

law, in the respect for legitimate authority, in the respect for the rights of others that is the standard moral code of every citizen.

—Submitted to Republican National Convention Committee on Resolutions, July 31, 1968

THE NEXT PRESIDENT must unite America. He must calm its angers, ease its terrible frictions and bring its people together once again in peace and mutual respect. He has to take hold of America before he can move it forward . . .

The first responsibility of leadership is to gain mastery over events, and to shape the future in the image of our hopes.

The President today cannot stand aside from crisis; he cannot ignore division; he cannot simply paper over disunity. He must lead.

But he must bear in mind the distinction between forceful leadership and stubborn willfulness. And he should not delude himself into thinking that he can do everything himself. America today cannot afford vest-pocket government, no matter who wears the vest.

In considering the kind of leadership the next President should give, let us first consider the special relationship—the special trust—that has developed between President and people.

The President is trusted; not to follow the fluctuations of the public-opinion polls, but to bring his own best judgment to bear on the best ideas his administration can muster.

There are occasions on which a President must take unpopular measures.

But his responsibility does not stop there. The President has a duty to decide, but the people have a right to know why. The President has a responsibility to tell them—to lay out all the facts, and to explain not only why he chose as he did but also what it means for the future. Only through an open, candid dialogue with the people can a President maintain his trust and his leadership.

See LAW, Page C2

LAW, From Page C1

It's time we once again had an open administration—open to ideas from the people, and open in its communication with the people—an administration of open doors, open eyes and open minds . . .

The President's chief function is to lead, not to administer; it is not to oversee every detail, but to put the right people in charge, to provide them with basic guidance and direction, and to let them do the job. As Theodore Roosevelt once put it, "The best executive is the one who has enough sense to pick good men to do what he wants done, and self-restraint enough to keep from meddling with them while they do it." . . .

I don't want a government of yes-men, but one drawn from the broadest possible base—an administration made up of Republicans, Democrats and independents, and drawn from politics, from career government service, from universities, from business, from the professions—one including

not only executives and administrators, but scholars and thinkers. Only if we have an administration broadly enough based philosophically to ensure a true ferment of ideas, and to invite an interplay of the best minds in America, can we be sure of getting the best and most penetrating ideas.

But such men are not attracted to an administration in which all credit is gathered to the White House and blame parceled out to scapegoats, or in which high officials are asked to dance like puppets on a presidential string. I believe in a system in which the appropriate cabinet officer gets credit for what goes right and the President takes the blame for what goes wrong.

Officials of a new administration will not have to check their consciences at the door, or leave their powers of independent judgment at home . . .

Theodore Roosevelt called the presidency "a bully pulpit." Franklin Roosevelt called it pre-eminently "a place of moral leadership." And surely one of a President's greatest resources is the moral authority of his office. It's time we restored that authority—and time we used it once again, to its fullest potential—to rally the people, to define those moral imperatives which are the cement of a civilized society, to point the ways in which the energies of the people can be enlisted to serve the ideals of the people.

What has to be done, has to be done by President and people together, or it won't be done at all.

—Radio speech, Sept. 19, 1968

BUT OUR FOUNDING Fathers had the genius to set up a system, a system of government in which there was provided a

peaceful means to change those laws that we don't like. Now, that's worked very well in this country for 190 years, and I believe that any system of government that provides a method for peaceful change, there is no cause that justifies breaking the law or engaging in violence.

I take that position because if you accept the proposition that each individual is going to determine what law is right and what law is wrong; that might be very well for a professor, it might be very well for a highly intelligent individual, maybe a minister, who can make these value judgments. But if you are going to say to the great mass of American people, "You only have to obey the laws that you agree with and you have a right to disobey the laws you don't agree with," you have anarchy in this country.

—Regional television broadcast, WHDH-TV, Boston, Oct. 18, 1968

THE GENIUS of our system, the life force of the American way, is our ability to hold fast to the rules that we know to be right and to change the rules that we know to be wrong. In that regard, we would all do well to remember our constitutional roles: For the legislatures, to set forth the rules; for the judiciary, to interpret them; for the executive, to carry them out.

—National Conference of the Judiciary, Williamsburg, Va., March 11, 1971

ONE FINAL POINT: You talk about police state. Let me tell you what happens when you go to what is really a police state: You can't talk in your bedroom. You can't talk in your sitting room. You don't talk on the telephone. You don't talk in the bath-

room. As a matter of fact, you hear about going out and talking in the garden. Yes, I have walked many times through gardens in various places where I had to talk about something confidential, and you can't talk even in front of a shrub. That is the way it works.

What I am simply saying is this, my friends: There are police states. We don't want that to happen to America. But America is not a police state, and as long as I am in office, we are going to be sure that not the FBI or any other organization engages in any activity except where the national interests or the protection of innocent people requires it, and then it will be as limited as it can possibly be. That is what we are going to do.

—Interview at the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, April 16, 1971

PENDING SEC. RICHARDSON'S confirmation as attorney general, I have asked him to involve himself immediately in the investigative process surrounding the Watergate matter. As attorney general, Mr. Richardson will assume full responsibility and authority for coordinating all federal agencies in uncovering the whole truth about this matter, and recommending appropriate changes in the law to prevent future campaign abuses of the sort recently uncovered. He will have total support from me in getting this job done.

—White House statement, May 1, 1973

THE TRUTH ABOUT the Watergate should be brought out — in an orderly way, recognizing that the safeguards of judicial

procedure are designed to find the truth, not to hide the truth.

With the selection of Archibald Cox—who served both President Kennedy and President Johnson as solicitor general—as the special supervisory prosecutor for matters related to the case, Attorney General-designate Richardson has demonstrated his own determination to see the truth brought out. In this effort he has my full support.

Considering the number of persons involved in this case whose testimony might be subject to a claim of executive privilege, I recognize that a clear definition of that claim has become central to the effort to arrive at the truth.

Accordingly, executive privilege will not be invoked as to any testimony concerning possible criminal conduct or discussions of possible criminal conduct, in matters presently under investigation, including the Watergate affair and the alleged cover-up.

—White House statement, May 22, 1973

IN HIS PRESS CONFERENCE today, Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox made it apparent that he will not comply with the instructions I issued to him, through Attorney General Richardson, yesterday. Clearly the government of the United States cannot function if employees of the executive branch are free to ignore in this fashion the instructions of the President. Accordingly in your capacity of acting attorney general, I direct you to discharge Mr. Cox immediately and to take all steps necessary to return to the Department of Justice the functions now being performed by the Watergate Special Prosecution Force.

—Letter to Robert H. Bork, Oct. 20, 1973