert and keen mind, plus his manner which gets along well with people, make him a natural for this assignment and I am delighted that he is now going to stay with the Department although his period as a White House fellow is over. This could be a major economic advance in the history of the country. If farmers can

report on the election in Vietnam. I did and found a good deal of interest in the farm bargaining power theme and believe I might have gotten some exposure and made some points that will be useful. As the President put it, we ought to use every opportunity we can to advertise and sell our own merchandise around here as well as running out around the country. So it all worked out quite well.

Also, incidentally the analysis of the election in Vietnam was most encouraging as Katzenbach summarized it, we ought to be impressed with the fact that here's a country that has really not had national elections, passing a constitution, living up to that constitution, holding free elections, allowing free press, all at considerable risk when they are in the midst of a great and very trying war. We ought to be impressed rather than supercritical with the accomplishments that this indicates was his main thesis.

Early this morning I testified on the Sawtooth Recreation Area -- an interesting concept here of condemning scenic easements. The Sawtooth Area needs control development. The National Recreation concept emphasizes recreation but permits other uses. Initially Udall had agreed that this should be in the Forest Service. Then Udall seemed to renege because of Park Service's objections and initialled a statement that they were to file and indicated they still hoped to have a park, although I haven't verified that yet. I have been having tension with Ed Crafts lately. He ran out on us on Mineral King. . . . He just sits back and sulks and doesn't communicate. He may have serious problems but they would be easier to contemplate if . . .

of the Senate. He referred back ironically to some of the things said about Roosevelt, and then more specifically to recent statements by Fulbright about Roosevelt, and then the bitterness between Fulbright and Truman when Truman described Fulbright as an over educated idiot. So the Cabinet meeting ended on a fairly high note.

The President then called me over along with Bill Wirtz. The two of us had made a report to the Cabinet. He on the labor situation, and me on agriculture. Mine seemed to be well received. I outlined the economic background, the nature of our problem, how farm programs worked but specifically emphasized the bargaining power theme and its importance and its need. I emphasized also the rural urban balance question and the President reacted very favorably. He stated that I had done an outstanding job in trying to keep the farm prices up and that they had forced on me more than I should have had to take on, apparently referring to the inflation fight. He then asked Humphrey to head a task force to review what could be done by way of contracts in the rural areas so that we could try and stem the on-rush of people from rural America to the city ghettos. He described housing in his own area in Texas, and the tendency to locate various operations in the big cities instead of in the countryside, and indicated his wish that we see what might be done to stem that on-rush. He wasn't demanding about it. He said he recognized the problems, that people did go where other people were and where the public utilities, water, sewer, etc., were to be found but maybe the time had come to reverse it a bit and use some of the housing that is being abandoned. This was indeed most encouraging. He asked me to see if I might join Nick Katzenbach who was to brief the press on his



This visibly stimulated the President and made him feel much better. I was delighted that it worked out that way. He was calm, balanced and methodical throughout the Cabinet meeting, but the thought ran through my mind -- What a difficult time.

This morning when I rode down to work, a very rainy, humid day, reading the New York Times I really felt for the President. Everything seemed to be going wrong. We've lost a half a dozen planes in North Vietnam, several into China. The Chinese are attacking the Charge de Affaires and the residences of the British in Peking. Trouble continues in Hong Kong. There were reports from New Haven ~~of Haven~~ of more rioting and Negro difficulties last night.

John McCone just testified that the very stability and future of the United States was gravely threatened by the current racial problem with Negroes. King himself is talking a much stronger, meaner line and moving towards the Black Power concept. The National Student Association resolutely in favor of Black Power. Even Whitney Young and the more moderate Negro leaders are moving toward a black power, more militant point of view. The Congress at the same time is snapping back the other way. General Throckmorton was treated very rudely and brutally by Adair's Military Affairs Committee in the House when he challenged the performance of the Detroit National Guard and defended his orders that they unload their weapons because they were indiscriminately shooting up people. In other words, as one looks at it, it might seem that the world was about to come to an end.

Therefore, Nick's positive statement about our relative position in foreign affairs was a kind of breath of air. The President smiled, seemed visibly relaxed and brightened a bit, although he gave no evidence of being way down before, and then commented that he had had some people make some historical checks for him in other periods and it was true that very seldom does a President get along with the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee

at it all the time and that we would do everything that we could and that was it. I was instructed to prepare a memorandum for him reviewing the conversation and specifically evaluating the recommendations as made. I had had some hesitation about Staley seeing the President because he had acted so badly at the time of the withholding action and had made so many attacks on him, but I'm glad now that the meeting was held. I think it will do some good. Staley won't be quite as loud in his August meeting and it's good that we have established rapport with him once again.

August 23, 1967, 2000 p.m. I just returned from a Cabinet Meeting. It started slow but ended on an interesting note. The President had discussed at some length what we could do to try and contain and have better liaison with the Democratic Members of Congress. He pointed out how he gets each morning a statement which covers the Congressional Record and sets down who made unfriendly comments in Congress the day before. That statement is then circled and he has a chance to review it, he then goes back to that Congressman and tries to correct the situation if possible. He complained that how could we expect to carry forward when our own people in Congress were continually sniping at us. He particularly referred to Abe Ribicoff and his enormous demands for a multi-million dollar program for the cities. He also referred to Bobby Kennedy. He emphasized that these people are continually sniping, yet having been in the Cabinet they could come and find out what's wrong and try and do something about it quietly or perhaps they should have done something about it when they were Cabinet officers. He made the comment in closing that we need to do everything we can during these difficult times. We have to do it.

Nick Katzenbach stepped in and said, Mr. President, any where around the world any leader of any country who looked around for success would look to the United States in compared to what he is doing, whether it be military, whether it be treaties or whatever it might be in terms of recognition and power and leadership, the United States would be No. 1; that that's DeGaulle's big gripe. That there is no other nation really, except the U.S.

They made no bones about the fact that they were operating strongly politically. They didn't say in as many words but they meant they were selling Thousand Dollar President's Club Memberships up and down the Mississippi River States and planned to move into the Lake States. They needed something to improve the package they said and that should be a 50-cent increase in fluid milk prices. It was put so crudely that I resented it and felt the President did as well. Staley conducted himself I thought in a superior fashion. He told the President that he was a Democrat but he was a farm leader first. He related the grievances and the problems of agriculture, that everyone was leaving the farm, etc., prices and income were down, farmers were bitterly dissatisfied. He said quite frankly that that dissatisfaction dated from the President's statement on television that the wives should not buy meat or butter. He made it clear that the inflation fight had really hurt the President's image with the farmer. He then recommended an increase in the loan rate on feed grains and said somehow we had to get prices up. The President handled the session I thought extremely well. He talked a great deal about his own background in farming, about his father and about how they had lived and the difficult times they had had and the limited food and diet and that kind of thing with amusing anecdotes and teasing comments. He then said seriously that he knew these things were true, he didn't dispute that at all. He wanted to help agriculture very much but he didn't know how to do it. He said then that every man that ever sat in the President's chair wanted to do the right thing, the problem was how to do it. He didn't discuss the two proposals directly but rather referred them to me with his hard head Jones story, saying that I should take the ball. In the process he was very complimentary, said that he had been here in Washington for 35 years, had seen many Secretaries of Agriculture and that I was by all odds the best one, hard working, intelligent, dedicated to the farmer, working



Saturday, August 12, 11:45 am. I'm down here today assaulting a big stack of papers including all kinds of review material for next week's trip. I've got two big radio and television interviews, two press conferences, two major speeches, and then a "shirt sleeve" session in Utah with the Governor there and farm leaders.

Then we're going on a conservation tour, including a watershed and a primitive area. That ought to be interesting.

The pace of activity continues high here. The farmer bargaining power session on Thursday proved to be very useful. Nothing specific accomplished, but a general vote of approval that we move strongly in that direction.

It's another strong instance of our policy of cooperation and consultation. I followed it with a session conducted by Joe Barr from Treasury. Fred Deming also Treasury and Robinson of the Federal Reserve Board joined in outlining the fiscal situation and in seeking support for the President's Tax program.

Oren Staley was there. Out of it did come the Presidential invitation to see him which was stimulated by Mills. Apparently the President's reason for seeing Staley was mostly Mills' pushing. I was asked to attend and did. Dave Parr and Harold Nelson were there. First Parr and Nelson waded into the President with about as crude an approach as I have seen.

expressed his concern that prices would go much higher if supply got very low. He generally wandered around the subject but made a clear impression that he wanted to act. Ackley was unable to give very much, although he wasn't particularly very brittle. Hughes merely pointed out the budget problem. The President finally terminated the meeting. He and I and DeVier Pierson walked across the White House Rose Garden to some chairs that Bob McNamara was sitting in and sat down and played with his dog and kidded and joshed about as he does. When Pierson asked him what to do, he said to go back to Mills, to tell Mills we don't have the numbers right, that Freeman doesn't know what he's talking about and we've got to get these numbers ordered and agreed upon. He went on to say that even here the associated lost out in their current effort to increase prices, and then if we came in later on we wouldn't be hurt, as a matter of fact we would look better to the farmers. I didn't have a chance to tell him that we wouldn't to associated and to an organizational point of view we needed these people and we ought to do this in a fashion whereby they would go out and really cut the mustard politically. I'm afraid if we fritter around here we will get the worst of both worlds and farmers won't really realize what's been done for them. The organizations will be angry and that consumers will be unhappy and we won't have gained much. But that's the way it is. I just talked with Pierson. He had talked with Mills. Mills didn't know why the \$20 million figure he had sent to the President was not accurate, he thought it was. He didn't blame the President. If the costs were that high, he wasn't sure he would be for it either and now Pierson is evidently talking to Nelson. I'm not sure where it will all come out. The process seems to be one again where the President is trying to get unanimity, trying to get that broad concurrence and then hopefully Gardner will be happy and will reflect that in responding to the attacks that may take place from the consumer point of view because of this action.

I'm going to follow this one closely and see if it works as it is supposed to and try and make a judgment as to whether the Bureau and the Council will wind up happy because of the twisting and turning and monkey business than if a clear decision had been made.

The President teased me some about India. He did finally announce the million tons of wheat for India. He then pointed out that after having made the announcement to the press he walked over and looked at the teletype and there was an announcement that Mrs. Gandhi had sent a very cordial message to Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam on his birthday wishing him well and et cetera. He needled me about this no end, again laboring me as one of those do-gooders who want to give everything away to India. He then asked me how much we would have to give away in order to bolster up our wheat prices and I said I would like to give away at least another million and a half tons. He twitted me with having guessed wrong a year ago on the wheat acreage and I didn't disagree with him, but he was twitting everyone the same way -- Gardner Ackley for not being able to hold U.S. Steel in line, and so it went. Speaking very seriously he pointed out that the review of Congressional attitude and political evaluations was grim and almost disastrous. That without exception they report very, very low support. He referred to the 19 percent approval on the Wallace Poll, but most of his concern about the political situation seemed to be on other things and particularly on taxes. He said that Vietnam was undoubtedly the underlying cause, but any time you try and increase taxes you get in trouble. He referred to Rhodes in Ohio with a 68 percent approval until he tried a bond issue and got beat 3 to 1. He's conscious as a politician of what happens when you try and increase taxes. He went on to say that most of the Congressmen he had talked with expressed their sympathy and indicated that he thought he was right about the tax program but that they weren't about



to destroy themselves by supporting it or voting for it. Nonetheless he seemed to be in good spirits and fairly relaxed. He took the little dog that Luci apparently had gotten as a stray at a gas station, played with him and told the story of how he took the dog in bed this morning and actually got the dog growling at Mrs. Johnson until she fled to another bedroom and didn't return until 9:00 o'clock in the morning. In the meantime he was playing with the dog and showing complete self-possession and good spirits without great dejection. I shurely do admire him for it. At the moment he has more plans and things look grimer than can hardly be explained.

September 5, 1967 -- Today is Tuesday, the day after Labor Day. It seems like a Monday. One of those blue Mondays. Personnel problems, more dairy problems, confusion, et al. Mostly I'm concerned about personnel problems. Ken Birkhead who has been so important and so good, just isn't right. He burst out in a meeting today declaring that Rural Community Development Service was impossible, that we are going no where, that it can't be done. I bugged him on it, but he was defensive and determined. Later John Baker said he had even considered going to the Conference Committee and saying that that appropriation should be deleted. This isn't like Ken. That's disloyal and much more erratic than he normally has been. I simply must pull him off that assignment or he will poison the whole thing. Billy Matthews can carry on. John Baker understands thoroughly. John will check and see with Barbara Birkhead what can be done and how bad off Ken is. This is a shame. He is a top man and terribly important to me and this is a great loss. Equally complicated is the situation in International Agriculture. Eskildsen is now out at National Institute of Health. His leukemia is so-called smoldering in nature. Anything can happen. He may or may not return to work. That means no one to bridge the gap between Dorothy Jacobson and Les Brown. Les is arrogant and intolerant. Dorothy is petulant and defensive. Today I tried to

talk to her for I could see that they simply weren't communicating and she was highly defensive, contending that she had done everything and was getting along fine and it was up to Les who had made it clear that he would deal with her on some things and deal with me on others. They simply aren't communicating. Ray Ioanes more or less hangs in the wings. The top staff people don't know which way to move and I'm not sure what to do. Bill Abbott will be down there working with Les Brown. I guess the best thing I can do for the time being is to ride with it and hope that something shapes out. I was quite short with Dorothy today when she was simply non-cooperative. I just abruptly dismissed her. The President has asked for a review of countries to whom we might ship grain. Henry Wilson who talked with me a week ago Monday did go to the President and talk with him about boosting prices by use of our P.L. 480 authority. The President now sounds interested although he approaches in his usual bantering way of What are you going to give away next? He hinted today that he might make me the Food for Freedom man overnight. This might reflect some of Henry's suggestions which probably would be highly critical of State and AID. If the President would stay with it, why we could do things there, but he is off again on again, hot and cold, he resents giving it away and particularly to those people who aren't friendly enough. I'm afraid he doesn't have the real basic feeling of economic development. So it is a kind of a transitory business. Unfortunately so much is of that nature responding to his petulance and political forces. We had a conference today primarily about dairy. The 50 cents per hundred increase and the increase in price support we estimate will cost about \$150 million. That makes him shudder given the current situation with a tax bill pending and a big economy drive. Yet that is a projection with some uncertainty in it. The Associated Dairy people contend that although the action in question will cost more, that some

of our cost projections are high and the overall will not be more than we have projected for the fiscal year. Nobody can be sure. The President wants to play with Mills on it and so he left it today that I should call Mills and try to get Mills to come and see him, then he would do some wheeling and dealing. In the meantime we should watch to see what happens in the associated countries area where they have themselves increased the fluid milk price 50 cents. Early today they seemed to think that was holding. Later on when the President's position was more equivocal, they hit the panic button and were calling all over the place about it, contending it was slipping seriously and organizing an emergency meeting for Chicago tonight. No one can be sure. I called Mills. Mills didn't say yes or no, responding to my invitation on the suggestion that he go see the President rather ambivalently. He stated strongly that we couldn't afford to put the President in the position of increased cost given the overall tax budget situation. So the matter swings.

A good example of Bureaucratic confusion came up today, too. When I got to the office early this morning there was a call from Jim Jones, currently substituting for Marv Watson. I couldn't get him back, but the message was "Tell us what more can be done about forest fires." I talked to Ed Cliff and got a brief memo saying it was largely under control. There wasn't much that could be done. This didn't satisfy them. They sent it back. I called and asked what in the devil did they want. They said they had a memo from Interior saying lots of things that could be done. My response was that everything is being done. When I got over there finally I discovered what had happened. Apparently the President saw something on television about the fires and that not enough was being done to stop them. As a result he must have contacted Interior. Interior had sent in a memo listing all kinds of things which they



should know are already being done, recommending that Udall be assigned to provide leadership to coordinate all these various forces.

September 6, 1967 -- 10:30 pm -- I'm at the desk at home getting ready for another tour. I start early in the morning in South Carolina. I'm getting increasingly excited about the urban rural balance question. We had a meeting with the Vice President today pursuant to the President's directive that he head up a Task Force on the subject. He is very excited and enthusiastic. He describes it as not only a great national problem about which we must do something, but something new and fresh with appeal reaching many people, including those in big cities who still carry some rural pastoral nostalgia. Ken Birkhead was there. I moved swiftly this morning to ask him to leave the Rural Community Development Service operation and come back with me on a staff capacity. He said he would. I think he's a bit confused and shook up, but I must get him out of there where he has been progressively negative and seek to use his great talents and at the same time watch him because I'm afraid he is emotionally upset.

I'm also planning a press conference in Omaha on the grain situation. It's gotten more and more critical. Friday, Carl Albert, Senator Mike Monroney and Tom Steed were in the office. They had been worked over by the Oklahoma Wheat Growers. They asked for some statements and some action showing forward momentum and so we have conjured up a release outlining what we have done repeating the request that farmers hold not sell and calling for passage of the Purcell strategic reserve bill. This has been stalled because of the hassle about resale levels. I'm going to hint that the Republicans are stalling and then on Saturday in Minnesota I will name names if necessary and we'll try and smoke this one out. It's kind of a delicate operation because the tax situation and with increased expenditures create an almost impossible situation.

Mills is squeezing the President to match tax increases with budget dairy cuts. That's almost impossible. I'm afraid we've lost the proposed dairy price increase. A couple of weeks ago the President was prepared to move it. He wanted to do it. He had about sweet-talked Charley Schmitze and Gardner Ackley into going along. Then he suggested that we get Mills to come and see him, so he could do a little horse-trading. Mills didn't say it to me but he told George Mehren after my call that he wasn't about to go over and sit down with that man about the dairy thing which was really in the President's interest because he knew there would be some horse-trading involved. Mills tried to keep the numbers so confused that no one could say it involved any increased expenditure. When that wasn't possible, he was unwilling to get himself in the position of advocating it despite all the pressure he's put on over the years for dairy increases. The associated dairymen in the meantime have gone ahead and negotiated increases with their handlers and it appears that those increases are going to stick for the time being. I don't know where we go from here. The commodity situation is not very good. Prices are down on wheat, soybeans and feed grains. The organized farm groups are hollering. However, the farmers haven't been as vocal as they might be. Maybe I'll find otherwise on the trips this week. We did receive a check from the ~~Secret~~ Service that there was danger of some demonstrations around Dawson, Minnesota. We're going to travel from South Dakota straight West to Montevideo and then on into Waverly and Minneapolis. Dawson is an old farmer alliance non-partisan league area. Youngdahl, the former Communist party member who ran for Congress 20 years ago is still active and could very well be making trouble. We've called Staley and tried to get him to call off the dogs. We'll have to wait and see how it works out. It would be very embarrassing to have some demonstrations and of course if we have them, they'll get all the press.

Anyway it promises to be an interesting week and we've really had a hectic time trying to get ready for all this. I'm preparing a lot of material to go to the Press to make the urban rural balance point.

On Tuesday we have a meeting of the Humphrey Task Force on urban rural balance. Then I'm going to Minnesota and speak at a political rally and see Bill Thatcher on Sunday. I'm back here then for just a couple of days in meetings with the Industrial leaders on getting industry in rural America and then off on Friday again to Oregon for another tour. These tours take me out of the office just enough to pile up the work and the decision making so it seems almost impossible to keep up but on the other hand they are gratifying and I think very useful.

I went down today to speak a group of Minnesota DFLers here in Washington. Don Fraser's office had promoted the meeting to try and get them to join in the sustaining fund drive going on in Minnesota. It seemed strange to be in a DFL group and feel almost like a stranger. It made me realize how long I've been gone from Minnesota and how limited my ties are there now. It has been a long time. There were a lot of young people there. They listened, how enthusiastically I'm not sure. I talked a little history of the party, the sustaining fund, which goes back to my buck a month club in 1952, and then spoke very strongly about the Democratic record of accomplishment and that we ought to be out bragging, fighting and not be intimidated by the Republican demagoguery. This is sure true. At the moment at least, the Democrats are almost intimidated. It reminds me a good bit of the situation back in 1948 when Truman was at his very low point. The Vietnam war is a tough one and there really isn't too much we can do about it here. The arguments have been gone over so many times. The problem is that the press and television are



30 bad. I don't know why the media always accentuates the negative. We had a Cabinet meeting some weeks back. It was preceded by the report from the election observing team and they were impressed with what they saw and angry with the press reporting of it. One of them said, I don't know whether we can keep the Vietnamese honest, but maybe we can help keep our own press honest.

It's really been a working week end. Jane and I planned to go to Ocean City. Then we were called over to the White House at 6:00 o'clock on Friday to have a rundown of the trip with Mrs. LBJ. That took 2 1/2 hours. We hurried home, quickly packed and were just getting into the car when the phone rang. It was Jim Thornton alerting me that a hurricane was moving into Ocean City and they were evacuating people. So we unpacked and went out for dinner. I went into the office yesterday and have worked last night and a good bit of today, but I managed to get all the speeches and writing moving along for the next couple of weeks as well as get my paper work at least organized. So I feel reasonably accomplished.

I completed last week another round with the Japanese. They were here from Tuesday night through Friday noon. It was a rather boring session. There were no matters of real burning concern. The level of the Japanese Cabinet this time with the exception of Miki, the Foreign, was not up to what it had previously been.

I jammed in time in the morning and the late afternoon trying to keep things rolling in the office, but along with the absence on tours it was a rather frantic week trying to keep up.

We did have a lovely party at State Department.

September 17, 1967 - 10:30 pm at the desk at home. I'm afraid I've been neglecting my diary for the last couple of weeks. I've even forgotten exactly

where to pick up. Since the return from the Middle Fork Trip we've been running a hectic foot race. I've had two town and country tours now -- Texas and then South Carolina and Georgia. The local publicity has been excellent and the rural development theme is, I think, catching hold. This coming week the Vice President will hold a meeting of the task force the President has asked him to convene. We've sent him a lot of material and I hope we will gain forward momentum. There is an interesting juxtaposition here for great efforts are being made to do something about the big cities. We tend to get a bit overlooked on this.

The dairy thing continues to kick along. The President two weeks ago was ready to go along with the increases. He had me call Mills and ask Mills to come and talk with him about it. Mills refused. He told George Mehren he wasn't about to get in that office and get involved in horse-trading with the President. The President is now sweating out expenditure cuts because Mills is demanding that new taxes be matched with expenditure cuts, therefore he has regretfully said "no". He also is sitting on eight or 10 P.L. 480 wheat arrangements which he asked me to forward to him two weeks ago. He has them now. No action. The President is acutely conscious of the farm problem.

Connie's home. She arrived hale and hearty waving a diamond. She seems very well adjusted. Had a wonderful trip and everything seems to be a plus.

The Baldwins were over today, Sunday, for Brunch. Connie came in when she finished her duty at American University. We had a nice visit with her about Africa, Civil Rights, current disturbances around the country. She has grown to be a very knowledgeable and responsible young lady and seems to be in good order.

Reports from Mike at Rutgers are good. He's enjoying being proctor and seems to be getting along fine. When I hear some of the problems of others

with their children, for example, Dean Rusk with his daughter, I am indeed thankful that these two seem to be getting along in good shape.

This weekend Jane and I had planned to go to Ocean City. We haven't been at the beach all year, then on Friday we got a call to meet with Mrs. Johnson about the Crossroads America tour she's planning on which we are to accompany her. It's really been hectic to try and get this straightened out with Liz Carpenter. She is an exacting dynamo and it's been quite a battle to get her to put any real Rural America flavor in the tour. Distances are tough. It was necessary to visit the Humphreys at Waverly, Minnesota, and she's ruled a good big hunk of culture with plays along the way.

I told Dorothy that she'd better do some hard checking, that this looked to me like pretty sloppy stamp work. I'm worried about international agriculture. With Eskildsen sick and undoubtedly not very efficient when he returns and the feud between Les Brown and Dorothy really presents me with problems.

I hope my tour will be another successful one. It looks pretty good on paper. Off and at it early in the morning.

Another comment on the Cabinet meeting. The President went around the Cabinet table because we had a few moments before the allotted time ran out and asked each Cabinet officer to make a few comments. I concentrated mine on my current series of tours, pointing out that we were trying to reach small town USA. I related that tomorrow night I would meet with Agri-business leaders and try and tie our programs into the development of their communities and then move sharply into politics pointing out that without a Democratic Administration and President these programs would not move very far. The President interrupted me at that point and said that we had forfeited our popularity in agriculture, that in 1964 it had been at an all time high and



he had carried farm states such as Iowa and South Dakota and Nebraska, almost never carried by Democrats. This, he said, was lost in the fight in 1966 against inflation. We had to do this but in the process, he said, we engendered suspicion and hostility so that for the farmer the President is Public Enemy No. 1 and the Secretary of Agriculture is No. 2. No one said anything but the point was clearly made. It may well have related to the hassle going on now about the dairy price support increase. I, of course, was delighted to hear him say this. I've been trying to get this point across so that the current low state of popularity would not reflect on our programs, nor indeed on the Secretary of Agriculture. It would seem that the point has been made, and it is I think a fair one, and there would appear to be no resentment or hostility on his part, but quite the contrary. I was delighted.

This coming week promises to be a hectic one. I'm off early tomorrow morning for Omaha to speak to the National Association of County Agents and try to drive home to them their responsibility in community development. Extension is tough to work with. They figure they are an independent agency, but I think they are coming around and community development should be their forte.

September 18, 1967, at home at my desk 11:30 p.m. I had a rather interesting day today. I flew out of here this morning, reaching Omaha about noon. I spoke to the National Association of County Agents and had I think a pretty good reception. I challenged and tried to inspire them to really get aboard on Community Development and painted the picture of urban rural balance I think in pretty good focus. Anyway there seemed to be a warm response. Had an interesting luncheon visit with the Chancellor of the University of Nebraska Hardin. I asked him if he thought the young people of today were more of a problem than 15 years ago when he first became Chancellor. His response was an unequivocal "no". He stated they were smarter, better prepared, more active, and more activists. That we hadn't quite learned how to channel that

activism, but on balance they certainly were not any more of a problem; as a matter of fact there was less boozing and wild running around than there used to be.

I no more than reached Omaha than I had a call from DeVier Pierson in the White House. He informed me that the President had authorized negotiations to begin with the countries I listed about 2 weeks ago for P.L. 480 with the thought that we ought to announce such agreements in timely fashion to strengthen wheat prices. So after some hasty checking back in Washington I announced at a press conference promptly when the markets had closed that the President had authorized negotiations with a number of countries for amounts of wheat, feed grains, and oil that would run into hundreds of thousands of tons. I'm sure this will result in some speculation and have some market effect. How much is hard to tell. The traders have probably discounted most of these countries already knowing that they are on the list but the amount involved is close to a million tons, and ought to help a good deal.

I got back about 9:00 o'clock and have been hard at it every since running through the day's mail, reviewing material to use on the Lady Bird Tour and doing some dictating, trying to launch some ideas that came to mind today. It's about time now to make a break for the sack -- tomorrow is a busy day. I felt pretty peppy today. I really don't know why. I was very low last week but for some reason sharpened up over the week end. I saw Phil Duff, the editor of the Red Wing Republican, who 20 years ago for a while worked with me in the DFL State office. He was then playing at being a young Democrat, but he came from a wealthy Republican family, and I guess ended up being a mug-wump. He never could make up his mind. I was pleased though when he said that I gave the distinct impression in the Press Conference

and subsequently of being completely on top of my job, of enjoying it, and that I didn't even look tired. I hope I can convey that impression often and more effectively.

October 2, 1967 -- 6:20 am -- Portland, Oregon. It's early in the morning here in the home of Bob Dwyer. I've just completed another Rural Development Tour. This time in Washington and Oregon. I awakened a bit early for the three hour time difference gets the sleeping Department a bit mixed up. However, I was to bed in good time last night by 11:30 for I was completely exhausted and although I am not quite awake yet I think I'm going to feel much refreshed today.

Before I get into this tour, a comment is in order on the overall Rural Development build the countryside thesis. I really think it is beginning to catch hold and the more I check it out the more good sense it makes. Having made about five of these tours now and having seen so many things all over the country I am first and foremost enthused about the American people. There is so very much going on. So much outstanding local community leadership. So many people that want to do things and the right things and they are beginning to use our programs and tools that I can't but be enthusiastic. We have a basically well educated, well trained, well motivated people in this country. I am thoroughly convinced of it -- at least in the countryside and it's sure a source of reassurance given the garbage we read in the newspapers, and of course the problems that pour into us in Washington, to get out and see what takes place, how beautiful this land is, how determined the people are and how many good things they're doing. At the same time the need for a bit of motivation, a bit of assistance, a bit of resources is very strong indeed and so our programs are important and becoming more so and we've got to fight for them and improve them and to do the job better. The Technical Action Panels



are really beginning to take hold. I think my presence on these trips and my emphasis on them is very meaningful.

In this overall connection, several things are interesting. Last week before I left Washington two important events took place. First we had the Cabinet Committee Meeting -- the one chaired by Humphrey. Everyone was there -- Weaver, Boyd, Gardner, Trowbridge, Myself and Humphrey. In the course of matters Shriver and Udall came in. This confused matters a bit. I guess they came because they were a part of the City Task Force which I didn't serve on. That was a little clumsy because they, <sup>pretended</sup> ~~intended~~, particularly Shriver, not to know about the Symposium. Anyway the whole period was spent discussing the December Symposium. A question of definition, what we were trying to do came up again and again. Weaver was defensive as if this was an invasion of the Cities. He didn't like the word "balance" in the rural urban balance combination one bit. Boyd and Trowbridge weren't sure and <sup>why</sup> ~~they~~, they were. They weren't negative but neither were they positive. They really didn't seem to get exactly what I was driving at. Gardner was the source of strength. Again and again he made the point that the forces that occasioned our moving into big cities were no longer in existence and that we could and should direct ourselves to reversing this trend and building a different kind of America. Humphrey was great, too, and seemed to understand it. Actually we talked for better than an hour and a half and it was all mush. It did end, however, in a goahead on the Symposium only because it had already been announced clearly and they had all been committed which I had done at the time of the Boston speech on a personal basis. You sure couldn't get an agreement on the symposium out of those fellows today. It's lucky I did it the way I did. Also, although it wasn't crystal clear there was enough for me to go ahead now to organizing the Symposium so I went back and got hold of Paul Ylvisaker. He agreed to talk

~~James~~  
to ~~Harold~~ Conant and hopefully we can have lunch with him this week, Friday, that is Gardner and myself with Ylvisaker who thought that Conant would then get the spirit of this and be prepared to make the kind of presentation that we need. If he won't do it, I think it comes down to Gardner doing it himself or maybe Ylvisaker and then we can get on to the rest of the names.

Ken Birkhead will be working over the kind of program we want, based on the discussions that were held last week. However, it was rough going and I really felt kind of discouraged. I'm tired and was more so last week. For a while there I just wondered if it were possible. It's so hard for me to understand how people have difficulty getting this concept which seems to me so very simple indeed.

The next day which was then Thursday, we had scheduled a conference with Industrial leaders about locating in the countryside. I was tired and very unhappy when I went over there early in the morning to open the session. I had a prepared statement, but this was ~~an~~ around the table kind of thing and I didn't like to read it. The result was I kind of garbled it and did a rather lousy job. Then Wirtz and Trowbridge came over and they did worse. Wirtz got off the subject altogether and got to talking about the problems of the slums and educating people and getting them jobs and it was a kind of lot of mush and Bill Wirtz at his worse. A lot of emotion, philosophizing, negativism and pretty flat. Trowbridge did poorly too, and the fellow from Small Business, Rosenberg I think, was awful. He read in a dull monotone a lot of numbers about the number of Small Business loans. All in all I was discouraged, down, and tired when I had to leave myself at 10:30 to go to Clarence Eskildsen's funeral which was very, very sad indeed.

I returned to the office for a hurried lunch and got a report from John Baker that was wildly enthusiastic about the response and interest and eagerness

of the Industrial Leaders when the discussion started. I returned to the meeting myself about 2:00 o'clock and they went on until 5:20 and I could hardly shut them off. It was great. In the first place it was clear that they completely agreed with the concept of locating in the countryside; as Donald Douglas of Douglas Aircraft put it, you can't afford to build in the city with land costing \$100,000 an acre and a 2 percent turnover of personnel. Gerald Phillippe of General Electric agreed. There was no argument about that. I found the man Frank Threatt of the Congaree Iron and Steel in Columbia, South Carolina, the man with 375 negroes out of 400 employees was simply great. He had them sitting on the edge of their chairs when he got into discussion with Don Douglas about training men and pointed out that you started with Negroes in South Carolina by teaching them how to flush the toilet. It went all around the room and the question was how and the interesting thing was that their main concern was not should they locate in the countryside but was the countryside ready for them. They pointed out they wanted to pay higher wages, they needed community facilities, the problem was the community and what it was prepared to do and how it would accept them. There was even a love feast between Andy Biemiller and Frank Fernbach from the Steel Workers for there was no question of wages or exploiting cheap labor or union busting at this meeting at all. It concluded with a tour on the Honey Fitz on the Potomac which everybody thoroughly enjoyed and man after man came to me telling me how wonderful the conference was, how important what I was doing in this area was, and that they would be writing me later about it. That was sure a plus.

Friday early I was off on this tour after spending a desperate Thursday trying to get things caught up and lined up and the paper moving off my desk. My big concern now is personnel. Eskie is gone and I must do something about



a Deputy Assistant Secretary in International Agriculture. The unpleasantness between Dorothy and Les surely continues. We don't have a Sales Manager there either. I directed Dorothy, Joe Robertson, Tom and John Schnittker to really dig into that one and I hope they have something for me when I return to the office tomorrow morning.

With the Si Smith problem and his soon leaving, I must get a C&MS Administrator, too. It would appear Rod is doing rather well on that one.

Ken Birkhead worries me terribly. He's been on a negative personally depressed jag for a long time now and I am afraid his effectiveness has become almost zero. He keeps talking about how he is no good, how he can't do anything, that he is looking for another job, and I've been more than patient with him. I pulled him off of our RC&D some time ago and have him as a special staff man on our Symposium now, but still he cries and runs around with a long face and seems very, very worried and keeps running himself down. I'm just about out of patience. It's a shame, because Ken was great. I wish we could get him back in shape somehow and I must try.

The big problem I have been facing the last three weeks is cotton and more specifically, the skip-row. We've got to have more cotton. We need quality cotton, but we mustn't add too much cotton. The same old story. We've held here a series regarding hearings and everyone wants the current program including a return to the 1965 skip-row rules. That's impossible for it would mean too much cotton and too much cost. The program will cost almost \$1 billion anyway. Far too much -- and I shudder to think of the reaction of the President and the Council and the Bureau on that one. Horace Godfrey tells me that skip-row is not that politically important, many important sources no longer really support it, and we should go on without it. John Schnittker agrees. I'm afraid they are not very politically realistic. Every single one of the sessions resulted in a strong demand for skip-row

by the farmers, and I can't but believe that it is politically important, and needing more cotton it seems to me we should get it through skip-row in part and juggle our mandatory and voluntary diversions accordingly. What I think I'll do is return and have called in the key cotton leaders and spokesmen and discuss with them skip-row again and make it clear that if we act favorably this year that doesn't mean it is permanent for next and they should so understand and then go ahead with it provided I can get clearance from the Bureau and the Council and the President. That should have gone before them over the weekend while I was gone. Hopefully it will have moved along far enough so I can call this meeting, make these decisions and get it done. We also had the Feed Grain Advisory Committee in last week and that went rather well. They turned out quite reasonable, recommended a return to the '66 program. We had a lunch in which Poage, Belcher, Ellender and Young showed up and Ellender made a very good presentation to them which was firm but not unpleasant about the cost of the program and did a lot of good. I think that one worked out all right, and I felt fairly good about it until I called Tony Dechant of the Farmers Union getting him out of an Executive Board Meeting. This was John Baker's idea because he had heard we were being strongly criticized and thought it would build up Tony's hand. He opened his conversation by criticizing me because of a story in the newspaper to the effect that I had said farm income was up -- this was at a fund raising event held by the Democratic National Committee. I explained to him the location and purpose and we went on from there with a rather unpleasant discussion with his complaining again about farm income, prices, how tough it was in the countryside and all the rest. It ended I think on a fair note. I urged him to go back to the Board and tell them I had called to ask their advice on the feed grain program and that I also wanted their further counsel on cotton and a strong drive by them to get the Purcell bill passed. That was discouraging but again dramatized the problem of farm income

( and the commodities. It goes back to the Lady Bird Tour and my encounter with Joe Johnson, the young farmer in Wisconsin. He's the one that had borrowed repeatedly from FHA, had since 1960 increased his net worth \$20,000 and his income about \$4,000 and was moving forward but yet complaining -- not bitterly, but strongly about milk prices and identified himself as an NFO milk dumper. The press loved it. They called me into the act, and I could do nothing but agree. They then asked him if he wanted to leave farming and he said oh by no means, he hoped to buy another farm and increase his size and efficiency. How typical. I've run into that kind of on this tour too. It is really hard to know what the situation is. Adjustments mean great hardship -- there's no doubt about that. However, farmers do end up, provided they own their land, with a real strong equity. Out here in Western Oregon it runs to hundreds of thousands of dollars for relatively small cattle spreads because of the high price of land and the fact it is constantly bid up. Joe Johnson in Wisconsin has a net worth, as Jim Thornton put it double his, and they are the same age yet Jim has a definitely better education and of course on the surface would appear to earn a great deal more money which he does. Jim's in the \$20,000 class. He lives better, but certainly works equally hard. Farmers continue to complain bitterly; cost-price squeeze, low income, and of course with the low grain prices this year they have a lot to scream about. Yet, I think our numbers are probably right. Most farmers are still not ready to use credit as they should and continue with a considerable reflection on them instead of like business, something they use if they can make money on it. Most farmers ignore entirely the increase in their net worth because of land values. The larger ones, \$10,000 a year, if they are reasonable operators I think are doing reasonably well; but my how bitterly they complain. It's clear that's not getting any better and it presents a grave political problem



both in maintaining my own position and of course looking to next fall. But there it is. I tread a very narrow line between trying to do the right thing recognizing their relative position and yet feeling deep sympathy for those that are cut up in the transition period and are really hurting and bleeding and at the same time educating them and the public as to what the real conditions are, sorting out the difference between farm commodity programs and poverty programs for those that are too small and inferior and trying to do something about that and at the same time carrying forward the drive to build the rural countryside and contribute to the solution of the big cities. It's not an easy trail to walk and I'm not sure I do it too well, although I seem to be alive politically and I must say I think the Rural Development thing is beginning to roll and be helpful politically. It's been kind of murderous taking all these tours and keeping up work in Washington, but with the Northeast one later this month we will have completed the cycle and hopefully it has paid off politically although I am concerned that we haven't gotten anything very tangible to sink our teeth in, in connection with direct political follow-up. But I guess it is not quite time to do that nor is the climate right for this is a grim and unpopular time for the President too. The Vietnam war grows worse and worse. Nonetheless I have a feeling that his really great abilities and determination and courage and toughness is beginning to come through, and when people compare him with the Republican potentials that are kicking around he comes off pretty well. I sensed that yesterday in this long session with the lumbermen up in the woods when at the conclusion of the meeting Mort Doyle their Executive Secretary asked me what about politics, and I took advantage and said very sharply and strongly that I thought the Democrats and Johnson would win strongly simply because he was a strong, tough, determined, able man who would run anyone of their businesses and do it better than they could and watch a penny more carefully than they do and that there was no

Republican that could really stack up to him, that at this key time in our history we needed that kind of leadership and I believed the American people would recognize it and that they would act accordingly, vote accordingly, and the result would be another Democratic Administration. I was surprised that most of them there did not seem to resent it and it might have done a little good. This had followed a 2-hour session in which we had reviewed the problem of the lumbering industry in great detail with considerable emphasis on the Japanese log export problem, the seriousness of which I had not really understood until my trip here but more about that in a moment. It's now 10 minutes till 7:00 and I better get dressed and packed and ready to leave here. I hope I can complete at least this tape before I get on the plane.

I will relate on another tape the details of my tour here in Washington and Oregon. The one thing I did learn and it demonstrates again how important it is to get out in the field is how critically important the Japanese export log problem is. I've been a bit ambivalent about it before, but it seems very clear to me now that the 10 to 15 percent Jap log export, that demand working on a short supply situation where almost a thousand small loggers are fighting for enough material to stay alive in the national forests bids up the price arbitrarily. This is especially so when the Japanese have unlimited resources bidding for logs that they will then sell for finished products in a sharply inflated market; they can afford to bid high because they are going through rapid price rise and they get it back in the end product. Our people here don't have that opportunity and hence it is most unfair competition. I advised them here quite frankly that they better get their Congressmen to get a bill in Congress like the dairy and meat people do on imports with a of its passage so if we can convince State and the White House of the merits of their case it will be possible to act internationally.

*Ruby - Put this in  
my diary please -  
BJ*

This folder is an excellent example with specific program examples of the real budget process and decision making --

1. President and Congress mandated cut in fiscal 1968 budget directed in mid-year.
2. Application of FPB priority system (Congressional involvement makes cuts regardless of political pressure easier than in 1965 -- so far at least 2/25/68)
3. 1968 cuts carried over into 1969 budget decision --
  - A. Appeals to Bureau of the Budget
  - B. Appeals to President.
  - C. Memos to White House, i.e. Califano, so our priorities would be adequately considered in the legislative program (task forces, message preparation and necessarily various adjustments in administrative relations and prerogatives between Department -- rural urban balance, small farm, bargaining power battles took place here.)

Actually the whole system is remarkably orderly and well paced although infinitely complex and frustrating and involved as it takes place.

Orville L. Freeman  
2/25/68



February 29, 1968 -- 7:40 pm at the office. I'm waiting here for Jane to come. I just finished changing clothes into the Tux for a White House dinner for the Governors. It's a rainy miserable night. I slipped over at 6:00 o'clock to play squash, this time with Jim Reynolds, and was delighted that I was able to do so despite the knee I twisted skiing in Vermont last week. It's my first game in almost 10 days, but I felt good, played hard, and then delighted to be back at it. I was also delighted that when I weighed in I was exactly 178 1/2 -- that's about 10 pounds less than a couple of months back. I carved off 10 pounds during January and early February and now it seems to have stabilized. I haven't been working at it very much the last two weeks and yet I haven't gone up. If I can hold it here, I'll be in pretty good shape.

This has been an interesting day and a busy one. We opened this morning at the White House where all the Governors assembled. The President came in and opened the meeting. He did a very effective job. The Governors asked particularly about law enforcement and crime and violence. Instead of demagoging this subject which he could have done, he went on to talk about health and jobs and Civil Rights and all the things that the people want, making the point that that's the way to prevent violence, to give people hope. He didn't spend too much time on Vietnam, but made a very simple, very direct, almost emotional appeal saying he was doing everything he could for peace but Ho Chi Minh didn't want peace. That he had responded with the TET offensive to great efforts on our part. He recounted the record to them, teased them about their own problems, cited Eisenhower that partisanship stops at the water's edge. It was really a very effective, direct, sincere presentation. He might have over done it just a little bit in terms of recounting the record of the Administration. That's hard to tell, but it was a thoroughly professional performance.

March 1, 1968 -- 6:30 am. I'm sitting in the parlor here at home. I just crept downstairs. We got in late from a party at the White House for the

Governors that was really a lot of fun. It started snowing and it's a mighty white world out here. The wind is blowing sharply and this house which is not too well constructed is leaking cold air all over. I'm kind of bleary eyed with a short night's sleep. They've been short for quite a while now. I must get busy on two speeches I've got for next Monday and Tuesday so they can get reproduced. I'm having trouble getting exactly what I want, particularly for the Minnesota Farmers Union Exchange next Monday night in St. Paul. I was saying that yesterday was a very interesting day. From the Governors Conference opening I went back to the office to work on a host of internal things, including some speeches and then at noon went over to have lunch with representatives from Canada, Argentina and Australia. They came in to review the International wheat agreements. We're worried about that. The trade here is violently opposing it and we must get Senate confirmation. Then, too, wheat prices are soft around the world and a number of these countries have been doing forward selling below the minimum which takes effect next July. We're being criticized for not doing likewise. The question is -- what can we do to work the price up and hold it given the supplies of wheat in the world today, it looks very difficult. Anyway I went over for lunch. We socialized a bit, had a brief summary and then I returned to the office for another series.

It was kind of sad last night, Bob McNamara being gone. I played squash with Jim Reynolds who is a delightful guy, but it isn't quite the same as Bob McNamara. I'm delighted that he got such a warm sendoff from everyone -- he's certainly earned it. I woke up this morning thinking about him. It must feel good to be gone on a month's vacation.

March 1, 1968 -- 1:35 pm. I just returned to the office from lunch at Interior with Udall. We're on speaking terms but not too close, although it's warming up a bit. He was miserable about Mineral King. Then he came and begged

for help in some land exchanges in Arizona to help him on his water problems. I told John Baker to go ahead and we maneuvered some land around with Interior and Forest Service holdings and he got about what he wants and now Congressm an Saylor is raising Ned. Anyway this occasion was a luncheon to review some foods that had fish protein concentrate in it. It was interesting and the foods were really very good. A Mexican menu and an American menu, including tomato soup, beef stragnoff, apple crisp and sponge cake. The real promoter of this was a company called International Flavors and Fragrance with a very aggressive President by the name of Henry Walter. I had Aaron Altschul along with me and when Walter got to be making some pretty extreme statements, Aaron checked him. The long and short of it is that fish concentrate, fish powder is coming into its own now after a long and difficult struggle with the Federal Food and Drug Commission that labeled it as adulterated for a long time. They are struggling to get subsidies to try and bring down their cost of production. They are working it into various foods, tailoring them to the eating habits of the people in question much the same as our program of getting American companies to develop special foods for special places. I'm kind of glad I went because it brings this whole question into a little balance. It's fundamentally a question of economics -- what kind of food with adequate protein make-up can be prepared at various places consistent with what people will eat and at the lowest cost. It is just that simple and there really ought not be too much competition about it although currently there is. Withess Julia Hansen, who's on the Interior Committee, a Democrat and a very crusty old gal really took out after me because Neal Smith keeps spiking anything to do with fish concentrate. Anyhow, I got a better perspective at the lunch. I also felt rather good at Aaron's participation and got a bit of personal satisfaction out of the fact that I pulled him out of the laboratory three years ago down in New Orleans, brought him up



here to work on nutrition and proteins and he's now sending me a report which details how much has been accomplished. Aaron Berg was here from India the other day and spoke to staff. Again he detailed how much had been accomplished. It surely isn't Orville Freeman that's done it, but I suspect it would have gone much slower if I hadn't brought Aaron in and that makes me feel like it's been worthwhile.

Had a press conference this morning to announce the Tokyo Trade Promotion trip. It was carefully prepared with strong emphasis on the ladies side of it, pointing out what they would do in reaching the Japanese housewife and consumer directly. This to try and counteract the attacks on us already on a number of radio and television programs around the country, the front page editorial and cartoon in the Chicago Tribune, and of course Senator John Williams. It seemed to go well. Last night at the White House we talked to a number of the Governors that are going and they were all excited, particularly their wives. Actually we wouldn't get many Governors without their wives. It's interesting how ideas and things develop in the nature of the political process and perhaps competition. In this instance I wanted to have the wives along simply because there was no reason they shouldn't come and it would be nice for them and for their husbands. I recognized that many of the Governors might not come otherwise and this would help get them aboard. Then the criticism came and then we began to think how we could answer it and then it developed very naturally that the best way would be to involve the wives deeply with a program of their own, using their special skills which is to reach the Japanese housewives. So now, Jane this afternoon is meeting with the Governors' wives who are going to review with them precisely what they can do and our own planning people are prepared to schedule them carefully and to use them effectively which they hadn't even thought about before.

Also this morning I participated in the swearing-in ceremony for Clark Clifford. The President looked good and did a fine humorous job in presenting him -- later in the receiving line he commented about a letter I sent him commending him on yesterday's performance to the Governors. I thought Clark Clifford did very well in his remarks. He didn't have a piece of paper. You couldn't tell whether he had memorized what he said, although I suspect he had and then had adjusted it. He gives a very good appearance of balance, of detachment, a kind of judicial presence as it were, and he very carefully touched bases all the way up and down the line with everyone there with the ironic and humorous comment about the cooperation of the Committees which he hoped for as long as it lasts, and something similar where the press is concerned. I'll be interested in seeing how he does. Frankly, I haven't been too much impressed by him since President Kennedy sent me to see him during the transition period back in 1960. Tom and I went into his very imposing office, simple but expensively luxurious with an air of somberness and super-culture, and low pressure. He didn't seem to know what he was doing or have many thoughts or interests, even in the technical facets of the change-over. But he might have been involved in other things and indifferent about agriculture. He's always been most cordial and friendly and he must have some chips if Truman, and Kennedy, and now Johnson used him as heavily as they have and if he was able to build a law practice here which is most consulting with people, and I gather very seldom in court at all which makes him a pretty high priced influence peddler but in a fashion that has never gotten him any criticism at all; quite the contrary the President spoke about the Government as his client now, acknowledging that he had many clients and was an influential lawyer. So it will be interesting to come to know him better and to see how he does at this very tough job. Again the accolades were running strong to Bob McNamara which I'm

delighted to see. He's gone now. I awakened this morning thinking about him. Clark Clifford made commendatory remarks about him and the press has been full of them. It's an ironic and interesting, and in a way delightful, series of events that the elevator should stop between floors in the Pentagon with the President aboard, the loud speaker go dead and the weather come down so the Jet fly-over was prevented. All of which focused some more attention on the great event of Bob McNamara bowing out. Anyway he now will have a month of richly deserved time away. I'll bet you in 10 days he'll be chaffin at the bit for action.

Just had two interesting meetings that I want to flag here. We had a meeting on administrative relationships which involve revising the memo of staff and line relationships throughout the Department, combining that with a Secretary's memo on the Task Forces. There were very minor changes made and seemingly an understanding of what we have tried to do here to clear up staff, line and operation responsibility, but at the same time to accomplish overall planning coordination to leap over agency lines and fix our targets on our goals, to wit, the Six Task Forces. I think now that we are administratively so arranged so people will know where they are and what they're doing for the year ahead if I'm gone a good bit. I suggested to some of the staff people that this whole experience and the way this thing has grown like Topsy from the initial desire on my part to improve our public relations and information, hence the Task Forces, then the Agriculture/2000 speeches and the pamphlet, then recognizing the Task Forces could and should do more by way of coordination and long range planning, and finally the current package today where hopefully we can coordinate, we can plan, we can communicate, within the Department, we can then have good public relations and information all without getting in cross purposes operationally. So often these things do grow like Topsy on a trial and error basis and I'm rather pleased with this one. We'll have to see how it works out.



The other meeting I'm not so pleased with. Dorothy Jacobson came in to talk with me about her going to Rome for three weeks again for a meeting on the World Food Program and also the FAO organizational committee. I told her we ought to take a real hard line about FAO now. I'm angry with Boerma and his refusal to consider an American as the head of the World Food Program when we put in most of the grain. Every evidence that he's just playing politics and paying campaign debts and no reason to believe he has the strength or firmness to run FAO which is tough to do with a multi-national group on a one-vote one-country basis. Therefore, I'm of a mind to discontinue active participation, to downgrade it to about third ranking representation and to move our resources and our attention into other things, such as the World Bank. With Bob McNamara there we will have strong leadership and in any event that organization can move in a way FAO can't.

Saturday - March 2, 1968 -- 11:15 at home. I'm sitting here in the kitchen looking out over the back yard. We so enjoy this little breakfast nook that Jane has fixed up with flowers on the windowsills and red and white candy cane striped curtains and a few bright pictures on the walls. We can look out over the backyard and down into Rock Creek Park. It's a brown, white and green picture today. Friday night it snowed. When we came from the White House at 12:15 am it was lovely. I didn't have time to enjoy it yesterday -- what with the hectic day in the office and now a good bit of it's gone. Nonetheless I can see the birds, now and then a Cardinal. Our little bird feeder which hangs on the light lamp is swinging in the wind. The birds have been eating a full quota each day. The squirrels run over the trees and it's just nice. It makes me feel for people who live in an apartment case or worse, the slums somewhere. We slept late this morning after working before the fire last evening until almost 2:00 -- then breakfast, and Jane's off to shop with

Connie. They're getting ready for the big wedding and have already bought a wedding gown and today they go to the Church. I'm going to do paper work and dictate here instead of going down to my office which is kind of dark and dreary, and then I want to try and get 1967 slides arranged and in boxes. I wonder if I'll ever use all those slides. We've spent a lot of money and a lot of time on them. We're so busy and increasingly as I get older I become less interested in taking a look at what happened yesterday and more in thinking about tomorrow. I hope that's the way to stay young. It seems that way to me.

One thing yet, a carryover from last week -- when we left the White House Thursday night it was after 12:00 o'clock for the program with the Governors ran late because the President had a picture taken with each one. They'll get a beautifully framed colored picture now. We have two of them, and we treasure them. In any event, Jane was very tired and we were slipping down the steps to the cloak room and out the South Entrance. The President was standing near the East door seeing the Governors out. As we got to the entrance to the stairway, almost 50 feet away, I heard him holler and we both of course went back. He was smiling and jovial and again thanked me for the Farm Message, the comments of the Governors have been good and he's pleased about it. Jane then commented that all the ladies had appreciated his coming in at lunch and speaking to them, that no matter how busy he was. He laughed and said that he enjoyed having them all in the White House, that he had made apparently a room or telephone available to Happy Rockefeller and then he laughed and said when he came in to check if she was getting her calls through all right why he found her measuring the drapes. He was laughing of course, but it was a clever remark in light of the Romney withdrawal last week and the whole new dimension to Republican politics. Rockefeller this morning is in the paper as the willing candidate. He declares he will not go into the Primaries because he doesn't want to create dissension in the Republican Party. Nixon responds by quoting

( Jack Kennedy in 1960 that the time is passed when candidates can duck primaries and expect to be nominated by the king makers in smoke filled rooms. Reagan fires a shot from California, and charges Rockefeller with promoting factionalism in the Republican party by his appeal in effect to the Governors. So the issue becomes joined. It will be a hot year in the Republican party. I am reminded of a conversation at the Ranch last week and the President talking about the Rockefeller brothers. He said that their father can sure be pleased and happy that he has raised such fine public spirited sons. He spoke most highly of Laurance, as I did. Laurance Rockefeller is the most genuinely modest man I know. John, Jr. seems the same. The President even spoke in a friendly fashion about Nelson Rockefeller, saying that they had gotten along very well, that he certainly wasn't any Republican in the ordinary sense of the word and quoted Mary Lasker as saying (and she's very close to Nelson Rockefeller) that he hoped she would not be forced to ever vote against Nelson Rockefeller. It's hard to tell what will come of all this. Two years ago Rockefeller was as dead as a door nail and allegedly anyone could have beaten him in New York politics. Then the Democrats dropped the ball -- he put on an effective well financed campaign and worked like a dog, made it, and has gone on from there very cleverly. I thought he made a serious mistake on the garbage strike in New York City, but that seems to have quieted down and may not be so serious after all. Although it may have scared some conservative Republican king makers. Anyway, it will be quite a political year. The President is off again today. He's been in Beaumont, Texas speaking to the space people, now he is somewhere in South Carolina. He's determined, he seems to hold up well and is certainly resourceful. If we can get over this election he'll continue to lead this country to greater progress on all fronts, but for the moment it really is grim. Increasingly it looks like a set back in Vietnam. On the TET offensive it was serious, we appear to have lost the offensive almost completely. We may have too many troops



immobilized at Khe Sang. The countryside, large parts of it, remain in the hands of the enemy and psychologically it appears from this vantage point at least that great harm has been suffered. But it's hard to tell. I still don't know whether I should go to Vietnam next week or not. Dean Rusk thought not when I talked to him at the Swearing-in Ceremony for Clark Clifford. Then after initially saying things were in kind of a mess there he backed off and said, "Well, maybe for morale factors it would be a good idea for you to go." And promised to get together his Vietnam advisers and give me an answer. Supposedly Bill Lenhardt is checking with Bob Komer and with AID and State people. It could be that a Cabinet Officer in Vietnam would give them a lift and get our boys back on target and give me a positive platform to speak from about Vietnam, as I step up this speaking schedule. I'll have to try and get a firm answer very soon.

I just read an article in the New York Times for February 16, 1968 on Ken Galbraith sent to me by DeVier Pierson with the heading "In View of your Mandate to do Battle with the Black Knight". I'm reminded that last week in Texas the President fussed greatly at an alleged statement by Ken that liberalism stopped with Kennedy and did in effect tell me to go after him and set the record straight. He then rambled on at great length the record of solid progress in this Administration on a host of fronts. Actually Galbraith's article does not seem critical of the President. It actually says that he likes Johnson and thinks him a doer. I rather suspect that although Galbraith feels strongly about Vietnam that he may be at the right time a bridge to the liberal forces in the days ahead. For example, this article quotes him in several places as follows:

"ADA's choice may be between a Democratic Administration which we have ever less reason to support and a Republican prospect that is in every respect, worse."

and then he went on to say that if the Democrats seem to be lacking in

credibility, the Republicans produce a man you can really mistrust -- Richard Nixon.

Sunday, March 3, 1968 -- 6:15 pm. It's been a nice weekend. Yesterday afternoon I concluded my desk chores, working about an hour on the slides when Jane and Connie came home and it was a delight to receive them. They'd been wedding shopping -- bought a wedding gown, chose the dresses for the bridesmaids' and picked out some kitchen ware. I've never seen Connie quite as glowing and bouncy. She was a mighty happy little girl and looked fine. She's lost a good bit of weight. Her morale is good and she really seemed as happy as she could be with prospects down the road that she will graduate cum laude. She was delighted that American University had voted to give me an honorary degree when I speak at her commencement, so we had a visit, a dinner at home and then off to see the play at the New Ford Theater "A Comedy of Errors". Frankly I got lost in the first act, although I enjoyed the second. There's something wrong with my ears, I just don't pick up words that are not customary. In this instance the Elizabethian english left me cold and I couldn't hardly follow the dialogue. I didn't remember the story very well and it wasn't until the second act that I got with it. In between acts the management came and took us to meet the actors back stage which was fun. Afterwards we went down to see the Lincoln Exhibits which I hadn't seen before. Then we went on to Blackbeard's for an evening nightcap with young Don McIver whom we met there, a nephew of Dale McIver. He was on leave from Fort Bragg and was obviously all alone because his buddies hadn't come, so we kind of took him in tow.

Today we slept late, read the papers -- they're all full of the President's Urban Commission report which came out last week and so is the Television. I think the report is undoubtedly a very good thing. It will give some recognition and assurance to the Negro community. It ought to help pass the current Civil Rights Housing Bill and it will remind very strongly and prestigously the white

complacent community that there is a serious problem. It's main thrust and message that were moving to an entirely different communities, one white and one black, comes through loud and clear and anyone in the country is going to have trouble avoiding hearing it. In terms of the action program to follow, that's another story. I was irritated when Bob Kennedy came on and said, "We knew all these things a year ago - we had the riots a year ago - and things are worse now - we've done nothing." It was much better put by Ray Sherer on NBC the White House correspondent who listed the things, such as education, housing, Civil Rights, that the President had recommended and so far had been unable to get from Congress by way of appropriations, making the point that this was a Congress more inclined to save than to spend. The only danger in the report is that it will once again incite some expectations that can't be met. So many things are happening, maybe only in little bits and pieces, but the framework has been put in place and these great inadequacies and needs are not better satisfied overnight. The real danger now is that we will get overwhelmed and discouraged with the demands and engulfed by the expectations and this is what we've got to fight to prevent.

We then went out to Olney House for dinner. It was a birthday party for Jane Wirtz - the Carl McGowans went, too -- they came here first for a drink and it was really fun. The conversation was a good bit about Illinois politics and very worrisome because the ticket the Cook County Organization has put forward for Governor and Senator is very, very weak. The Cook County group turned their back on Adlai Stevenson, III, and also Sargent Shriver who would have made a very strong team. I can't figure out why and they didn't know either. It would seem to me the President would have been in this one up to his ears and working with Dick Daley would have been certain that there was a strong team field in Illinois which is a big and important State. Instead it looks like the very lowest level of provincial politics prevailed and a



weak ticket in Illinois can't help but hurt the National Ticket. I wonder what happened.

March 5, 1968 -- 10:00 p.m. at home. Well the week of March 3 is off with a bang. I just returned from a hectic 2-day trip. I had a busy day in the office on Monday, including breakfast with Whitten, designed to set him up a bit for this week's appropriations hearings. He was quite amiable. He's still ducking the Japanese trip, but his wife wants to go and he may well come for that reason. I had a television program and then Bobby Kennedy, John Cooper and Carl Perkins of Kentucky came in to bug me about food programs. Cooper and Perkins were reasonable -- Bobby was totally unreasonable. In the first place, he won't listen to anyone. He merely states, demands in a very pugnacious sort of ornery manner, in effect says there are a lot of hungry people in the United States, he saw some that had only 10 cents a meal for food -- what are we doing about it? He then wants to run over the law, the regulations and requirements, and just bores in, stalling the ultimate and refusing to acknowledge or even to cooperate on eliminating some of the difficulties. At one point in the discussion I had to in effect say, well now just a minute, let me finish and you listen for a little bit. I don't know whether he strongly resented that or not. The meeting seemed to end on a reasonable conciliatory tone, but I was fairly sharp spoken. He did make a good point and brought something to my attention I hadn't completely realized and that is in some of these instances we are not giving very much by way of Food Stamps. We're requiring people to put in as much money as the schedule would show that the average person would be spending for food. Then we make an allowance, but that allowance is not very generous. The argument our administrators made was that if we put too much food in, jump from let's say a \$50.00 a month usual expenditure to \$200, that people simply won't spend that for stamps -- they don't really know how to use it and that it will end up in the black market with all kinds of administrative problems. Bobby jumped on that

with both feet with complete contempt ridiculing the concept that we are so timid and so conservative that we don't give people enough to eat well on the grounds they won't know how to use it with all the usual emotional arguments.

It finally settled down, but there was something in what he said and I think maybe we've been a bit too conservative in this respect, but many of the people administering the program went through the fiasco of the forties and of course we have tried to administer this program carefully so we would not have an administrative breakdown. We're having enough trouble getting money from Congress the way it is. This then makes a good example of how you have a confrontation. Anyway I told our people that we should take a look now and see if we could move those amounts up even at the risk of some leakage -- then asked them for a report on if we used additional money for that how much it would detract from our opening food stamp programs in other places because we're getting near the end of our resources. I also asked them to tell me how we might supplement it some places with direct distribution, despite the law which says there can't be two programs at the same time in the absence of a national emergency. They ridicule this one too and say where anyone is hungry we ought to just declare an emergency. Sounds good, but it's not very practical.

These food programs continue to give me a great deal of trouble. On the one hand we've really worked wonders. We're reaching about 800,000 more people than we were a year ago, but there's still a lot of hungry people out there and they're making more and more demands. I suspect we're going to bleed on this one for a long time to come and I'm not sure really how to play it.

I saw an educational TV program on Monday which is really atrocious. They got me to make some film, then they used some of the things I said out of context -- in effect, painted a picture that the Department are a bunch of ogres, picture of people leaving the Department getting on buses with the point that here we've got

all these fat, well fed, well paid bureaucrats while you've got all these poor hungry Negroes in the South and it makes quite a story. I'm figuring out really how to protest it because it's not a fair balance picture and I think it will do the program in the long run more harm than good. There's an emotional quality here which puts the people who merely scream and point their finger on the offensive and those of us who've got the responsibility to administer these programs on the defensive, no matter how much we've done nor how hard we try. It's the same old story, it's a lot easier to make a speech about something than it is to do it and administer it and be responsible for it, particularly before Congress with highly critical members and the need to justify everything you do and to get appropriations to try and do more.

Now we have a lawsuit on our hands with some Negroes bringing an action, insisting that we start a program in some counties in Alabama that don't have one and that we lower the charges and increase the amounts in others. I don't know where that will end up but it'll certainly get a lot of publicity, all of which makes us look bad. So we'll have to figure out how to proceed. Anyway, I left the office about 2:00 o'clock on Monday in a Jet Star -- flew to New York where I took part in a reception as a part of the book week.

Ten name publishing houses submit three names each of what they think will be their most prominent publications for the coming year, then the sponsors of the Book Week select one. Those 10 are then specially featured at this reception. We sat around in a hotel at little tables with drinks and canape and talked to reviewers and book people from The New York Times and others. I couldn't stay long, but hopefully did some good. A cute little girl that is a public relations gal for Praeger's met me and really steered people our way and if nothing more I think she will now be more interested and plug my book a little harder.

We left there about 5:20, fought traffic through New York and what a fright that is. Then flew to St. Paul where I spoke to the Farmers Union Central Exchange,



answered questions again for about an hour and had a brief coffee reception with them. It was refreshing and stimulating to see old friends. I caught a lot of nasty questions, most of them from North Dakota and South Dakota from the Wheat People who are the most spoiled in American agriculture. A lot of old friends came up and wished me well and complimented me and criticized those that had jumped on me. I also made some pointed comments about Vietnam, emphasizing that there were North Vietnamese in South Vietnam but no Americans or South Vietnamese in North Vietnam and dramatized the murders and assassinations perpetrated by the North Vietnamese and also the fact that all Ho Chi Minh had to agree to get to the peace table was not to take advantage of the cease fire and bombing. It seemed to go over very well and I think needed to be said, particularly because McCarthy grows increasingly noisy. We didn't get out of Minneapolis until after 11:00 o'clock, flew into Newark and didn't get to bed until about 3:30. I woke up at 7:00, the noise of traffic was so loud with two freeways close by. I finally got up, worked on my speech a bit and then went to the Fairleigh-Dickinson Convocation. I spoke there at some length on the agricultural system as an example of creative Federalism and how the success that it had gained could be used as an example in meeting the urban problem. It seemed to go well, more of a lecture than a speech, and was followed by some questioning, including some very pointed questions from the far out student on Vietnam that I answered very strongly along the lines of my speech the night before with the addition that none of the so-called doves proposed that we pull out of Vietnam and that their enclave theory didn't make much sense, that anyone that had been shot at or bombed or shelled would know that this was impossible and that we couldn't subject our boys to that. I also emphasized that Ho Chi Minh is the one who kept away from the bargaining table, not the President. The response was a unanimous and enthusiastic spontaneous applause from the audience which really surprised me. Actually the question session went very, very well.

We had a quick lunch, then on to the plane and back to the office -- a host of calls, papers to process, et al. Tomorrow, testimony before Whitten -- Friday on P.L. 480 -- a pile of daily mail here and I'm tired. So is Jane. We just finished dinner. I had a squash game which relaxed me, but frustrated me because I'm playing lousy and Jim Reynolds is too good for me. I miss McNamara. Anyway we're planning to go to bed early tonight and I'll get up early and hit this desk in the morning when I think I'll be a lot more productive than I am now.

The Vietnam thing really hangs over everything. I got a very sharp letter from Don Fraser that disturbs me. Perhaps I asked for it. I wrote him one in which I said I never thought that we would be at odd ends on an issue as important as this. He came back with a very sharp reply, saying strongly that he didn't think Dean Rusk was really trying to negotiate and that he had looked into this very deeply.

March 6, 1968 -- 10:15 am - at the office. I've been working this morning getting ready to testify before Whitten and the Subcommittee on Agricultural appropriations at 1:00 o'clock this afternoon. I'm struck at how incredibly difficult it is to cut appropriations from a given spending level. Charlie Grant just left here remarking, "It's much easier to get a new appropriation than to cut an old one." This despite Congress's constant muttering about high levels of spending. I guess it's the nature of the process. The point is that in the exercise of last fall when we cut back according to the Congressionally mandated formula based upon 2% of personnel costs and 10% of other costs we went through a terribly taxing process here, seeking to make our cuts in terms of priority items, not just in terms of spreading it on a percentage basis to be allegedly fair to all. However there was one group where the cut was pretty largely set from outside and that was in our watershed and conservation programming, particularly watershed protection and flood control where there are comparable

programs; reclamation in Interior, and of course the Corps of Engineers.

Charlie Schwartz insisted that we adhere to a formula which was equitable across the Government and that that formula came out at the level which we subsequently cut our SCS spending, I must admit my mind is a little fuzzy on that now, and Joe Robertson and Charlie Grant had some doubts as to whether we did not do this ourselves, but at a minimum we had held up under a freeze and merely extended and continued that freeze, so it was not a decision independently reached internally. In any event, now Whitten is really focusing in on that physical '68 cut in his budget hearings. It seems there are some watershed in his area that were ready to begin construction who had floated bonds and borrowed outside money apparently some from FHA and now they are unable to go forward. Whitten is complaining that they must and apparently has made commitments that they will. Actually he has not pushed me on it directly. He's just generally grumbled about this and didn't even mention it at breakfast on Monday. In the meantime SCS has not made available the funding that would meet his problem. It seems to me they could do this. My guess is they're not doing it because they want him to maintain a maximum of pressure. Thus they hope to get more funds than just to meet his problem. Inasmuch as on a percentage basis they have a 10 percent cut, which is almost twice that of other parts of the Department, they do have a legitimate complaint, although Don Williams has never made that complaint to me and apparently tried to protect the Department in his hearing yesterday before Whitten. I'm in a spot because I do think that these watershed protection programs are important and I do feel SCS does a fine job. So I regret the cuts and the hold back in program level, too. So in this instance I called the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charlie Zwick, and got after him and said that they had made a clear commitment to me that our cut would be proportionate to that of Interior and that of the Corps and now I find that it is not. This has embarrassed me with my Chairman and with my people and I'm in a bad spot. He argues as to



just what is the percentage comparison, but I then said let me restore about \$10 million and I can do this by taking it out of P.L. 480 where our spending level is actually substantially lower than that set by Congress anyway and so I can stay within the law and still increase our spending for all practical purposes. He told me that was all right if necessary provided that it was kept quiet and didn't break out in other places around the Government, such as GSA and HEW, and others, where the cut in spending on construction was on a percentage basis very much higher than it is in Agriculture. So there it sits. I don't know exactly what to do but I've asked Charlie Grant to get the precise figures from SCS as to Whitten's needs and what they would do if they had \$10 million more and I may then call Whitten and try and make quietly a little deal with him to restore this, urging him to be very quiet about it, not to make noises that will upset other Departments of the Government and we will go about our business and mark this one off. That would please him, please me, certainly please SCS -- the only problem is we have given and spending has been increased another \$10 million over what we thought it would be.

Saturday, March 9, 1968 -- Springfield, Illinois. I'm sitting here at 1:00 o'clock in the morning in a very lovely suite, light pine paneling, blue rugs and furniture, blue bath tub and fixtures, all alone. I just finished speaking to the 4-State Democratic National Committee gathering, followed by an organization meeting of Town and Country for Johnson and Humphrey. I probably spoke too long. The audience was not too farm oriented and I got wound up for almost 45 minutes, but I think I conveyed the message which was that we have a record of accomplishment and a program of promise. I hit hard at the conclusion on Vietnam and got the audience back that had begun to drift. The response I think was pretty good and the Town and Country organizing meeting was excellent. Vietnam and politics have dominated the picture for the last

few days as always. Things continue in a state of flux and uncertainty in Vietnam. I still don't know when I'm going. They sent a cable over on Wednesday, putting it up to Bunker, and still no response. Rostow offered last night at the Kuwait Embassy where Jane and I went to a party honoring Dean Rusk to call them, but I didn't follow up on that. I don't want to be pushy and the cable indicated that they thought here that I should go now. I'll have to postpone it a month or so if I don't go now, but maybe that's just as well. According to most of the press reports and inside reports, too, the countryside has been pretty thoroughly disrupted. It would appear that Hanoi has the initiative on the military front for the moment and has knocked out a good bit of the encouraging progress in development and pacification. That's heartbreaking, but I guess we should have expected that something of that was likely.

Maneuvering, looking to the Convention, is stepping up. McCarthy's press has been more favorable and I'm worried that he may get more votes in New Hampshire than was predicted earlier. He's getting the feel of campaigning now and the early criticism of being so academic is toning down and he's beginning to go for the juggler vein. The caucuses in Minnesota went poorly. Apparently the McCarthy forces, the Anti-Administration Vietnam group, pretty well took over in Minneapolis, St. Paul. They have delegates around the State. It can be held but it's going to take some work. I've made a few phone calls. I'm trying to help. Gerry Heaney called me, all excited, and said we needed an organized effort to hold the pro-Humphrey Administration forces around the State; otherwise, the opposition would out-manuever them and take over the whole delegation. That will be humiliating and bothersome to Humphrey and very dangerous to our whole Party in Minnesota. I'd kind of like to get into it full steam, but Humphrey never calls or talks to me about Minnesota politics. I can't help but feel that he continues resentful over the fact that many people feel that I was the political organizer and I ran the State as Governor and he

was the great symbol and he simply subjectively resents that. I know his staff generally has always resented me and so it is not sensible for me to get too far out in front. It would just mean a level of frustration. So I guess I'll stay put, do what I can quietly and not hazard the underlying good will that I think I have in an abortive enterprise where Humphrey will not be clearly in support of what we're doing. Strange business.

As I say, I hit hard here on Vietnam and had a good response. I emphasized that even the doves don't recommend that we pull out. Their recommendations are totally unrealistic and then went on to go after Hanoi for its terrorism et al. When I do this, there is a pretty good response, and I'm convinced we need to do more of it to give some fighting ammunition and a positive posture to the people who want to support the Administration so they aren't overwhelmed and intimidated by these wild men, on the anti-front. It sure presents a miserable situation for the President who doesn't dare get too emotional or strong or he will find the extreme right who want to attack Hanoi getting out of line. I really feel for him. I haven't seen much of him for a week or so now, but how he's able to leave Vietnam and go into other things giving them his undivided attention is more than I can figure out. He's a tough and resourceful guy.

I did quite a bit of testifying this week. The session with Jamie Whitten on Thursday went remarkably well. He pretty well bought the package in regard to restoring some funds for watershed and flood prevention and I have the closest to a love feast that I've ever had there. Charlie Grant was amazed.

Today I went up on P.L. 480. I did some fussing to get ready. The staff work could have been better. I ended up carefully reading the entire law which was a useful exercise for I got back into the swing of the international thing a bit which was important. Bill Gaud and Jacobs from the State Department who I hadn't met before went up. The testimony we finally shaped up was



really outstanding. It was too on the appearance before the Appropriations Committee. I must remember that testimony and use it. Anyway I gave the testimony. The questions were fairly good, none of them particularly critical. When we finished Bill Gaud was pleased and amazed. He and Jacobs didn't even give their testimony, they just filed it. P.L. 480 is going to be allright. Poage has set forward the dates for hearing as well and is completely cooperative on that basis, so for the moment the matters before the Congress seem to be in pretty good shape.

Wednesday and Thursday Jane and I were out. Wednesday at the Iranian Embassy at a Party for Jim Symington. That was a dinner and dance, started late and we didn't get home until well after 2:00 o'clock.

March 11, 1968 -- at the office -- Vietnam. This is increasingly uppermost in my thoughts. I worry about it. As I've related, I spoke several times about it last week with quite favorable results. Nonetheless the indications are that the under-current of resistance and resentment is growing. It would appear at this sitting that McCarthy will do better in New Hampshire tomorrow than anyone would have dreamed. Thousands of college kids have been over working for him and he apparently has picked up a lot of money. Governor King told me yesterday that he must have spent a quarter of a million dollars. King and McIntyre, the New Hampshire Senator, attacked McCarthy declaring he was aiding and abetting Hanoi. This may have backfired for McCarthy immediately screamed "McCarthyism". A number of Democratic pro-Johnson people backed off and apologized and even Nixon got in the act contending that we would disagree without questioning patriotism. Apparently no one had the guts or good sense to say, "Of course it's helping Hanoi. It couldn't help by help Hanoi, but that doesn't mean that Mr. McCarthy is necessarily not patriotic. He apparently feels that in this case helping Hanoi is necessary to get the U.S. out of Vietnam, which seems to

be his objective." But nobody said that. McCarthy in the meantime still doesn't advocate withdrawal, nor do the other doves; however, that's what they want. The paper this morning talked about a basic reappraisal of our position in Vietnam triggered by apparently Westmoreland's request for another quarter of a million troops. Last week there was a diatribe on the Floor of the Senate planned by half a dozen Senators, including Bobby Kennedy, Fulbright and Mansfield, declaring very emotionally that this war was immoral. The polls show only 49 percent of the people think we did the right thing, going into Vietnam. I myself am worried that the TET offensive was apparently so successful and damaging that the Viet Cong and Hanoi appear to have a lot of men and a lot of Divisions in position and the offensive; I can't help but worry about the men that are tied down at Caisson with Vietnamese tunneling all over and with the airport there more and more interdicted by artillery fire. I'm especially shocked at the reports that the Viet Cong way down in the Delta have new modern armament and light rapid fire rifles out of Russia and China and that we have not armed the

forces yet with our M-14 rifles. I suppose that's partially operational because of the trouble with that rifle, but still that they are better armed way down there with that long supply line is rather shocking. I'm also somewhat distressed personally that my willingness to go to Vietnam, including a cable sent by Lenhardt in the White House, almost suggesting that it would be a good for I had good forums on my return where I could at least present the Administration's viewpoint and talk about the pacification program, has not received any response. The cable was sent last Thursday, or Wednesday, and still no answer. I had expected to be in Vietnam this week, and here I sit in Washington. I'm not going to ask any further. I'm going to revise my schedule and probably go in late May, but it would seem to indicate that they are disturbed, they are reviewing the situation, and they don't want a visiting fireman at this point.

I was also shook up last night when Jane took after me on this issue. A week or two ago I had a little altercation with Connie about it when I was disturbed that she was considering going to school herself next year while Gary taught so he would avoid the draft. That shocked me and I got after her a bit, asking whether it ever occurred to them that they ought to meet their obligations to their country. She was somewhat taken back and in the course of it I stated did she ever stop to think that her father had tried to do that. At the time Jane indicated her disgust at their attitude and her general approval of what I had said. Last night, it proved to be a different story. We were having dinner and talking about the fact that the President's son-in-law had asked to be taken into the service now and transferred from his National Guard Unit where he would not be called. This is Pat Nugent. His other son-in-law, the Marine Chuck Robb, will be leaving almost immediately. Jane asked what would happen if they were captured, etc., and we discussed it and then out of a clear blue sky she asked, "What are we doing in Vietnam anyway?" referring somewhat obliquely to conversations with Connie and with Jean Eisenberg across the street. I was taken back and began to recount the reasons I thought we were there. She referred to the problems of unrest and upset where the young people are concerned during the formative periods of 25 to 30 years of age and I couldn't help but respond that the maximum service involved is 3 years and that won't hurt them -- it certainly doesn't discommode them any more than it did us 25 years ago. Her response to that was to get after me pretty strongly for having referred to Connie the fact that "her father had done it". That she said was the worst thing I could have said and that was again recounting back to an earlier period and it did more harm than good with the young people today. She's probably right, although I was more than a little irritated. She referred to Jack Lyons again, the old Minnesota Democrat or Farmer Laborite, who was the epitamy of



a referral to the old school during our period of taking over the DFL Party way back in 1946 to '48. I recognize of course that we can't deal with young people by saying how we did it, but she is so supersensitive to this, and refers to it so often, that it kind of irritated me and the result was a most unpleasant interchange which ended abruptly and unsatisfactorily. This is the first indication that Jane is wondering basically as to what we're doing and it's perhaps symptomatic of many others that have felt we were doing the right thing but now are taking another look. So maybe a basic re-examination is taking place as the newspapers report this morning. I hope so. It may well be that we simply don't have the resources to do the job under these circumstances where Hanoi and the Viet Cong can be supplied with endless amounts of materiel from China and Russia and apparently are able to move it down successfully despite our bombing and of course they also have an extensive manpower which they can train and can move and there's no reason to doubt but that they are firmly in control in their country and that there is a pretty high level of Morale. If that's the case and the progress of the South Vietnamese Government is as slow as it appears to be at this juncture and their response to the TET offensive is faltering as it was although there is increasingly reported news of effective fighting by many units, yet there is little news that the Government has succeeded in acting very effectively to overcome the frightful destruction of the TET offensive. I sat next to Gallagher, the head of the AP, at the Gridiron dinner Saturday night and he related to me his judgment that he felt that the South Vietnamese Government was too corrupt to be effective. He said he had no solution, but he felt as matters now stood we were not doing the right thing in continuing our present course of action. He also related that after developing a kind of common front initially following the TET attacks the South Vietnamese Government proceeded to arrest a number of prominent South Vietnamese who were associated with that and when remonstrated by the Americans closed the door sharply and said

that was internally politics and absolutely none of our business. He was very pessimistic and disagreed sharply with Dave Lillienthal's evaluation that the new Government and its Cabinet were the best that he had seen in any of the less developed countries he had visited. Anyway, it is a rather bleak picture at the moment. Contra-wise I noted a build up in U.S. News and World Report for Southeast Asia with a very optimistic analysis of progress made. The implication of this series was, given a little more time and stability these countries are on the move and they will be able to act jointly to prevent invasion and destruction. No one knows -- it's particularly difficult to be in my position where I feel the need to be an advocate. I do feel the doubts I've already outlined, based not on the fact we're doing the right thing, but whether we have the resources to do the right thing, short, that is, of an all out attack on Hanoi and a total mobilization of our own economy, and that would represent major policy judgments that I'm not informed enough to make. It is hard to feel a sense of responsibility, to be called on to articulate the program, and then not really to be informed or in the fundamental decision-making process. This is a frustration I've felt ever since I've been Secretary and that I've repeated many times, but there's no sense complaining because obviously only so many people can participate in that process and I'm not one that has the information or the responsibility requiring my participation. Maybe we'll get some indication of what goes on at the Cabinet meeting on Wednesday.

Yesterday was a quiet day at home. I went to the Gridiron Dinner Saturday night, it wasn't up to the usual standards, although the skit ridiculing the Republican potential nominees was clever. The rest of it was, I thought, not up to usual standards. I really slept in Sunday morning. I wasn't feeling well and stayed in bed until 12:00 o'clock, sleeping most of the time. That's almost unheard of. I had a kind of miserable night last night for my back has been

bothering me a great deal. I hope it doesn't mean that the old war injury is being activated and will continue to bother me. I'm going over and take a heat and massage treatment now. I don't know where this came from but it started bothering on my Northeast trip and has gotten steadily worse. It could be just a --. I was just interrupted by a phone call from the Attorney General. He asked that I expedite issuing administration regulations here that will set down clear standards and requirements for the Presidents of Land Grant Colleges where Civil Rights are concerned. As he relates it, all hell is breaking loose in the Negro colleges in the South and the Extension System is a particular target. I've been over these regulations, I've wanted to slow up their issuance a bit and had asked for a memo anticipating what would happen and where when they are issued. I told him I'd get them out this week.

I sat next to Clark Clifford at the Gridiron Dinner and it was interesting to talk with him. He really didn't communicate very much, except it was clear that he was somewhat overwhelmed by his new duties. As he put it, there is so much to learn, so much to do, so many big decisions to be made so rapidly, and he's a person who likes to reflect a bit before making his decisions. I tried to encourage him a bit by pointing out that that is all of our problems when we first take over one of these big operations. He did comment about the President's very high regard for me and that the President didn't have to say that if he didn't really feel it,--to him Clark Clifford. This is good to hear. It comes to me from many sources and is of course most gratifying.



October 3, 1967, 11:20 p.m. at my desk at home. Well I made it back from Oregon. A long plane ride. I played squash on my return. A long night at the desk again finishing out the pile of paper which I feverishly worked on all the way across the Continent. Today I spent in Atlanta, speaking to the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture. I hated to go, but it was one of those command performances, and on balance I guess it worked out all right. They were pleased. Relations were improved and I preached the message again of two ideas whose time has come to-wit bargaining power for farmers and rural urban balance.

I returned to find that <sup>James</sup>~~Harold~~ Conant had declined to participate in the Symposium. We still don't have a featured speaker for our program or for promotion. I'm getting very worried about it. We simply must get this under way. The fact that Ken Birkhead seems unable to function with his old efficiency creates a very special problem. I just don't know what to do with him. He keeps complaining all the time that he's not up to the tasks at hand and he can't do anything right and it's more than he can handle. I gave him a lecture more than a week ago to the effect that he ought to quit crying that I would mark the report card and that I had great faith and confidence in him and told him to quit complaining and go to work. He's kept complaining, but not to me, and apparently felt offended that I spoke so sharply to him, so that didn't work. I think I'll try Charley Murphy tomorrow and see if he can find out if Ken is really ill and figure out what to do about it.

I'm still struggling with the cotton decision. I had entertained the thought of calling the key cotton people around the country in to discuss skip-row with them. I decided against that. They've all been consulted and an extra trip to Washington would probably not be received with favor on their part at this stage of the game. I am going to meet however with all the cotton congressmen

and lay it on the line with them, that skip rowing may well mean that we will have to break the minimum allotment, and that I would expect their help in doing so. I'm scheduling that for Thursday morning. I hope to see the President Thursday afternoon, hopefully we can make the cotton announcement on Friday. It really has gone too long now. But it's a toughy and I have wanted to cook in it a while, and then being gone I couldn't see the necessary people and bring it to a head. Horace Godfrey and John Schnittker still don't believe that we should expand skip-row, but as John said with a grin, "We've come around to be for it," and then seriously, "We know you want it and so we do." I think they are sincere about it and will defend it and carry it forward. I simply feel that there are so many that want it and very vocal and articulate ones at that, that we ought not to run counter to those wishes. We're going to have enough trouble anyhow and we ought not to get plastered unnecessarily when there really isn't any good reason for not doing it now.

My Oregon-Washington trip was really a revelation once again. It's reaffirmed me in my confidence that great things are and can be done in the countryside. All we need to do is go out and drive them through. Now somehow I've got to transmit this to others.

October 5, 1967 -- 11:00 a.m. at the office. I've just completed a session, breakfast session, with Members of Congress on cotton and in the process I think made up my mind on this issue. I believe that skip-row basically is a production technique and that we should permit it as such. Certainly there is great demand for it and there will be disillusion and strong attacks for it and political consequences if we don't. Further as we think in terms of the cotton program to come, the question of minimum allotment may not be as important as I initially thought. The likelihood is that we will recommend a two-price program for cotton similar to wheat. If that's the case, minimum allotments ought to become no longer so important and we will be using payments tied to

acreage diversion and we will be using historic bases as tied to wheat with cotton moving at the world price. If we move in that direction there really isn't any reason why we shouldn't permit skip-row now for there will not really be ~~d~~involved the kind of cutback for non-skip-row users that otherwise concerned me. This has been an interesting example of how I try to make some of these big complicated decisions. Initially the people in the Department, particularly Horace but John Schnittker joined him, opposed skip-row. They pretty well mobilized the facts and presented them to me on that basis. Yet I knew there was powerful support for skip-row beginning with Poage and that we couldn't deal with the issue lightly or we would be in serious trouble. Therefore, I called for the hearings around the country and observed them closely. I insisted that skip-row should not be withdrawn from consideration as had been done initially. I held long discussions here and in the staff, went up to talk with Congressmen on it, talked to other people in the industry generally, and with Congressmen on it, talked to other people in the industry generally, and it culminated this morning with the Congressmen. Now I feel satisfied in my own mind that it is the right thing to do and I'll act as promptly as I can get the President to authorize me to do so which hopefully will be within an hour or so, when I take some 4-H kids over to the White House. The Bureau may buck and that may slow matters. The program is far too costly, but we will do our best.



October 7, 1967 -- 12:05 am at my desk at home. I just returned from a rather interesting evening at the Pakistan Embassy. Dean Rusk was there. The Pakistan Foreign Minister and Finance Minister and some Americans were there, but not too many. Dean was ~~raking~~<sup>making</sup>, I was No. 2. The Iranian Ambassador was there and we had a very interesting conversation referring to the Shah's official inauguration and their desire to get some agri-business types to make major investments in Iran. These to be phased out with adequate returns to go to Nationals in due course. The Iranian Ambassador is a very intelligent, very sensitive, thoroughly informed individual. I had a most interesting conversation with him and will follow up and try and get primarily some of our big sugar companies who are skilled in land development to work out a pattern with them. Sandy Platt who died recently would have been ideal to contact on this. I'm not sure how to proceed now but I must reach Lyle Schertz because Les Brown is gone and get this under way. I've got some of the Sugar Companies doing this in the Philippines. They have done it successfully in Australia. Now they could do some fine work in Iran. I must say that the Shah there is doing a great work and is approaching this most intelligently. The Paks is another story and I hope we can help them. The Finance Minister was in to see me. We gave them a million tons of wheat back in April. In September we granted another 500,000 tons and now they want 250,000 more. The President has said we will match what they will buy. Bill Gaud of AID claims they can't buy any, that's the Finance Minister's claim, because their foreign exchange is down so low. I told their Minister we would reconsider it and told Gaud today I would join with him, if their foreign exchange position is as weak as they claim, and if the failure of more wheat would endanger their liberalizing their economy which we have urged. Anyway last night we were at a party by their representative to the International Monetary

*Shoah*  
Fund ~~Shoah~~ in his private home which was a mess. McNamara was there. George Wood was there. Harold Linder was there, George Ball was there, both of the Rostows were there, and I've never seen poorer service or a bigger mess. Tonight it was different. A stag party, about a dozen men. After dinner Dean Rusk ended up in one corner, me in the other. I would like to have been in his corner to get some more of the overtones of the political where Pakistan is concerned. They are more than sensitive about China, about Kashmir, and Dean seemed to me a little brittle as he needled them. I had just a little feeling tonight for the first time that he is tired, wrung out, and a bit abrasive. I didn't have a chance to really talk to him but where I was concerned he seemed almost a bit arrogant. That's not like Dean.

Anyway it was an interesting evening and again as I have done over the years, I kind of pinch myself to be a part of it and for all intents and purposes almost prime mover -- certainly so in the agricultural front which with these countries is of prime importance even though my exposure known on the political front is even less than I am willing to admit. And so I kind of keep my mouth shut in these kind of things, making my occasions to be heard, and being seen more than talking. However, it was stimulating and useful. Now I'm at my desk at home. I just finished dictating an extensive memorandum to John Baker in preparation for testimony in the very near future on the bill to merge the Agricultural Resource Agencies, Forest Service and SCS, with the Interior Department sponsored by Ted Moss. This will be before Ribicoff's Subcommittee and I predict he will try and give me a bad time because I've criticized him publicly a few times for what I feel are his uncalled for attacks on agriculture. However, I do get a bit personal and express my honest opinion of him which is that he is a politician that will shave corners in his statements seeking votes and doesn't have much regard for facts, if it serves his political purposes.

Unfortunately a woman reporter at what I thought was an off the record luncheon printed that. I got a curt note from Abe, wrote him in return half-way apologizing, haven't heard since. It will be interesting to see what he does when I appear.

I had a rather thrilling experience this morning. I spoke to the closing session as a part of a panel of the National Planning Association. It was their 50th Anniversary. The program was projected to look 50 years in the future. It was very timely that I should be there at that point because as I emphasized in speaking to them the whole proceedings written and oral had not used the word "rural", "farm", "countryside", "town and country", even once. I challenged them as to what kind of planning that was, with 90 percent of the space we need outside of the metropolitan areas to which they directed exclusive attention. This shocked them. It took me half an hour to get away after the presentation for people coming up. Many said this was the most original and stimulating statement of the whole conference. That may or may not be true, but I have the very strong feeling that what I intuitively stressed some 6 years ago in part it's true because of the political problem of what do you do with those displaced on the farm in rural America. But nonetheless this problem of how do you build rural America and small towns which I sensed as a politician is now coming to the front and our growth center concept of a working alternative to megalopolis seems to be commanding increasing national attention. It projects the Department of Agriculture as a viable operation with a scope much broader than agriculture per se. This really shakes up many people in the Department and certainly the Congress, but I believe it is vital, critical and very significant as matters are developing around the country.



Anyway I left the meeting which I attended all the morning considerably stimulated and rolled back to the office to spread my wings on some other problems. I change problems like a chameleon changes its skin. The first one was cotton. The President agreed the other day that we could go ahead with the cotton program with skip-row. Then Charley Schultze got in the act. He protested the estimated \$50 million more it would cost. He called the President about it. He suggested getting a letter from the key members of Congress that are for skip-row. The President vetoed that and suggested a meeting by Schultze and myself. I vetoed that. Schultze ended up calling them himself -- then he tried to clear it with the President. The answer was no; now we're scheduled to meet, the cotton Congressmen, Schultze and myself with the President some time on Monday. Actually this may be all right. It delays the announcement I wanted to make, but it will be interesting to see the President put an arm on some of these people who are giving him so much trouble now on the tax increase bill and that are screaming economy so loudly. Again, whose ox is getting gored.

After cotton, I turned my attention to international agriculture. I speak next Monday in New York to the International Supermarket Association and I'm taking this occasion to make a rather sharp attack on both the do-gooders who scream we're not feeding enough people around the world and the doom-sayers who contend that we can't possibly prevent world mass starvation. The language may be a little sharp, but I think it's timely for me to spell out that this great crusade to win the war on hunger goes on and the fact that our analytical study showed that the world had the capacity whereby the developed countries can feed the less developed with grain at least to the year 1980 doesn't by any means mean that we don't have a serious problem. It's timely I think for me to move back a bit into the international area, I've let that cook a while,

particularly because I hope both Jane and I will be in Rome in November at the FAO. I'm worried about the FAO thing because we have not yet taken a position on the Director General. I talked to Dean Rusk about that some weeks ago, but they continue, the State Department, to sit and do nothing. I hope Sen wins -- Boerma nor Santa Cruz will not do the job. If we can get Sen for two years with an agreement that he will step out, it's time for someone from this country, a top person, to try and make some sense out of that Organization.

The most interesting event of the last week was the Wednesday Cabinet Meeting. The Vietnam issue came into very, very sharp focus in this meeting. The President called on Rusk for his remarks as to major developments. Rusk emphasized as he has done before that we continue to maintain the initiative and make progress. He pointed out that in the opening of the U.N. in New York that not a single major minister had taken the initiative for private talks on the ceasing of bombing in Vietnam. He claimed that some had literally apologized for their public speeches. After his rather general and bland statements, the President stepped in and asked Rusk and then McNamara some very pointed questions. The questions were: What is the relation of our National Security in Vietnam? What is the problem in connection with U.S. credibility? Why don't we negotiate? What is the situation re the effectiveness, the effort of the Vietnam troops? What about the enclave theory? What progress are we making in the civilian area? All of these questions, Rusk or McNamara answered and I must say very effectively. Rusk pointed out that our national security was involved. There was Communist infiltration in significant numbers in Laos and in Thailand. That in Indonesia if they had assassinated eight rather than six generals, it probably would have meant Communist domination. That there was a threat of 750 million Chinese and only 10 years for the other billion people in Asia to get ready to meet the threat of the billion people in China.

So far as credibility is concerned, he pointed out that the commitment in Vietnam began with Kennedy and as the President said that the notes of the meetings of decisions that Kennedy made showed more than merely a passive interest but rather a major commitment. So far as negotiations are concerned, it was the same old story -- that we had tried in every way we can to negotiate, through every instrumentality, with no success. Incidentally George Ball said to me last night at ~~Shoab's~~ <sup>Shoab's</sup>, that the real problem was that in North Vietnam war was a way of life, they've been at it for 25 years, and that Ho Chi ~~Minh~~ <sup>Minh</sup> had been exercised by Communists by having made a mistake of judgment in the Geneva Court of 1954 and that when it was clear that the election was supposed to follow would not result and that in effect he had been snookered that that meant that they would not under any circumstances be willing to take a chance again. So far as the bombing is concerned why the whole business of committing our troops to be plastered with the whole enclave theory is thoroughly preposterous. This came out rather clear. So far as the civilian side is concerned the answer was that they simply had a lack of administrative apparatus to get things done, particularly in the country-side. As Dean Rusk put it, the old adage of Vietnam is that the custom of the village is more important than the law of the king. So far as the fighting of the South Vietnamese are concerned it is spotty, but in the main the difficulty is leadership for the French had appointed all the officers and senior NCOs and therefore there was a great difficulty in leadership, but that real improvement was being made and that the buddy system is being followed there with American troops and is working.

The conversation then turned to what the Cabinet could do and the President made some strong statements as he repeatedly does about the fact he doesn't get the kind of support from his Cabinet, such as Roosevelt got



particularly from Ickes during that period. This is a frequent song. I picked it up right away and said to him that I would like nothing better than to get in this act, but that I would strongly recommend that the State Department take the leadership. As I put it, we should be the horses and they the riders. Joe Fowler agreed -- said they should be the quarterback and we should be the fullback. That they should send us two or three pages of material and that we would be prepared then to use it at our various appearances. The President seemed to agree with some reserve. Later he drifted into the credibility gap question and pointed out that one of the real problems was that the press kept jockeying us into the position where Defense, State and the White House seemed to be contradicting one another. Hence, the credibility gap because we were not all consistent. It seemed clear to me that what came out of this was the same old business that he is so concerned about consistency that he has not been willing to use the Members of the Cabinet. I don't know where we go from here. The next week on Tuesday night Rusk is going to have a stag for the Cabinet, allegedly to review the Vietnam situation. Whether State will at long last be willing to relax and use us and take a chance that we might not always say exactly what they want at press conferences following any statements we make remains to be seen.

I saw the President after the Cabinet meeting to discuss particularly the cotton question. I mentioned to him that the Cabinet meeting was a fine one and that I wanted to get into this and he gave me something of a lecture on some of the issues but did not go all the way and say what we should do. So probably we're not going to really get turned loose after all.

Another interesting factor in the Cabinet meeting was the presentation by Dick Helms, the head of the CIA. He talked about the fact that we had

not had any real measurable criteria to determine what goes on in Vietnam. He then went on to spell out for us some of the reasons why they thought we were making progress. One was that the Viet Cong are not attacking the revolutionary cadres which he deducted meant that they were being quite successful. He also referred to the system of hamlet evaluation which apparently had been instituted at McNamara's instance with a number of criteria something like a fitness report, setting down the actual status of various things in the hamlets. This has gone on about 6 months now. It involves a number of criteria graded with three or four variations to measure the effectiveness of what's really taking place. Dick Helm seemed to be really quite enthusiastic about it, but McNamara interposed himself into it and said, "No, the time has not come yet where we can really rely on this or use it because you can be certain that the press is going to do everything in their power to knock it down and you get again into the credibility gap problem." The President backed off a bit and more or less agreed, and I think Bob is right. I hope they can get something however because the general pessimism, the overall attitude that things are not right and that we really aren't making progress is, I think, one of the most serious overall aspects of the entire situation. The Vice President confirmed this when he said that he thought he had probably spoken more than almost anyone and the general pessimism was such that we were clearly on the defensive and needed to break out. As the President put it, when he arose at 6:00 o'clock in the morning and turned on the T-V for the next three hours he heard nothing but bad things. About that time he'd have to call someone in to tell him what was really going on so he could have a bit of sunshine for the day. I don't know what we do about this. I must say that I am appalled with the T-V and Newspaper reports. It seems not only in Vietnam but here at home with the racial problems and

the rest that the press and television go out of their way to emphasize the negative. The accusations that they schedule, the radical Rapp Brown Stokley Carmichael appearances so that they will get maximum television time although denied I suspect are probably true. How do you live with this? Hopefully the good sense of the American people will come through but the dinning, particularly of television, is a new dimension which sometimes shakes your confidence in free speech. These guys just seem to be impelled with the negative and the sensational and I wonder sometimes if we can continue to tolerate it.

Anyway, it was a stimulating and interesting Cabinet Session and I do hope they will turn us loose to take on the Vietnam fight. I'd like to get into it up to my eyeballs but we haven't been able to do so so far.

Well it's 12:35 and I guess I better head for bed. Jane is in Madison making a Food for Freedom speech, Connie is with her and I'm sure they will have a good time together. I'm going to try and stay home tomorrow and work on the lawn, it needs mowing, fertilizer and grass seeds. That dam crapgrass has taken over again. I hope I can hold out and stay here but will have to wait and see. If I do it will be a major miracle.

Tomorrow night is the big Democratic Fund-raising affair. I'll have to go to it, hopefully I can leave in time to pick up Jane who is coming in at 10:00. We're scheduled to see the Redskins play Dallas on Sunday which will be delightful, and then on to another hectic week. The last six months have really been active -- what with rural area development tours, commodity problems, agricultural problems, international agriculture and the whole scope. However, I've been feeling much better than I deserve to feel, squeezing out only 5 to 6 hours a night of sleep. However, I've been getting in those squash games.



I played yesterday with Jim Reynolds and hurt my back so I had to postpone a game with McNamara today, but on balance I'm feeling pretty good and the scope and ramification of all these problems is a constant challenge. I get frustrated trying to stay ahead of the paper but on the overall I guess if the pace were less and the demands didn't continue to grow and I didn't feel we were innovating and pioneering a bit that I would be frustrated and bored which most emphatically at this point I am not.

Sunday, October 8, 1967, at my desk at home. It's about time to close up shop. I leave at 6:00 in the morning for New York where I speak and then return promptly. I don't know why I accept some of these speaking engagements. They always look different in the future than when you face them. I've been shuffling paper here for several hours but not very energetically. It's impossible to stay ahead of all the publications, reports, etc.

October 9, 1967 - 10:45

I've finally gotten to my desk here. It's been one of those long days. I was up at 5:45 today to head for New York. Spoke today to the International Association of Chain Stores. I had agreed to do this a long time ago for Myer Marcus, the Executive Vice President of Food Fair. I spoke mostly on the world food problem, with some rather harsh words to the "breast beaters" as I called them, those who complain that when we aren't sending all we can produce to other countries around the world where there might be hungry people, we're cruel and inhuman, and the "doomsayers" who feel what's the difference, the world's going to blow up for lack of food by 1975 anyway.

After hopefully putting them in their place pointing out that only through self-help could we hope to meet this threat and stating the determination of the President and the Administration to be responsible and to slowly but determinedly meet the problem. I went on to make an appeal to the chain store executives assembled to invest in less developed countries and use their skills and administrative know-how.

It seemed to be very well received. I sprinkled in a few stories that went well. The press conference was kinda flat. The speech was a little too general. No real hard news. The radio, television, and press coverage were relatively uninformed, and so it wasn't a very satisfactory press conference.

I returned promptly to the office, worked through a lot of paper work, snatched a few minutes to see the Boston Red Sox win the fifth game of the World Series making it 3-2 now, and played squash with McNamara from

5:30 to 6:30. I was lousey. He beat me four straight and I couldn't even hit the ball. And then to the White House for a 6:30 meeting on cotton. The President had assembled House and Senate pro-skip-row advocates and we spent an hour and a half listening to them. He took it under advisement. I am quite sure he will recommend it and in the meantime having gone through this charade he'll have a basis for bugging those who assembled who give him trouble on so many of the Administration bills. He seemed in relatively good spirits.

I merely layed the problem on the table, said it would cost more but at his instance related that I had changed my earlier position and was for it. I might have bought a little good will myself. The cotton problem is a tough one, but he didn't beef too much about it, even though the current problems on taxes, spending, budget and the Congress is as rough as it is.

Actually the only Congressman that was unfriendly really and kinda nasty was Jamie Whitten. I thought we were getting along better, but he came back to the whole old-saw about how we under law are mandated to set certain export targets and then to accomplish them by whatever means it took. Finally after he had repeated it about three times Ellender jumped in and said, how, how, how, how, how, and then, of course, Jamie backed off as he always does when it comes to a confrontation.

On balance I think it probably turned out pretty well. I think I have been right in my judgment. Certainly I have over-ruled the entire Department, including Godfrey and Schnittker to get here, but I believe it is only sensible to use the best cultural practices, we need more cotton, and hardly sensible to fly in the face of almost unanimous opinion of the most articulate

people in the whole cotton business.

Schultze will supposedly call the President, then me in the morning, and perhaps we have this miserable decision behind us and then we look forward to the feed grains one which promises to be equally nasty.

Got home about a quarter to nine. After a drink and visit and a relaxed dinner and a very short nap, the evenings gone and I really should be going to bed, but I think I'll run through tomorrow's mail quickly and then really will, for I slept poorly last night. Only spent about five hours in bed anyway and my eyes were burning.

October 10, 1967 - 11:45 p.m.

I have just returned to the office from a Cabinet Session at the State Department with Dean Rusk, Bob McNamara and Most of the Cabinet officials. This meeting grew out of the last official Cabinet meeting when the President suggested that the members of the Cabinet get together and discuss where we go from here with particular reference to Vietnam.

It was, I think, the most revealing and useful meeting that I have participated in since I have been in Washington. Let me recount it.

The discussion started on a relatively low level reviewing the place of intellectuals in American political life. It focused in shortly where it was intended to be on the current political situation, vis-a-vis, the election just over the horizon. The issue was posed fairly shortly by Larry O'Brien who said, "Why should people vote for Lyndon Johnson?" This stopped most of the members there.



I made the point that the record clearly would call for his reelection, that the relative well-being of the overwhelming majority of the American people would mean his reelection drawing the parallel with Eisenhower in 1956. Few in the Cabinet seemed to agree. I further made the point that the real political issue was Vietnam and that we had a case to make, that we needed to mobilize our forces and give resources and ammunition to those who would be willing to speak out, who were by and large intimidated today.

The response to moving out was less than enthusiastic. Bob McNamara sat mute; Dean Rusk seemed to avoid the discussion. We moved into dinner and with a few drinks, we got closer to the issue at hand.

After a while it became rather to me, vis-a-vis, both Bob McNamara and Dean Rusk, that one of the reasons why, if not the reason, that the Cabinet and even the President had not more pointedly and effectively made the case for Vietnam was the concern about the hawks and that we would be pushed too far with the cataclysmic potential results of all out war. Thus we have been quite grounded.

Again and again to the point of probably being offensive, I came back to what I consider the primary issue. That we needed to bring the story to the American people of why we are in Vietnam and what it means.

Dean Rusk responded again and again in terms of the opinion formers to whom he directed obviously most of his attention. He mentioned Fulbright, the New York Times, his bitterness at Galbraith, Schlesinger and Goodwin came through again and again. I was forced to the conclusion that in a sense he was so deeply involved in the fight to win the argument that he really was not paying much attention to the war.

I tried to emphasize that in a way the American people couldn't care less about the New York Times or the intellectuals. That we needed to get out on the stump and to tell the story in terms that would reach the American people. He agreed to the extent that he acknowledged that he got good press when he got around the country, but if he repeated himself twice, he got no coverage out of Washington. Nonetheless, he came back again and again to the handful of people with whom he is engaged in this great debate.

It's a good example, I fear, how those of us who make decisions and must defend them become so deeply involved in the argument that we forget how to reach the people out there. I must say that this happens to me too and today was a good illustration.

This afternoon we had call on us the President of the Farmland Cooperative. This is the successor the CCF out of Ohio. It's one of the biggest co-ops in the country. They came in wanting to develop better relations with great friendliness, but as the conversation drew to a close, they remarked that they hoped the Department would be more for the farmer and not so much for the consumer.

This triggered me into a long dissertation and debate about the lack of leadership in agriculture. What we had done to raise farm prices, how we had passed farm bills, how phoney the consumer preference charge was, and how disastrous the failure of leadership was and how it threatened the farmers in American agriculture.

I'm afraid they walked out of here thinking I was a little nuts. By the same token I left the State Department thinking that Dean Rusk was overly concerned with Foggy Bottom and the New York Times.

In a sense the same thing is true of Bob McNamara. However, much less so. He was conscious of the over-all problem of reaching people, the need for limiting the issues to a few demonstrable areas, but he became almost as emotional about the problem of expanding the war and the danger of escalation and whetting the appetite of the hawks. So he responded much the same to the groups that had pressed him so hard and that had required answers and justification from him. It is, I think, a part of the process and a limiting factor that all of us must watch very carefully indeed.

John Gardner was, I thought, rather superb on all of this. He is a complete intellectual, but direct, sometimes blunt and quite incisive. I am impressed with him. He made the point that we are asking the American people to support a major national effort without giving them the kind of emotional justification that a little patriotism and a little more demonstrative support would allow. He questioned whether it was fair for us to expect them to support this tremendously important endeavor under these circumstances. I couldn't agree with him more. Joe Fowler agreed too. He felt we needed to zero in on the Vietnam issue very strongly and interpret it more effectively.

I must say that outside of those two I had relatively little support for the point that we needed to join the issue more strongly on Vietnam. I repeated my point, as I say, probably more than useful, although when it closed off I think it had had an impact far beyond the opening discussions.

As I emphasized to Dean Rusk, what goes on in Washington seldom reaches the American people. I illustrated this by the Korean War particularly and also by the Joe McCarthy epic when Washington was up-ended but the people in Minnesota were little affected.

In the course of the discussion Dean Rusk made the point that Eisenhower and the Republicans, a number of them, were pinned and would stand behind our position in Vietnam. I emphasized strongly that this was nonsense, that they would back, fill, and qualify and would support their political party which would be anti-Vietnam the further we moved into the election.

Rusk made mention of Truman telling him that it was necessary politically to bring John Foster Dulles into the Department of State. I think I devastated that one by pointing out what Dulles then did in the Republican Platform and campaign of 1952 when he completely exorcised Truman and the whole Administration using his enhanced prestige from having been a part of that Administration to write a devastating platform plank and join in a vitriolic completely political unconscionable attack on our whole position in Korea.

Larry O'Brien agreed; Joe Fowler agreed. I told Dean Rusk that if he expected to get anything out of the Republicans he better get them in now and get 'em signed in blood. Everybody clamored that that was impossible, and I agreed and said, let's not kid ourselves about the Republicans.

Larry O'Brien continued skeptical. I tried to bug him asking why he was so pessimistic, making my point that the Administration's domestic record would stand on itself, that as in 1956, if we could take care of Vietnam the relative well-being of the American people would be such that they would not want to trade it for an unknown quantity in any possible candidate for President on the Republican Ticket.

Early in the evening that position seemed to be challenged. Later on it seemed to be more accepted.



The biggest dove in the group somewhat surprising was Stew Udall. He seemed to be disturbed by the fact that his brother is moving from a pro-Administration viewpoint in Vietnam to a more neutral position. He was clearly shaken up by this and made the point that we must have some great exhibition of some kind reiterating our dedication to peace and our efforts towards an agreement and settlement in Vietnam. He further predicted that the Republican nominee was likely and almost certain to be Rockefeller, and how tough he would be. That we must plan accordingly for that was the worst possible contingency.

No one argued that. Rockefeller certainly will be tough, and I think there's quite a likelihood that he may be the Republican nominee.

Udall also went way off on the question of program and budget and being shot down by Joe Califano, Charlie Schultze, and Gardner Ackley. The expressions about domestic program and the confusion involved in the budget and spending problem was echoed with some bitterness by Bill Wirtz and to a less extent by John Gardner.

After some reflection on this, it more or less coalesced with a kind of fuzzy agreement that we had to postulate hope and continued progress to great ends in our domestic programs.

I sought to make a point that we had made enormous progress, that we could emphasize that progress and that we could paint pictures of the future at the same time acknowledging we couldn't go as fast as we would like to because of budget-fiscal-Vietnam problems. Joe Fowler entered in with considerable emotion and I think rightly so, that the worst possible posture we could be in in the election would be a raging inflation of 5 to 10 percent with

all the erosion of spending power by the American people; that would be a really top flight issue for the Republicans.

No one could really disagree, although again the Gardners, Udalls, and Wirtz's expressed frustration at the tight rein to which they are subject and again because it came through Califano, Schultze, and not too good a coordination or forward planning out of the White House.

In terms of domestic issues, there was considerable emphasis on law enforcement, on safety in the streets as one of the big issues. Fowler, even Gardner, McNamara, landed a bit on Ramsey Clark on the grounds that the law enforcement program had not made a very effective case. That rather it seemed that protection of the rights of the criminals had gotten precedence over the protection of the rights of people, and that Reagan and other Republicans had rather taken the initiative successfully on this one.

Clark didn't make his case very well. He was very quiet, as was Sandy Trowbridge. They are both new in the Cabinet and were not very aggressive, although Sandy tried to get in once and a while with some points. Ramsey was pretty mute.

Ironically Joe Fowler made the point that one of our law enforcement problems had international political overtones and that he had been thwarted by the State Department, to wit, not vigorous enough action had been taken to keep narcotics out of Turkey. The point was made that this was a cash crop for the Turkish farmer and he turned to me with the allegation somewhat facetiously that cash crops were not an all important political influence in this country, to which I ironically agreed.

There was a lot of repetition, interruptions and round about in the course of it, but it was really the most stimulating, pointed and meaningful evening that I have had since I have been in Washington. Tentatively a date was set for a rerun.

Several times McNamara and I summarized what needs to be done, to wit, that someone needed to review and land on the key domestic issues and develop a strategy to carry them forward. I made the point to Dean again as I have previously that the State Department ought to call the signals, determine the times and place and how, and mastermind a massive national campaign to buck up our people in regard to Vietnam and why it was right and why we must continue it.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Dean indicated that they would work out something that would meet my urging. There was a little joshing and a little kidding about my being a mean, tough guy. I hope this was in good humor. It seemed to be generally favorable and not deprecating, although it's hard to be sure.

I may have talked too much, but I must say that there's no doubt in my mind in conclusion that we need to organize this, that we need to assume the worst in terms of Presidential candidates, that we need to limit our attack on domestic politics, that we must avoid inflation and still hold out hope for future developments, and that we must recognize Vietnam as the large and compelling issue, assume that it will not get better in the coming year and prepare to carry it to the American people and not let ourselves flounder in a continually more bitter debate with a handful of intellectuals, with a few

members of Congress and with the New York Times and a few publications. As I said again and again, they may be important but Democratic candidates have always won over the opposition of the newspapers and particularly the editorial page.

All of this tied into a call I had from the President today in which he commented on my statement before the television cameras following a gathering at the Democratic National Committee designed to promote the big Democratic Fund Raising Dinner last Saturday. The press had landed hard on Alan Boyd on the grounds that some transportation lobbyists had been at an earlier such meeting. Jane had rather encouraged me not to go saying I shouldn't stick my neck out on the somewhat pressure business of fund raising. I felt I should.

When I drove up in front of the Democratic National Committee I was met by a supernumerary who told me the television cameras were in the hall, and recommended that I should go up a back entrance. I thought a moment and decided that was bad tactics, went up the front elevator, told the television people to hold their water, that if they wanted to hear from me, wait until the gathering was over, and I'd have my say.

I went in, made some pointed comments about the President's record, the farm record, shook hands around, and left in about 10 minutes. I told the cameras that I was proud to be there, proud of the President's record, proud of the Democratic Party, was happily engaged in trying to raise funds for what I considered a top cause. In response to the question did I think it was improper, I said I wouldn't be there if I thought so.



This was prominently played on national television. A number of people mentioned it to me very favorably, that I had no hesitation in resolutely and proudly stated the case. The President mentioned this and then urged that I should get out around the country.

October 10, 1967, 7:55 p.m. It's now about time to call it a day once again. It's been a long evening grinding away at this desk -- the same last night. This was to have been a fairly light week for last week I canceled my New England Tour. Immediately other things swept in to fill up the time and then some.

Tomorrow I'll join with three other Cabinet officers to testify against protectionist measures which are to be heard before the Senate Finance Committee. There is a current drive to bring together quota laws on steel, watches, meat, dairy, textiles and oil, and thereby to severely cut back our imports. I'm going to hit it hard. I think I've got good testimony, which points out that our exports are twice as great as our imports and we're foolish to act in a sweeping manner. I'm going to emphasize that we're prepared to act when our producers really are being damaged, but to do so carelessly or loosely is a great disservice. It'll be interesting to see how it goes.

The following day I testify before the Senate Government Reorganization Committee on the Moss bill to combine the Forest Service, the Water Functions of SCS, with Interior and the Corps of Engineers in a new Natural Resources Department. My main thrust here is that the current efforts to build town and country to carry forward the President's concept of creative Federalism would be thwarted by turning these programs which have become so indigenous with local efforts and local people and local community development and programs over to Interior which is basically a national and regional oriented Department. I'm then going to pull a kind of cute one and suggest that if Congress is going to insist on combining agencies they would be wise to send the BLM, Park Service, Game and Fish over to Agriculture. Interior may scream about this. It will be interesting to see what they do or say. They

are proceeding very cautiously on it and the Bureau of the Budget is taking a neutral position.

October 20, 1967, 2:25 in the office. I just returned a few moments ago from Syracuse, New York, where I spoke to and had a shirt sleeve session with the members of Agway Coop. This is the biggest cooperative in the country and a very interesting and exciting one. They are in a host of service, production, and distribution activities, with many hundreds of millions of dollars of business yearly. The relationship between the different subsidiary cooperatives, and in some cases private corporations, is fascinating. They truly demonstrate that farmers get a fair return when they not only produce but handle, process and sell as well. They were most urgent that I come up and very, very gracious. We had a small dinner meeting last night for their Board in which they honored the Extension Directors in the States where they do most of their business. Ed Fallon, the General Manager was on the President's Food and Fiber Commission. He did not side with those who expressed my viewpoints and he is quite conservative and so I was rather surprised that I was invited so strongly and treated so royally. The reason came out at breakfast this morning when the Chairman of the Board, President and himself, together with their General Counsel outlined their activities and then informed me they were deeply concerned about an anti-trust action pending against them. They need some help. Hence, all the attention. That may be a little cynical but it was a considerable part of it. I'm going to try and help them for it would appear to me that they are not in violation. Certainly they are not acting predatorily and the mere fact they are becoming large ought not to be enough to run an anti-trust action against them. Anyway I'm going to have a meeting this afternoon with our legal people and Dave Angevine and take a look at it. I was glad to get this exposure. It's quite an operation.

Then I spoke to their annual meeting, some 4000 to 5000 people, in a tremendous auditorium. I enjoyed it. The boys thought I spoke too long, but I had a well prepared manuscript which I had worked over enough so that I did not need to read it. I reviewed farm prices and income past, present, and future, and made a strong statement in favor of our farm programs. I even cited the Food and Fiber Commission, qualifying by saying that my words might not reflect exactly what Ed Fallon had in mind, he could speak for himself.

I also made a strong Vietnam statement which they listened to apparently warmly and certainly not critically.

Then on to the airplane and back here. The question and answer period was not as long as I had hoped, only about 40 minutes, for I had spoken close to 50, but it was well received. This answering technique works extremely well. I seldom get hung on a question I can't answer, and the mere fact that I stand up there and take the questions creates a very positive response from the audience. I closed this one off and got a big laugh when I said that I've gotten a note from your program director that it's time for me to close and no longer take questions because you have a business meeting to conduct. Then I added, I want to make it clear to you that I'm not running out on you -- you're running out on me. All in all I thought it was quite worthwhile.

I went up yesterday afternoon and met with their Central New York Planning Agency. This encompasses 5 counties with Syracuse as the center. It's interesting and novel, both because it reaches throughout all of the 5 counties, including the total rural area in them and not just the metropolitan area, and also because there is a program called "Midway" which is an effort by Extension to tie in with this Planning function and to educate people throughout the area about the plans and the process to create the understanding and support necessary to



further action in preparing and implementing a plan. I was a little disappointed that the planning wasn't further along than it is. They have only \$50,000 and basically are waiting for Federal money.

Then I met with the Technical Action Panel there and was very encouraged by it. Barthly Beach, our FHA Director is a good man and is moving in strongly. It would appear that the other Agencies and local agencies as well are pitching in in pretty good shape. I was especially pleased at the response of the Executive Director of the State ASCS Committee who outlined how they approached the assignment of reaching the poor in their section of Appalachia with land improvement programs. As he put it, he didn't know what would happen when he approached the hard bitten ASCS elected Committeemen and tried to tell them to go out and help the person up the road who they would contend, and in some cases rightly so, were in bad shape because they spent too much time in the local gin mill. He ended up by saying that it had worked surprisingly well, that 75 out of 150 Committeemen had pitched in and then told a couple of success stories of people they had moved successfully from marginal hill farms into decent valley farms. He described it as an enormously gratifying personal experience and I was touched with it. All in all, it would appear to me that our Technical Action Panel approach is beginning to work. Again I had people from Labor, HUD, and OEO and they seemed to be turning to the TAPs because that is really the best machinery to get a job done. I'm going to have a meeting here in a few moments on the Rural Urban Balance Symposium. Monday I got a nasty memorandum from Bob Weaver complaining in the strongest language about the use of the word "balance". None of the other Cabinet members seem to give a darn. Humphrey indicated he thought this was a lot of nonsense. Weaver contends that there was an agreement among us not to use that word and he insists that I adhere to it. Well, there wasn't. It was agreed it wasn't

the most satisfactory term, but it was not determined that we should not use the phrase. I've been cogitating all week as to what best I can do. On the one hand I can ignore it and just go about my business. It's hard to tell what Weaver would do -- the worst he can do would be withdraw HUD from participation and that would result in some very unfortunate publicity. I could write him and tell him we've got to go along or insist that he come up with some new phrases which he hasn't done. Or, I could go see him. I gather that the boys here are recommending that I change the name somehow so we can avoid any serious problems. I suppose I'll have to. We do need to get along. We are working increasingly closely with HUD and should in these new programs and with our new thrust. On the other hand I really hate to have to give in to such nonsense; however, Weaver is, I'm sorry to say, strictly limited and certainly the most limited man in the Cabinet. One of the boys from the National Planning Association said to me this morning that Weaver was a housing developer and didn't raise his <sup>sights</sup> ~~sites~~ any further than that. That's probably about it.

October 22, 1967 -- 9:30 a.m. at home. It's a beautiful fall Sunday morning. I'm the only one up. Mike has his friends with him from Rutgers. The boys are just stirring. Jane is sleeping. This has been a perfectly magnificent fall day after a rather rainy, crummy week. I'm going to do some yard work with Mike and we'll listen to a couple of pro football games before he goes back to Rutgers. He came in Friday night and things have been pretty hectic around here, with two boys from Cornell, Nancy here for dinner with Mike and Connie on Friday, and last night one of the Cornell boys had his girl, Connie and Mike. Mike got his schedule kind of screwed up and we had a rather wild time. Anyhow, it's great to have him back and things are sure tumbling around here.

Yesterday was a most interesting day. I had planned to stay home, and late Friday I called the President to ask him if I might make a tentative announcement about a P.L. 480 package to India so we could have a favorable impact on the grain market as quickly as possible. He told me to go ahead and then called back and said he wanted to talk about it. In the process I told him of my speech at Syracuse and that after a strong statement on Vietnam I was surprised that there were no questions on that but rather questions on agriculture. He gave me then quite a statement about what we needed to say and why and how, and then said "Come and have lunch tomorrow" that he was lunching with Souvanna Phouma. I of course was delighted to do so. Then we had a call from the White House for me to be there at 11:00 to see the President and at 11:15 to talk feed grains. I was there at 11:00 somewhat disappointed because with the lovely day and the boys home I wanted to stay here. The President came in shortly after I was there and we went out to the Rose Garden where as it turned out I spent most of the day. It was a perfectly magnificent day. The Rose Garden is lovely. The flowers this time of the year are fall flowers -- golds, dark browns, and different shades in between. The sky was blue -- the sun was warm. There wasn't a cloud. The grass was magnificently green and rolling as it is in the White House Grounds. The flag was snapping over the Mansion section. All in all it was a scene one can't forget and you couldn't help but revel in it. The first thing the President ~~did~~<sup>was</sup> to hand me a statement from a State Chairman in Nebraska about the general election situation and attached to it a letter from a farmer there saying that farmers wouldn't vote again for Johnson. I enclose a copy of this letter. (<sup>attached</sup>Please put it in my diary.) What do we do about this, he said. I don't know where all the numbers come from where I'm concerned. I don't see any rich farmers. I just looked at the



October 24, 1967

Mr. John Thor  
Chairman  
Stanton County  
Democratic Committee  
Stanton, Nebraska 68779

Dear Mr. Thor:

Your letter of August 10 to John C. Mitchell reached me via the President. As a matter of fact, he and I discussed it at considerable length at the very same time that the peace marchers were besieging the Pentagon. - I can assure you the President and the Secretary of Agriculture deeply share the concern you reflect. I touched on that as strongly as I knew how in a speech I made to the Agway Cooperative in Syracuse, New York, just last week.

I would appreciate it if you would review this presentation, the analysis I make of our position in agriculture and what we can and must do in the next year, and give me your comments on it.

If you are in Washington, I would be delighted to see you and to discuss with you other things that we might and should do in addition to those that I have outlined in the address I enclose. If you can't make it here, would you please write me and give me your comments and particularly outline for me the "simple answers to problems in agriculture and mostly cost free to Government, some that I personally know of that will work."

I can assure you that the close of your letter that "they do not want the answer" is not true. We are earnestly and honestly seeking for the answer but it isn't easy to find, particularly in an agriculture that is changing as rapidly as ours and a Congress which is 90 percent city oriented with tough, mean budget problems of the kind we all have noted in Congress the last week. We fought desperately to pass farm legislation that would improve farm income. We've made some progress, but not enough. We are determined to make more and we need your help to do it.

You can see then that your letter at least is getting a maximum of attention as will any proposals you can make.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Enclosure

cc: Mr. John C. Mitchell, Chairman  
Nebraska Democratic Party

OLFreeman:cwt

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY



August 10, 1967

John C. Mitchell, Chairman  
Nebraska Democratic Party  
311 Anderson Bldg.  
Lincoln, Nebr. 68508

Dear Sir:

Having made a life work in agriculture and related fields I find it difficult to become enthused about the coming election in 1968 with farm prices now 11% below last year. With the net farm income for 1947 being 17.1 billion dollars and now 20 years later, by USDA's own admission, based on the first six months of 1967, the national net farm income is 14.8 billion dollars for the year of 1967. I need not remind you that many prices, especially grain, have fallen sharply during the first six months and more so just recently.

The poultry industry has been taken out of the farmers hands by the large corporate structures many years ago. The cattle industry is now controlled by the big commercial concerns or corporations, owned mostly by the rich and professional people of this country. The hog industry is rapidly going to large confined operations and due to their costs, which are prohibitive to the family farm, will be in a few short years exclusively controlled, like the cattle business is now. This leaves only the grain production for the family farm.

The farmers were asked to increase their corn production by 8% and wheat production by 30%, you would have to be blind to not know what happened to the wheat grower. For the corn producer last year in this area, corn right from the combine out of the field and carrying considerable moisture, was bringing over \$1.25 a bushel. This year prices have already plummeted and this same market will be below 90¢. That is the thanks that the farmer receives for producing as asked by the administration.

Subsidies which are being made and are appearing in the papers will no longer pacify the farmers. Why don't they publish subsidies on the railroad, airlines, buses and ships? You only read about farmers subsidies, which are

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

used to shame the farmers into taking less willingly, in fact, these are consumer subsidies with the public only paying 18% of their earned income for food, the lowest in the world, this is ridiculous. The 300 million railroad rate increase is known as going to cost agriculture 150 million.

I talked to my good friend, Paul Petersen, at Seward, Nebraska, who for 17 consecutive years attended The Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner and this year did not attend. He is a down heartened and disgusted farmer and says he is going to vote Republican next election, regardless of who they run. This is the feeling you find pretty much over the mid-west and with President Johnson's cheap food policy the farmers feel that they have been double, double-crossed.

I have been a Democrat all of my life and am willing to put my money where my mouth is, but I personally feel that in Nebraska we had better save our money, because we are just wasting our time in the 1968 election.

We are going to see violent riots by the farmers before the spring thaw. This is an inside tip for you, as I happen to be in the know as to what is coming, you may inform your friend President Johnson of this.

I have heard that some Democrats propose that Johnson retire so that we can have someone else run in his place for 1968, I whole heartedly endorse this thought.

It has taken some courage to write this letter and speak out. There are some simple answers to problems in agriculture and mostly cost free to the Government, some that I personally know of that will work, but I know that they do not want the answer.

Yours very truly,

*John Thor*  
John Thor, Chairman  
STANTON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC  
COMMITTEE

statement from my ranch this morning and I'm going in further and further. My costs are going up on everything I buy. I can't keep my labor -- they are going to town -- I had six, I have only two now. I wouldn't have those two if they didn't have a very lucrative profit sharing arrangement in some other enterprises. We've got to do something for these farmers. Then he went on to ask me what about it. I told him it was a typical statement, that it represented far too widespread attitude that it was really a response to a disillusionment from last year's high point to this year's low point. I told him I thought our farm programs were working the way we intend them to work, that they have their ups and downs. This year we had to absorb this tremendous increase in production. I pointed out to him how production has increased in every single item you could mention where prices were down some, pointing out that hogs and cattle were pretty good, and dairy was a little better than last year. About that time he hollered for Marv Watson and the other people to discuss the feed grain question. It was now close to a quarter to twelve. He also showed the impatient side of his nature that I'm sure results in many people being highly critical of him as he demanded very impatiently that he should have a telephone out there with him, that he wanted some cream for his chapped and sore hands, why hadn't the other people come sooner, why hadn't Marv Watson brought them out, and when he was informed the Vice President wasn't there yet he said we can't wait for him forever and he generally had people jumping around rather wildly.

Charley Schultze and DeVier Pierson came in, the Vice President a moment later and the discussion on feed grains took place. The President didn't want to talk about \$1.10 which was the recommendation we were making and with Schultze opposing he focused the conversation on \$1.15. He expressed his concern again about farmers and farm income. He expressed a definite feeling



which Humphrey strongly shared and that settles this one, that whatever we are going to do about increased incomes, or actions to bring them about, should be done now and not next year. As the President said, people are making up their minds now. He referred to an 87 to 13 poll in the Minnesota poll in Minneapolis. He stated that all the decisions people were bringing to him were ones that made enemies and not friends. He related again to Charley Schaltze that we needed to do something for Agriculture and that he and Ackley were always deciding against it, that they were in favor of poverty programs and for labor and for Negroes and for all that kind of thing, but they weren't for farmers, and that farmers should get some attention too, and that he would have to send Schaltze out to really do some work and learn what it was like to be a farmer. This in a somewhat jocular vein but a little cutting edge to it, and then he turned to Humphrey and myself in that same pseudo kidding way of his and said, and if you fellows would get out and do something to tell people about the Administration and what we're doing and travel around the country a little bit why you might be able to turn this around, instead Humphrey is off to Saigon, Freeman is off to Rome and in the meantime nobody is carrying the message here. Then he turned to me and said that when we made the feed grain announcement we should make it somewhere in a dramatic setting in the Midwest in a great farm group where we could command a maximum attention and we should be out there with those farmers until the manure was squeezing up between my toes. About this time he got the word that Souvanna Phouma was waiting and so he took off. I stood there for a minute discussing this whole thing with Humphrey who came down solid on increasing the loan rates, although he did not know too much about the facts that make up the program. Incidentally in the course of this discussion increased costs came into being. I felt kind of sorry for Charley Schultze. He was



arguing against an increase to \$1.10 based on the fact it would cost \$50 million which are numbers which he got from us. I didn't agree for I felt we would get the price above the loan if the program worked as we designed it to short the market enough and therefore in the short run it wouldn't increase costs any more than the increase from applying a higher loan level in the formula for payment for the diverted acres. But when the President jumped it up to \$1.15, I myself had to back off and say well now I've got to take a look at that. At \$1.15 it could have some effect on the diverted acres program by assuring the price at a level where farmers would not come into the program and we could end off worse off than we are anyway. Well, he said, bruskiy, get me a paper on this then and get it promptly. I called John Schnittker. We have that one in the mill. Frankly, I'm not sure about it yet myself, but the more I think about it the more I think we ought to go ahead and move it up. It would will be below our target. As far as market price farmers would appreciate it, it would provide a floor next year regardless of what happens. And so I'm going to try to get some way to do this.

Rice came into the picture too, and he asked about rice and why we didn't have more rice. I told him we had had enough rice, but we didn't want too much rice and that we had proceeded with some caution. When I told him that a rice program clearly would cost \$80 to \$100 million more because ~~it~~ definitely producing more rice, not less, and it meant shipping it out of the field for AID he wasn't so excited. I also told him he would be getting pressures to increase the loan rate on rice, that this was one area where I felt they were doing extremely well the way it is and I hesitated to do that. We must get a good rice memo to him pointing out alternative costs, including those costs if we increase the loan rate, and I think be able to resist that, which will be made harder as will be setting the peanut loan rate if we

increased the feed grain level as I think he plans to do. After a bit of conversation with Schultze and DeVier Pierson I went over to the Mansion and up to the President's quarters where he was sitting in the drawing room with Souvanna Phouma, his daughter, McNamara and Vance, Walt Rostow, Bill Bundy, Dean Rusk, the Vice President and myself. I'm sure those State Department types wondered what in the dickens I was doing there. The President made a statement in his Press Conference, that is George Christian did, that he had called me in to discuss rice with Souvanna Phouma. Actually, he called me in to give me a little more background, a kind of a dividend from my speech on Friday which was widely reported and which according to Humphrey had pleased the President very much. Anyway we sat around and talked through an interpreter which is always clumsy. I didn't get much out of it. We then went into lunch and I didn't get much out of that either.

Phouma's daughter is quite attractive, speaks fluent English, had spent some time at Harvard apparently, and is active in their Government. There was a bit of talk about rice, the new wheat strains, what it means. The President asked a few questions about agriculture, mostly we got in a kind of a kidding session where he was riding Bob McNamara a bit because the latest attack on Hanoi mentions Rusk, the President and Rostow, as the prime hawks and leaves out McNamara. He also teased McNamara about McCarthy. Apparently McCarthy has had some contacts with McNamara. McNamara said that was a Humphrey-Freeman responsibility and so it went. All in all it wasn't a particularly exciting event. It appears that Souvanna Phouma thinks because a pause in bombing might be necessary, but he emphasizes very, very strongly the importance of our place and our part in Southeast Asia. He would like bombing directed a bit more to invasion routes and probably a little less to

North Vietnam. I suspect this is the attitude of a lot of them when you get down to it.

The President asked to see McNamara for a while and Rusk, so I asked Humphrey if he wouldn't visit with me a minute and we went back out to the Rose Garden. I asked him primarily how we can orchestrate the public relations of the farm situation now. He volunteered that he thought my personal position was vastly improved over a year ago when he thought I was in serious trouble, that farmers generally now thought that I was trying. He emphasized that he thought we ought to go ahead with these programs even if they did cost money which we could do with Commodity Credit Corporation financing. He was, as always, strong on making P.L. 480 go further and making the right noises about using it. He, I think, is not at all convinced that our responsible position on P.L. 480 is a sensible one and that we ought to tune up that song. I'm not sure about that. He said he had been having excellent relations with the President lately, breakfasts, lunches, and long talks -- that he had talked with the President on the phone this morning an hour and a half, and he said the President was very pleased with me and what I was doing. He smiled and said you know when anybody attacks those around him why he really plants his feet and goes to fight for them. He said that is one of his great traits. And it is. He said the President had commented that I was a fighter, that I should be used more, that generally he was very, very favorable. All that is good news and confirms what he had told some Senators last week. So it is good to have a little assurance. We were about ready to break up and Humphrey to go to make a recording when out came the President with Averell Harriman. He sat down and indicated he expected us to stay and then began to review the overall foreign policy situation with Averell and what he thought about Vietnam. Averell said that he thought progress had been made there and commented that the election held and the institution of a Government of Vietnam in that country

was extraordinary under all the circumstances, but it was his judgment that we should plan for a pause in the bombing again. That we should try and organize to get a maximum pressure on Vietnam by other countries while that pause was under way, and that we should do what we could to further negotiations between the new Government and the national liberation front in Vietnam. Humphrey was in complete agreement on this. The President mostly listened. He commented on the bombing pause by saying that it hadn't done any good before, that he was fearful that that simply meant that you made the people that are now with you on Vietnam, the hawks, angry so they would say, what's the use this fellow isn't going to do the job anyway, and the doves keep right on going the direction they're going. Harriman and Humphrey didn't argue about that but said that in their judgment they felt that politically it was going to be necessary and that it ought to be timed with the right occasion and they guessed that probably that would be right around Christmas and time. About then the President left to issue a press release and I guess to sign a bill and told us to wait and a discussion with Humphrey and Harriman rolled a bit. It was interesting. First they both felt strongly that there might be possibilities of getting the new Government to explore with the national liberation front any possible arrangements given the split of families and people on all sides of Vietnam they thought that might have possibilities. Then they felt that the other countries around the world should be tied in when a pause comes so they will be able to put some pressure on Hanoi to do something about real negotiations at such a pause. The President was noncommittal about all this. I asked Humphrey and Harriman while he was gone why we did so poorly in the propaganda battle and they simply related the old saw that the press wants to report negative and not be positive. Harriman pointing out how a recent surrender of 25 Nazi Vietnamese which had been released as information had been totally ignored by the press, and not used anywhere. We also discussed



a little bit the question of further bombing of North Vietnam, particularly the dikes which apparently would result in literally inundating most of the countryside including all of Hanoi. They agreed that this was a frightful thought but given the way this goes that might be necessary, too.

The President then came back and our conversation continued, ranging rather widely. I was interested in his comments on Fulbright. He pointed out with some force that Fulbright had voted no on minimum wage each step of the way, that he had always been against everything, that Fulbright had a definitely conservative voting record, that he was a small town Arkansas boy despite the fact that he had gotten his education, or a lot of it, in Europe. The President said that Fulbright had on one occasion when he was having a discussion with him and had asked Fulbright why he was so against Vietnam, Fulbright just said to him they're not our kind of people, and then with real vehemence the President said that means what Fulbright is really saying is nigger, nigger, nigger. It was clear that what the President meant and what he detested was the fact that Fulbright basically was anti-racial and as such was no liberal and yet he got the kind of accolades he does from liberal circles. About this time there was some noise and the President got up and said come along. We walked across the White House grounds to the enclosure where he keeps his dogs. Banco the big white one and the four little dogs were turned loose and what a time they had running, barking, and jumping all over the President and each other around the White House grounds as we strolled back to our chairs in the Rose Garden. About that time I discovered that B.K. Nehru was coming. It seemed that the President had asked him to come over to discuss the proposed P.L. 480 package to India. This, I think, because he shared my wish and was responding to my urging that we get on with the P.L. 480 business as quickly as possible so it would help the

domestic farm price picture. Nehru came in with his usual suave and bland way. The President sat him down in the sun in a chair next to him. Harriman, Humphrey and myself were still gathered around. Walt Rostow came in with Nehru. The President told him that we had our budget problems here. That we were anxious to continue working with them and to be helpful in any way that we could, that we were considering a 6-months allocation of wheat for India, but that we had our problems with Congress and if we wanted to convince Congressmen with whom I was then in touch to go along with something of this type why it was very helpful to have some kind of quid pro quo. In this case he said we felt that if India could abolish the zones between the States and the movement of grain and could assure us that their commercial purchases of wheat would be made in the United States this would improve our position in dealing with our Congressmen very much. Nehru was not particularly taken back, he had an AID memo in his pocket with some figures on a sheet of paper as to their crop now. It roughly coordinated with our estimates around 95 million ton. When he broke it down to seed and feed to 2 1/2 million tons that were to go back into private storage hands and 7 1/2 million tons of imports, why he then had a figure of about 13.5 kilogram intake for the average Indian which he said was less than they had had before the recent drought period. He then pointed out that he felt that this was not adequate by way of reserves to abolish the zones and that matter had been recently discussed by the Chief Ministers. He was really fairly firm and direct about it.

About this time Joe Califano came in with a half a dozen young men that he has acquired and work around him who are very bright in the White House and it seemed that he had a session scheduled to talk with the President. So the President merely said to them to sit down and you fellows can observe

a discussion taking place here about a great issue and have some idea of how decisions are made. So he turned to me and said, "What about it, Orville?" In effect it was, go to it. I wasn't really prepared for this and I didn't necessarily consider it good negotiating, but there we were. So I made my point as strongly as I could that this was the time to abolish the zone. It would take something of a bold step and I couldn't give a firm answer myself as to whether it was politically possible to do it, but that we wished the Central Government would make a real try to do it, that the zones accomplished no useful purpose, they were purely protective in nature, and now when we have a situation whenever we are having a big crop and the danger of a sharp drop in prices is all the more reason for abolishing them. I argued that if prices do fall now the Indian farmer will feel it's because of the new varieties and the new techniques and he will be discouraged and disillusioned in using them and this could be very serious and threaten the momentum that we all feel they have built up now. Nehru really doesn't know anything about it. He came back with a rather lame statement that didn't the people on the ground know best and didn't we have any confidence in Democracy, if the prices fell in this fashion and the zones caused it, why then the people could vote them out. It was really a pretty flat and not very meaningful statement. It didn't leave me much more to say, but to go back and point out that in my judgment that the Government in a Democracy didn't always mean doing exactly what people wanted, it very often meant doing a thing that's right and then convincing people it is right and that so far as the voters are concerned they don't and won't know anything about this and the likelihood is if prices do fall that it will be blamed on something else rather than zones and that the zones will be more firmly established than ever before. This went on for maybe 15 or 20 minutes and then there wasn't much more to be said. The President summarized it up by asking me to review a bit further

with some of my technical people the implications of this and was it 2 million ton reserves which we would propose, to include 1 million tons from the Indians themselves matched by a million from us during the first six months, and that if they could and should do that and if we wished to continue to push hard. Nehru in turn was to go back to the Indian Government with our proposition and we left it at that.

At that point I marched out. The President stayed with the Califano young men. I would kind of liked to have stayed and participated in that but by now it was getting on to 5:00 o'clock. I wanted to call John Schnittker about the feed grain and rice that lies before us. I wanted to call Les Brown about the Indian and P.L. 480 matter, and so home I came to do a little raking in our front yard and then to try and help Mike unsort his problems with his young people here and to get ready to take Jané and Connie, which I did, to a movie last night.

All of this conversation in the Rose Garden was orchestrated by the noise in the background of the Vietnam protesters. I haven't had a chance to read the paper and really didn't listen to much news yesterday. I haven't had a chance to read the paper. Periodically people brought the President in reports. Generally they were that there weren't as many as had been estimated. Apparently they tried to storm the Pentagon and there was a good bit of fussing about it. The President really didn't say too much about it. He seemed to have his balance and equanimity. There was no evidence of any kind of panic or excess tiredness or disillusionment at all. He was kidding in his typical kind of sharp, deprecatory manner directed at everyone around him at one time or another. He was playing with his dog, little Yuki, and seemed perfectly self-contained and determined. It was clear, of course, that he was worried about politics, was watching the polls and was concerned that he had to make so many decisions that



were unpopular and not very many that are popular. He referred to this a number of times. No doubt but what his interest now running high in connection with agriculture with a willingness to spend some money on it is triggered by the political situation. The letter in question from Nebraska no doubt had made a contribution. This does pose me, as I say, with some problems here.

It's interesting that in my own Department because we have been very cost conscious, because we've had to fight for everything we could get for agriculture, and also because basically the economists, and that includes John Schnittker, believe that farm income is up sharply, that studies show it, that all the facts show it, and that if we're going to make these programs work we mustn't let them get too costly. Therefore, this general philosophy has permeated the preparation of our working papers. In cotton it resulted in an anti skip-row position which I turned around and we finally ended up allowing skip-row. That was a single handed performance and if anyone ever says the policy makers and the Secretaries are run by the Staff and the top Administrators of the Government, this is an outstanding instance where that is not the case.

I suspect the same thing is going to happen on feed grains. We brought in the Feed Grain Advisory Committee. We had concluded that we needed to keep feed grains down, the feed grains program costs down, and we pretty well got that Committee to recommend the '66 program for diversion but not do much about the loan rate. Then our hearings around the countryside clearly came in loud and strong to increase the loan rate. A number of the boys indicated this to me in sessions but it was clear that by the time they had filtered it through Jaenke and Godfrey and Schnittker that they realized this wasn't in the park and although they weren't necessarily convinced, they did acknowledge the merit in the position of their superiors and were not vigorously contesting it beyond saying let's go to \$1.10 for the loan which is about where the ASCS lined up.

John Schnittker pretty well bought that, although he would prefer leaving the loan where it is. Now I'm prepared to consider \$1.10. John was thunderstruck when I told him that yesterday. Nonetheless the more I think about it the more I believe we ought to go ahead and play this out. It shouldn't cost very much. We better be sure that the diversion program will work. Then let's get that loan rate up there. If our target is about \$1.20 corn, why shouldn't we have a loan rate of \$1.00 corn which when we hit some temporary overproduction periods, particularly within a given year, we'll hold that price up. It may very well limit the fluctuations of the market, but so what? That's not necessarily bad. Anyway I'm going to have to move that one around tomorrow and it will be interesting to see how this great and ponderous organization of mine begins to shift itself around to conform with the basic policy decisions of those who run it. All of this would appear to deny the thesis of Galbraith's book, at least in part, that the decisions in big corporations as in big Government are made on a Committee system and that no administrator can go much further than his committee.

October 25, 1967 -- 10:00 am at the office. In a few moments I'm going to have a big meeting of the Task Force on Rural Poverty. They are waiting. I just got a call from the White House moving up the appointment to discuss feed grains from 12:00 o'clock today to 11:00. Monday I spent a good part of the day preparing a detailed memorandum to the President, rethinking, restaffing, reestimating the alternatives. Ellender just called. He had been visited by DeVier Pierson who when I called him said that the President had ordered it, commenting that he was criticized for not consulting so he was sure going to consult. Anyway Pierson going to Ellender, alerted Ellender, and he called me to say pointedly that he felt it would be contrary to the Committee report and to the sense of the program to raise the loan rate. Now the fat is really in the fire. I've changed my recommendation to the President to increase the

loan rate from what I initially had recommended but to increase the diversion payment percentage even more so we would counteract the increased loan rate and would be more certain of getting the adequate number of acres diverted. It's really a difficult balancing act here. (a) The costs go up sharply with loan rate and with increasing the diversion rate; (b) It isn't good for the program in the long run to increase the loan rate and we hate to do that and prejudice it; but (c) the attitude of many skeptical, bruised, abused, and sensitive farmers and their co-workers will be affected by the loan rate announcement. We'll just have to discuss the alternatives with the President and see where we go. I could then go to Ellender I suppose if necessary and say, "Look this is simply some politics, I'll move this down as soon as I can, but we've got a real problem politically now. The President is deeply concerned. I would only do this under great stress, but these are the reasons for it and I can only hope that you will understand and ask your concurrence." I know that he will be hurt -- that he will protest, and that he will feel strongly that we have eroded a basic premise in the program and it will certainly affect his attitude and support for it in the future. This is a painful prospect. It's been a struggle with Ellender for almost 7 years now. He has always disliked the feed grains program. He has gone along only when literally dragged. Now he might sit still for it and we may have to alienate him further. I just don't know what to do about it.

October 25, 1967 -- 12:55. Well the decision is made and I didn't win. The President ended up at \$1.05 for the loan rate, but he went along with 45 percent diversion rate. I'm disappointed in one way but almost relieved because I think we shouldn't increase the loan rate and I dreaded facing Ellender with it. Now we've got to put the best possible face on this, it's really a pretty good program, and carry it out around the country. The President, as I expected, looked at me and said, "you were in here Saturday talking about \$25 million and

then when I indicated I may go along with you and increase this program to sweeten it, you come back with \$200 million." He said, I don't mind your getting in bed with me but I don't expect you to sleep all night.

He was, of course, absolutely right and I tried to explain to him that on reviewing this further I was concerned as to its importance in light of his giving it such importance. That I had reviewed the figures again in great detail and had concluded we should play it safe.

At this point I moved off the \$1.10 loan rate down to \$1.05 with the 45 percent diversion rate and the President then turned to Charlie Schultze and said, "Is that all right with you? Will you buy that \$90 million more, yes or no?"



Schultze said, "As a good Democrat rather than as a Budget Director, I'll go along." Clearly the President was concerned about the newspaper story this morning by Felix Blair quoting an AID cable to all their missions stating that we could not plan and program more generously under P.L. 480 for the supply situation was much improved from a year ago, referring back to the order they put out to consider 25 percent tighter advance planning over P.L. 480 this a year ago. This was the cable that got so controversial with McGovern attacking us and my stating repeatedly that we had not failed to meet real needs or legitimate programs anywhere because of tight supply. McGovern was on the floor of the Senate congratulating the Administration and giving his approval of this now which obviously grated the President. But more important, the general tone of this could be taken to mean that he is now acting because of over-supply, low farm prices, and election needs and pressures. This obviously he did not want. That came out when in my presenting the case for increasing loan rates and payments I made the point that we needed to buy this, he thought I meant buy elections and obviously was worried about that language. I meant to buy out the acreage of course and we got that straightened out, I think. Obviously, he is worried about getting that label and image, particularly because increasingly he is taking, and I think rightly so and effectively, the posture of responsible, doing the right thing, regardless of all the outside pressures.

Also, yesterday he had DeVier Pierson go up on the Hill and talk to Members of the Senate and House Committees. I knew nothing about this. Ellender came down hard against increasing the loan rate, Holland the same, Talmadge was for increasing it. Ellender called me this morning and spoke very strongly against increasing the loan rate. The President I'm sure was worried on the Floor of the Senate Hearing that he was out buying votes with the Farm Program

increasingly the loan rate at the same time we're trying to divert acres, i.e., the old "suck and blow" at the same time argument. When the Vice President tried to say that Ellender is always against corn programs anyway, the President cut him off short saying, "So is Albert Gore always against us, always attacking us, but he is still a Senator and Ellender is the Chairman of a Committee and we can fight with just so many people at the same time." He is of course absolutely right and the balance of these two factors, neither of which I planned, turned the whole picture around from last Saturday when the President was pro doing more to the more limited decision today. However, 16 is a good decision. It's a good program, now we've got to get it in the right light, get the right people involved such as Tony Dechant, maneuver it around where they realize we've done well and they will go out and be enthusiastic about it. That means I've got some phone calls to make early tomorrow so I'm sure to reach these people and try and get them in the proper frame of mind.

The President also went over with us in some detail the polls that he has breaking down the Gallop Poll in various parts of the country. It's very interesting, he is really doing quite well everywhere as opposed to every candidate mentioned by the Republicans except in the Midwest. In the Midwest, it was Romney 60 - Johnson 30. I was surprised that in most places around the country Romney was leading the other Republican candidates. I had thought that his faux pas including the ill advised brain-washing statement would have pretty well destroyed his image, but he must have more following than we had realized. The President basically concluded as he went over these with us that we were in the ball park and that the numbers are such that we need not feel too grim about it, except for the Midwest. He shook his head there and said he could only explain that because after all the Midwest was isolationists. Then it must be the farm program and farm prices -- and he kind of drifted off with no better reasons for it at that point. Frankly, I don't have any better

reasons for it either and we really need to do something about it. The President was obviously distressed by the Felix Belar story. This man has had a direct pipeline, actually gets the documents out of the AID Agency. Bill Gaud is going to be over here for lunch in a matter of minutes and I'm going to ask him about this. He wasn't as much angry as he was sad about that. He made the statement that information and what the President does seemed to be like water, you just can't keep it stored up. He related that his wife had told him to just assume that anything he says to anybody is inevitably going to come out. I guess that's right. It certainly looks that way.

Thursday, October 26, 1:10 am -- at home, at the desk.

I have been dictating already for over 45 minutes, letters to Dean Rusk, Larry O'Brien, Tom Hughes, John Gardner and the President. All a follow-up of an exciting day and evening. I've already dictated the sequence of events in the President's office today on the Feed Grain Program. It's ironic where this one ended up. Now I've got to package it in a press statement and presentation which will sell but not go so far as to undermine my "credibility". I've been working on a draft on that. It's going to be a bit difficult to keep the wolves, to-wit, Farmers Union and NFO quiet and make them believe that it's as good as we can get. I'm sure we will be attacked in some quarters but I hope to get a good front on it.

I plan a press conference tomorrow -- tomorrow night I'm off to Nashville for a four-station nationwide Farm Editors' radio question and answer session, then on to Texas for the President's Mexican Spanish-American Committee hoe-down.

Hopefully I will get back here and Jane and I can get off Sunday night for Rome.

Late today we had a very successful launching of the Outdoor America Yearbook. All of the Conservation Organizations were present as sponsors at



the Wildlife Federation building. I presented autographed copies of the book to Laurance Rockefeller, he didn't get there because of the weather, Mrs. Pierce of the Women's Federation Club, and a 12-year old boy who was the contributor of an article and a grandson of Lloyd Partain of the Soil Conservation Service.

Also today a big meeting on the Poverty Task Force, a monumental task, where we got all the Departments of the Government to comment in depth on the recommendations of the President's Rural Poverty Commission, and not only that but to cost it out. Quite a headache. I'm going to deliver that in person tomorrow to Califano for it is a monumental task. I've been working on a letter to the President about his speech to the Grange, on my press release for tomorrow for the Feed Grain Program, on my FAO speech, and goodness knows what else.

Then tonight we had a followup of the pseudo Cabinet meeting of a week ago at the State Department for the Cabinet Officers meeting with Rusk. It was a kind of frustrating session really. We sat around and had a few drinks and tried to analyze the events of last weekend, the anti-Vietnam march on the Pentagon. No one really knows what to make of it. Joe Fowler thought we needed to use more force to stop that kind of thing. Weaver pretty well agreed. Gardner seemed to have more confidence in the overall public reaction against such excesses. His speech in Virginia which he sent me indicated more fear, however. It seemed to indicate his concern that the fabric of our society was eroding when people would not conform to decent standards of conduct and respect for others. McNamara was more or less pleased with the weekend's events, completely disgusted with the far out exhibitionists and their vulgarity and crudeness. Enormous force used with restraint was his key. My contribution was minor -- mainly that I felt in the overall the American people had enough sense to reject that kind of thing and that the leaders of it would

themselves find the ground cut out from under them when they no longer had public support. Gardner more or less agreed. We went in to dinner. What a plush layout that State Department is. We had the most enormous and delicious lobsters I have ever enjoyed. They were as big as your leg -- beautifully done, what a gourmet that was.

Our conversation first directed itself to the domestic political scene. It was a widely varying discussion. I couldn't help thinking that I could have an equally stimulating one in the Department at almost any level. It surely wasn't particular scintillating, informed, decisive or knowledgeable. Actually the only person that showed any depth or any real feel was John Gardner. I am impressed with that fellow. Bob Weaver is impossible. He's all over the place -- insecure, academic, professorial, indecisive. Udall is quiet as a church mouse. I guess he's pretty much grounded because of Vietnam and his brother's turn-around where he has announced his support of the Administration. Boyd doesn't know what he's for. Fowler is a kind of a hawk. He's worried about inflation. He feels that fundamentally people just want to be left alone. That they are concerned about our programs, our identification with those who aspire for better things. All in all it kind of circulated around with lots of nonsense. I made the point that Eisenhower won in 1956 by being for what is and not rocking the boat, but that the Democrats couldn't win that way, that we were the party of those who aspire for better things and when people do so aspire cease identifying themselves with the Democrats we're done. Basically I think most people agreed with me on that when the dust settled. Gardner kept coming in from time to time offering to try and synthesize our different analysis of the situation and how to reach people into a meaningful document. I tried to support him in this, pointing out that fundamentally what we needed was hope, that we were a party of those who aspire, that we could take the various programs from around the

Government, given the enormous accomplishments we have made in the past 6 years and synthesize them into a pattern of progress and a pattern of hope for the future. I think it came out that way and that he will proceed to do that. In any event I wrote him a letter to that effect (letter attached).

Larry O'Brien then came in quite late. He had been in a meeting with Congressmen at the White House. After some preliminaries he asked some questions about Vietnam. The results were rather astounding and I'm sure shook up Dean Rusk and probably Bob McNamara. Outside of Larry and myself, Dean of course, it was clear that no one in the Cabinet had talked or wanted to talk about Vietnam. Even John Gardner said that he felt very uncomfortable and didn't see how he could speak about Vietnam when his main interest, activity, and information were in Health, Education, etcetra. I'm afraid I again bowled myself into the conversation saying that really that wasn't much of a problem that all we had to do was identify ourself with the basic issue, Chinese Communist expansion and its threat to our security, and once we did that why the rest would fall into place and a minimum of knowledge would permit us to take normal questions and we could always duck the detailed and specific ones. No one rose to the occasion.

Later on when everyone else had left, meanwhile I had tarried to talk with Ramsey Clark about the problem of an antitrust action against Agway Coop, asking him to examine it himself because the Justice Department was anti-coop and further urging him if he felt that action had to be taken that it ought to be delayed until after the election for we had enough problems now without giving our enemies additional information for saying we're anti-coop, he agreed to look -- anyway I was there a bit longer. Dean had asked Larry O'Brien to stay and I got in on the conversation. We covered the political situation rather thoroughly and it kind of summarized this way. Again I was taking a rather progressive

position. I do hope I'm not alienating these people, but no one else seemed ready to think or at least to speak out in connection with it strongly. I urged Larry that he should take the lead, call in all top Administrators in the Government and lay the law down that from now until next November they needed to use the people and the resources in their Departments to identify all concerned, including the recipients of programs, with the Democratic Party. By that I didn't mean that we should be crudely political on a quid pro quo basis but we ought to make it clear that these programs mostly are Democratic programs and as such those who benefit from them should be aware of the fact that they have a responsibility or at least some reason to support the Democratic Party and should be reminded of it and involved in the Party effort in every way possible. I made this point after Larry had made it clear that he saw little hope that the Democratic Party under John Bailey was really going to do anything about this. He agreed with me that the President put much stock in the Party anyway and historically never had.

Then I suggested to Dean Rusk that he call in members of the Government individually and convince them of the merits of the Vietnam thing and enlist their support. He backed off in a way and said he shouldn't have to do that, that it was the Democrats Administration and they should be for it anyway. Then he complained rather pathetically that not a Member of Congress who was attacking our position in Vietnam had ever picked up the phone to call him. I told him that he was star gazing to think that they would. That basically if they could make points in their District by being critical or by straddling the fence they were apt to do it and they couldn't care less about Dean Rusk, that in politics you can't afford to have pride, that he would have to go out and hustle for them for they sure wouldn't hustle for him, that their source of identification and power and reelection didn't rest with him, it rested



with their constituents. He shook his head and said, well perhaps he would have to turn the Department over to Nick Katzenbach and take on this himself and I told him that was exactly what he had to do, but that I was convinced that if he would do it that the great majority would go along and at least those who would not could be identified, we didn't have to push them or drive them, or expose them, or make any move against them, but at least we would know where we were and we could mobilize the troops. I think he agreed. My letter to him, my letter to Gardner and my note to Tom are included in my diary at this point. Now we will see what comes of it all. Hopefully I will have been able to identify and activate, or at least contribute to that end, this Administration on a more meaningful political course in terms of both domestic and foreign issues. Maybe I give myself too much credit, perhaps the other Members of the Cabinet are resentful of my aggressiveness in this, but goodness knows it needs to be done. I can't but help have the feeling that both Larry O'Brien and Dean Rusk have hung back, rather than to exert the leadership that I think they have earned, that they can get and that will be effective if they will only exercise it. I hope it works out that way. In a way it was an interesting even. Now it's 1:30 in the morning -- tomorrow is full of press conferences and all the rest that hangs over my head -- I better squeeze out an hour or two of sleep. So be it for now.

October 26, 1967

Personal and Confidential

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Hughes  
From: The Secretary

The enclosed personal letters to Rusk, Gardner and O'Brien are self-explanatory. It's imperative that we stand prepared to help in any way we can.

The President reviewed with me today refinements and rundowns of the Gallop Poll which show that he is running very strongly with all Presidential aspirants everywhere but in the Midwest. In the Midwest including Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, as well as Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas, Romney is leading 60 - 30. This is appalling.

As we make our plans we must concentrate on the Midwest. We're responsible for it. Frankly, I'm not sure how we should proceed. However, while I'm gone I want you to call together our political pros, concentrate on these States, develop a complete intelligence report analysis on each one, the state of the Democratic party, key people, our rural and farm programs and contacts, the people that participated in the Rural Americans for Johnson and Humphrey, and get the whole ball of wax together. Let's concentrate on the Midwest and forget about the rest of the country for the moment. Town and country tours ought to be planned for the future and a complete overall master plan developed. This of course to be coordinated in accordance with the letters to other Members of the Cabinet which I enclose herewith.

Tom, this is absolutely crucial. Let's mobilize every resource we have and every bit of knowhow we've acquired so we can deliver the Midwest. Somehow we must do it.

OLFreeman:rby

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON

October 28, 1967

Personal and Confidential

Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien  
Postmaster General

Dear Larry:

Just a note to follow up on last week's pseudo Cabinet meeting. I really mean it when I suggest as firmly as I know how that you aggressively take over political leadership. You have earned, and properly so, the affection and respect of everyone in the Cabinet. Clearly you are the political pro, so designated by the President, but more important a title you have earned in your own right.

Pardon my emphasis, but I meant exactly what I said that you should figuratively at least crack the whip. If you would call in selectively all the top Administrators in this man's Government and explore with them what they can do and in effect direct them to carry out a pattern of organization with clear guidelines along the way as to how they should marshal their personnel and their programs to get a maximum political return come November, I'm confident they would respond with alacrity.

If we can help at the USDA, we stand ready to do so. We have a few bodies here that have been exposed politically for quite a while. If I'm not readily available, and I will be at Rome for a while at the FAO, Tom Hughes is alerted.

Larry, you know how to proceed much better than I do, but I do think the time for vigorous, determined, specific direction is now.

May I repeat that I do appreciate your speaking out on the Vietnam issue. Much of the indecision we see today is because many of us have not really heretofore been asked to participate in depth. If Dean will personally review the basic issue with top leaders in Government, I'm confident the overwhelming majority will go with him and when they declare themselves publicly their Departments by and large will come strongly. In my judgment we simply must give Democrats around the country some ammunition and some backing. For the time being at least they are being pounded to death by the "aginnners" and are getting precious little support from the political leadership that tacitly but not openly supports the President.

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

2--Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien

I am enclosing herewith a copy of a personal communication that I sent to John Gardner. I hope that I'm not being presumptuous but I do think that you and he can provide the spark to mobilize and ignite this Administration on a solid political path that we need to start following with all the resources and enthusiasm that we can possibly muster.

Let us know any way that we can help. We've got our hands full in the Midwest and I'm really not sure how to break it, but we'll be going at it with everything we've got.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Enclosure

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY





DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON

October 28, 1967

Personal and Confidential

Honorable John W. Gardner  
Secretary of Health, Education  
and Welfare

Dear John:

You were great at our Cabinet gathering at the State Department last week. Clearly the consensus of our colleagues was that you should prepare a domestic strategy issue paper, a kind of "domestic manifesto." The exact nature and contents of that paper were not very precise.

I hope I'm not presumtuous in trying to set down in general terms what I think it ought to be. In my judgment it ought to express national goals and contain a strong element of challenge, of hope, and even more than that, of promise and tie it all together with a catchy and appealing label that will sell.

Somehow we must reach every American with the promise of a better life. Implicit to this I think is meeting the problems of city and town and country alike maybe as a package. I believe our symposium can make a great contribution to this by synthesizing and broadcasting a new concept about how we can live better. Using the dimension of space we can call for a new quality of living, one which can reach and excite people in all economic groups. It can mean improvement in the slums and a promise of better days. It can mean for the countryside a promise of jobs and opportunity. Conservation, education, health, welfare, recreation, cultural opportunity are a part of it, too. I've been excited and impressed with the response to our town and country appeal. The mail to the Department of Agriculture on this is growing steadily. The requests to participate in our symposium climb every day.

A synthesis of all these forces, aspirations, fears, and programs directed toward a meaningful portrayal of a new quality of living, effectively and dramatically recalling the historic struggle of the Democratic Party for better and more meaningful things for people in all economic, racial and social classes, is I think the answer to our domestic appeal. I repeat, such an appeal does include what we are doing and have done in all our Departments. Conservation as we see it in Agriculture and Interior, highways, HUD's programs for the cities, OEO and poverty, Civil Rights, law enforcement and order, HEW and health, education and welfare -- the total package. The problem obviously is to put it in a demonstrable, definable and meaningful

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

2--Honorable John W. Gardner

dimension, packaged so that people in all walks of life can identify themselves with it. You know how to do this.

John, you have earned the confidence, the respect and the affection of all the members of the Cabinet. I would hope that you would prepare such a document, circulate it among us, and call us in individually or collectively to help. If we can do this and in the process pull the varying viewpoints within the Administration into focus, we can then go out as a team with a domestic manifesto, adjusting it to each of our program areas and the particular audiences that respond to our special responsibilities.

Hope for the future, an identification with the machinery to bring about the kind of future most Americans hope for -- this is what we must articulate. To do this isn't easy, but I am convinced it can be done in moving, understandable, simple terms with which every American can identify. The Democratic Party has accomplished such identification again and again throughout our history. Perhaps the challenge and the difficulty of doing it now is greater than ever before. That ought to make it a greater challenge and a greater satisfaction. Please let me know if I can help.

Thanks so much for your help on the Symposium. Barbara Ward has accepted. Others are joining up. I'm still fussing with Weaver about the title. I've about given in to him, but we're still kind of negotiating at arm's length.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.: This is a lot ~~to~~ ask of you, but it needs doing very badly, and for a lot of reasons only you can do it.

NEGO  
COPY

NEGO  
COPY

NEGO  
COPY



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON

October 28, 1967

Personal and Confidential

Honorable Dean Rusk  
Secretary of State

Dear Dean:

Thank you for your patience and your hospitality at our pseudo Cabinet meeting last week. You presided with skill and deftness.

I honestly believe that if you can find the time it would be most useful for you to call in individually or in groups of two or three the heads of our main Departments in the Federal Government, particularly men with political backgrounds. Some career people will be receptive too, but that's a matter of screening. It would be my judgment, Dean, that the timidity on taking a position on Vietnam by some of these men reflects their own uncertainty on the basic issue. I thought this uncertainty rather well reflected by John Gardner's comments which surprised me. In just a few minutes I believe you can settle the doubts. The fact of the matter is of course that most of us need not get involved in the day to day dialectics, the give and take that we read in the newspaper on who said what, when, where and how. The basic issue is American security and the threat to that security Communist China represents. If that threat can be understood and that we are "buying time" so that the rest of Asia can develop stable governments and a working federation to resist Communist expansion, that's all we of the Cabinet outside of State need to know. Beyond that, the details of the number of offers and counteroffers, the history of South Vietnam and our involvement, and all the rest are basically a matter of detail. Anyone with even a little experience and skill in dealing with questioners or the press can avoid getting involved in details. The main thing is a reassurance that our course is the right one. If that point is made the natural loyalties of everyone involved will, in my judgment, assure a commitment to the cause which will enormously strengthen our position.

If a dozen people in Washington whom we could name would make a strong statement about Vietnam and circulate it in their respective Departments we would find a changeover from doubt and hesitancy and avoidance to a strong position of militancy and support. I'm thoroughly convinced this can be done with a relative minimum of time and effort and danger of exposure. Obviously this must be done carefully so the press doesn't charge you with twisting arms all over the place.

NO  
COPY

NO  
COPY

NO  
COPY

2--Honorable Dean Rusk

Dean, all of this shouldn't be necessary. Everyone should be coming to you the Secretary of State, not only the Administration but Congress as well. Unfortunately, it doesn't work that way sometimes in the American system. Hence the additional burden on an already overburdened Secretary of State.

Anyway the above represents my judgment. Again I hope I'm not presumptuous in offering it relatively unsolicited.

However we cut it, Vietnam is the great issue before the country today. I feel so strongly about it that I have been impelled to set down my thoughts and my suggestions.

Again, thank you for your hospitality, for your unfailing kindness and courtesy. I can assure you we all feel the deepest affection, regard and admiration for you and for the job you are doing.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

P.S.: Don't let McCarthy bother you. He is selling books.

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY





DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON

October 24, 1967

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Dean Rusk  
Honorable William S. Gaud  
Honorable Walter Rostow

From: Orville L. Freeman

Saturday, October 21, a discussion was held with B. K. Nehru regarding the proposal to allocate 3 1/2 million tons of grain to India for the first 6 months of 1968 in turn for a commitment by the Indian Government to abolish their food zones and to do their commercial grain purchasing in the United States. Present at the discussion were the President, the Vice President, Averell Harriman, Walter Rostow and Secretary Freeman.

Secretary Freeman was asked to carry forward a discussion with B. K. Nehru on the proposed arrangements. Nehru's response was as follows:

1. Where the commercial grain question is concerned he thought that that could be worked out, although he expressed some concern that India should protect her relations with her Australian and Canadian friends.
2. Nehru contended that the question of zones had been reviewed by the Chief Ministers very recently and they had concluded that they could not proceed further to liberalize those zones at this time and certainly not to abolish them. He used the figure 8 million tons in reserve as the requirement to abolish the zones. (We later learned that the 8 million ton figure in Nehru's mind was not reserve requirements but import needs.) His crop estimate for the current year was 95 million tons, although he cautioned that until the winter crop was in he could not be sure about that, and therefore it was somewhat premature to hold to that estimate as a firm figure in forward planning, certainly in considering as sensitive and important a matter as buffer zones.

Assuming, however, a 95 million ton figure and making allowances for seed, feed and general attrition, together with an estimated 2 1/2 million ton that would go back into private holdings, he concluded that even with 7 1/2 million ton outside imports the

daily intake of the average Indian would be somewhat less than was enjoyed in 1964. Therefore, he concluded that India was not in a strong enough position yet to do anything about abolishing the zones. (Our estimates, allowing for stock replenishment and assuming a 95 million ton crop and 7.5 million tons of imports for 1967/68, indicate a per capita foodgrain availability for 1967/68 virtually identical to that of 1964/65.)

Secretary Freeman acknowledged that there was a political problem in abolishing zones. However, he pointed out there was a real danger to India's whole agricultural program in not abolishing them. A bold step at this time, he argued, would tend to counteract the downward pressure on prices from a big crop in the most productive states. Producers are increasingly adapting new techniques and methods. The Indian Government and their supporting friends are doing everything in their power to provide new seed, fertilizer, pesticides and all the required inputs and to establish the credit and distribution structure that will make possible the transition from a concessional to a commercial agriculture. If there is now a sharp drop in prices because of a bumper crop, it could well result in basic disillusionment by the Indian farmer which would set back this entire effort very seriously. The zones by bottling up production in certain States will have exactly that effect and now is the time to abolish them. With 2 million tons of Government held reserves clearly attainable, plus an increase of at least 2 1/2 million tons in private hands, this is the time to move.

Nehru talked about the necessity to listen to local decision-makers and about the Democratic process which would reflect itself in the demands of people to abolish the zones should the contingencies outlined by Secretary Freeman take place.

Secretary Freeman's response was that on occasion people in a Democracy must lead rather than count noses and that the issue of zones or not zones wasn't, and wasn't likely to ever be, a political one in which the people of India could express themselves in any event.

Nehru responded by saying that should a move be made in the direction of abolishing zones there ought to be assurance of grain from the United States for a longer period than 6 months.

The conversation closed here with a directive by the President that Secretary Freeman review his analysis of the India situation and confirm or distinguish his strong position that food zones in India should be completely abolished now and a maximum amount of pressure brought to bear to accomplish that goal.

Nehru in turn was asked to communicate to his Government and to see what could and would be done by them to abolish the food zones.



October 28, 1967 -- 1:00 am, Actually it's October 29. Tomorrow we leave for Rome. Yesterday I was in El Paso -- more about that later.

We just returned from the Hughes. We spent a couple of hours over there with Congressman Don Fraser and Arvonne. The subject naturally turned to Vietnam. Don, of course, is a dove. When this is pursued, there are of course nuances as to his position (a) he doesn't think we should get out of Vietnam, (b) he thinks our policy there is wrong, both in the bombing of North Vietnam, and also that there is an indigenous revolt, that the involvement of Communist China is minimal, and that our overall policy has been abortive. The differences of judgment as we review them are differences of degree. The discussion moved into the political realm and what do we do now so that we prevent a nasty confrontation with great political losses as we face the coming year. Gene McCarthy over the week end made a speech on the West Coast where he demanded the resignation of Rusk and declared that perhaps there should be a different Presidential nominee than Johnson. This of course puts Humphrey in a very difficult position and fuels the fires of the doves and the anti-Administration people in Minnesota. Don is worried about it. He tries to hold a kind of middle-ground with the doves unhappy with him a good bit of the time. He doesn't want to be pushed into an anti-Administration position. He recognizes the great accomplishments of the Administration and is anxious that a Democrat be re-elected. The question I posed to him was "How do we accomplish this and prevent a nasty confrontation?" As I pointed out, so far the doves have had the initiative because they are bigoting, screaming, hollering, condemning; because they are "aginnners" they have commanded the media -- while the pro-Administration forces have been largely shackled. As I pointed out to him we have hesitated, rather than Rusk, McNamara occasionally and the President, to say very much because the situation is sensitive. A misquote or a mis-statement

could have an impact worldwide, while Fraser and others can say what they wish for they have no responsibility. Thus, I pointed out, we have been handcuffed -- now the time has come, because those who would support the Administration have had little ammunition and few spokesmen when the political necessities domestically are such that they require running the hazard of making some mistakes in statements that would be adverse in the International area. Don understood this and in no way questioned or objected to those of us in the Administration speaking out. The President was entitled to this, he said, although he didn't necessarily feel that we could basically agree with the policy with which he strongly and honestly disagrees. The problem then is, as I posed it to him -- What do we do now in this very difficult political situation, when those of us that are pro-Administration and our position demands speaking out do so without driving him and others, and I mentioned Ken Galbraith who I think is trying to maintain a leadership position in ADA so when the time comes the Convention choice, the President to be sure, can be supported as perhaps from their point of view, the lesser of two evils. He didn't know about this, nor what to do about it, but we left it we ought to consider how it can be handled. Both he and Arvonne felt, particularly Arvonne, that we must not push too hard, that if in Minnesota the appeal was made to line up because of Humphrey, that there would be deep resentment and that many, many people in the party today, new and young ones, would have very little respect and feel very little loyalty and potentially great resentment toward us old timers. This is certainly true.

The whole question presents a very difficult area in which we work for the coming year. I asked Don why the Midwest should be so bad on the polls where the President is concerned, and he had no more answer for it than we have. All in all, it was an interesting discussion. I was somewhat amused at Don's



reaction when I pointed out that last Saturday when I mentioned to the President that I wasn't concerned about McCarthy's position on Vietnam but that Don's bothered me because he was sensitive, sincere, and conscientious. The President's response was, Yes and he shows up on every far out committee or list opposing us. Don's comment was, and he was somewhat taken back, that this is the first time he had any reason to believe the President even knew he was alive and that he was surprised that the President had noted this, which gave me a chance to point out that there are few things that go on in Washington that the President misses, that his span of interest, information and attentiveness is incredible -- which it is. Don agreed too with the accomplishments of the Administration and didn't challenge my evaluation as to the basic liberalism of the President in carrying forward his program. He was particularly impressed by the leadership and strength of the President on the D.C. issues of self-government, Civil Rights, et cetera. Arvonne of course is more bitter about the whole thing, particularly where Rusk is concerned. Both of them are most anti-Rusk and Don feels that Rusk has been arrogant and disliked in many of his foreign contacts. Allegedly they picked this up around the world in Africa and other places. They even charged that Rusk was kind of anti-Africa and therefore Negro, because African problems seldom permeate the 7th Floor at the State Department. This, of course, is nonsense as we tried to point out, but their antipathy toward Rusk is very real. In the first place, they and I guess many of the doves today harken back to the period when Rusk was Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs and allegedly, so they claim, carried forward what subsequently became the policies of John Foster Dulles. More important I think where the Frasers are concerned, Rusk was working very closely in the early days of the Administration with Walter Judd before Fraser defeated him. They haven't forgot a couple of letters from Rusk to Judd, that Judd used in

the campaign. I can hardly blame them for that. Even as conscientious and responsible as they are, nonetheless this experience colors their attitude toward Rusk, -- such is human nature. All in all, it was an interesting and I think useful evening. I don't know where we go from here, but it did pose for me in better perspective the political problem we face now in dealing with this extremely idfficult situation within the Democratic Party and the DFL in Minnesota where Vietnam is concerned.

Otherwise, this has been again a very, very busy week. I finally made the feed grain announcement on Thursday. We got out a press release and a press conference. It was a pretty good release I think and apparently fairly well received. I think I've related the Conference in the President's office and on the basis on which the decision was made. When we put the numbers together we were able to work out a pattern that showed that this program was better than 1966 and I so related with some temperateness in the press conference which was fairly well attended. I then climbed on a plane and went down to Nashville, Tennessee where I got on a clear channel 4-station radio hookup and made the announcement and was quizzed by Maynard Speece out of Minneapolis, Kirkpatrick in Des Moines, Samuelson in Chicago. It went fairly well, I think. I was a bit shook up at Orion Samuelson's comment that he talked to 4 people and all of them were negative on the feed grain program -- two were from the grain trade who said I laid an egg. My response to that was that the grain trade is always against anything that cuts back production because it curtails by definition their business. The farmers who had claimed this was nothing, why did we wait so long to make the announcement, I couldn't understand. I merely related that the program this year was better than 1966 and that attitude was beyond my comprehension. Later after Alfieri asked Orion about it and he related as best he could tell that apparently a lot of people had felt that