

GOLDWATER FOR PRESIDENT COMMITTEE  
84 North Main Street  
Concord, New Hampshire  
Tel. 224-7766

The following interview which Publisher William Loeb of the Manchester Union Leader had with Senator Barry Goldwater summarizes Senator Goldwater's views on a number of the major issues.

Q -- Senator Goldwater, do you want to be President?

A -- I don't think that personal ambition should be the determining factor in seeking the Presidency. I get a little suspicious of people who run so hard for it. It's kind of presumptuous, like saying that you are better than anybody else in the country. I think the job ought to seek the man in a way. There's a natural process out of which candidates seem to arise. Circumstances and events put them there, rather than some personal obsession. If events call the shots that way for me, I'd have to consider it seriously. But, at the moment, I'm a United States Senator and not a Presidential candidate.

Q -- Even so, your views have become practically the center of the political debate in the country, and in this state. One critical comment is that you are against things more than you are for things.

A -- That comment usually comes from people who forget that the basic ideas of our kind of society are against things also. Why, even nine of the Ten Commandments are against things. Take crime. You've got to be against it before you even set up your courts. I'm against tyranny too. So were our forefathers. There's always a positive side, of course. We're for freedom, for instance. But there's nothing wrong with being against things. For example, you have to be against tyranny to be for freedom. If New Englanders hadn't been against such tyranny we wouldn't even have a country.

Q -- How about the United Nations specifically? Some people say you want us to get out and that you're against the whole idea.

A -- I guess those people never bother to read the record or worry much about the facts. I've supported the idea of the UN, as expressed in its Charter. I also support the idea that it's a good forum for international debate. But you can't look at the UN today and pretend that it's living up to its Charter or even that it's doing a top notch job as a debating society. Its members don't even have to pay their dues the way things are going today. And our people have to make up the difference. The whole idea of responsibility in the UN is growing less and less. A lot of the members go off on their own whenever it suits them. Then they gang up on the nations that are sincerely trying to live up to the Charter whenever that suits them. No, I don't think we should get out of the UN at this point. But I think we should take some serious looks at how to make it live up to its Charter, even make it obey the Charter, and how to keep it from becoming nothing more than a weapon with which to club the West and the United States without ever criticizing the tyranny and aggression of the communist countries. You listen to the UN debates these days and you'd think the West was the enemy of freedom. I'd like to see our case made a lot better. I'd like to see the UN work. If it can't, I think our people should have the right to decide whether to stay in or not.



Q -- Do you want to end Social Security or help to the aged?

A -- Of course not. I'm against compulsory programs that don't give you any choice between government or private means. I also believe in handling any sort of assistance programs right at the home town level if at all possible. I don't think we have to yell for federal help right off the bat. I have more faith in our people than to think they should automatically be ruled out of handling their own problems. Why should someone in Washington know more about your needs and your problems, than your own neighbors or even your own family?

Q -- Are you just opposed to federal programs in general?

A -- Of course not. There are important federal programs provided for in the Constitution. This is all a question of emphasis and real need. If there is a program that is really needed -- and I don't mean needed just because some politician says so, but because the people really study it and decide it -- then our first step should be to see if we can do it right at home, with our own resources. If we can't, we move on to the county or state level, or maybe a group of like-minded states. If there just isn't any other way to do it -- and remembering that it's got to be something that's for the good of the nation -- then we should consider a federal program, and let Congress decide. It's not that I think federal programs are necessarily bad. It's just that I think local programs are likely to be better. Certainly they are better for people who value their independence.

Q -- Is that why you want to sell TVA?

A -- My suggestion about TVA, which men like Herbert Hoover had expressed in one way or another even when TVA got started, is that it is performing functions for which there is no federal justification. Principally this is in the generation of electric power in steam plants. That's a straight commercial operation, with tax money, and special privileges and so forth. I think that should be turned over to the states, if they want it, or sold to private industry, perhaps to a corporation like that set up for Telstar. Then there are a lot of other TVA functions that belong under other regular federal agencies, flood control, navigation, and so forth. I think those functions should be returned. This wouldn't deprive the people of the area of a single thing. In fact it would give them better services. But it would end a situation in which the federal government has, in effect, taken over a whole area in a way that Congress certainly never intended and which in the long run can only be bad for the people who live there.

Q -- Since you feel that way about TVA, how do you explain your support of the Central Arizona Project?

A -- Actually, there is no similarity at all between the two. TVA has become strictly proprietary business undertaking, selling electric power and fertilizer under heavy government subsidication. The Arizona Project, on the other hand, is truly a reclamation project. Its purpose is to bring water into central Arizona, water to which, the U. S. Supreme Court has ruled, the State is entitled. The water will not bring one additional acre of land into production, but will merely preserve existing farm lands. I have never said the project itself had to be financed by the federal government, but instead have repeatedly suggested that the State could either fund the entire operation or make a substantial contribution toward defraying its cost. Reliable financial sources tell me this is entirely



feasible. There would be no power generated by steam and hydro-electric output planned would be sold to commercial users at prices competitive with but not less than, that of private sources. Similarly, water would be sold to bring in additional revenues. The Bureau of Reclamation report on the Project estimates that receipts from sales of hydro-electric power and water would completely repay the government.

Q -- How about the income tax? Do you want to abolish that?

A -- I guess we'd all like to. But we know it can't be done. And I have never said that it should be done. Somebody has got to pay the bills for the government we must have. What I do object to and would like to see carefully reconsidered, is the steep rate of progressivity in our taxes. A flatter rate might produce all the money we need but at the same time cut out all the red tape that bogs our citizens down every year. Frankly, I think our tax system could stand an overhauling from top to bottom. This doesn't mean abolishing it. It means making it fair and workable. Our current tax system is a drag on our economy and it is actually killing some of the initiative that, for instance, could create new jobs.

Q -- How about foreign aid?

A -- I am opposed to foreign economic aid -- and underscore that word economic, will you? I have always been in favor of technical and military assistance. I think that's what our aid should be for -- to help protect freedom and to help people to help themselves. We have long since passed the point where economic aid does either. It fattens government inefficiency and waste in some countries and it just plain isn't needed in others. The underdeveloped nations, in particular, need private investments and better tools, not more U. S. cash in the government till. There are sections of our own country that could use economic aid a lot better than some of the foreign nations now getting it. Why should we send Indonesia money so that their dictator can buy personal luxury planes from the Soviet? Why should we finance the confiscation of American property in some countries? I think that most Americans are in common-sense agreement on this one. It's time that the politicians came to their senses, too.

Q -- The administration says that we can't fight communism without foreign aid. What do you think?

A -- I think there are far more important ways to do it. Our great NATO alliance is probably the first line of defense for the whole free world. But while the administration has been busy trying to solve all of our overseas problems by spending more money, they have let the NATO alliance come close to collapse. America's stock in NATO never was lower than it is right today.

Q -- What could we do to revive NATO?

A -- First of all, we'd have to stop undercutting our allies or acting like we think we can trust the Soviets more than we can trust France or Germany or Great Britain. The NATO nations deeply resent the fact that we are willing to carry on negotiations with the communists on matters that might weaken the security of Europe. Also, all the NATO nations have got to have the right to defend their homes with the most modern weapons, including nuclear weapons. Our refusal to meet this problem is right at the heart of the sickness in NATO.



Q -- Would you go so far as to entrust nuclear decisions to local commanders in Europe?

A -- I've heard people say that I recommended this. But I never have. I do believe that such decisions should rest with the top NATO commander. I think they have to. Great Britain and France are developing their own nuclear arsenals. There is no technical reason why other nations won't follow suit. We've simply got to face the nuclear problem in NATO -- and fact it on a basis of trust of our allies, or we'll end up with no alliance at all. We would be isolated and alone.

Q -- Then you don't think isolationism would work?

A -- Not in this age of missiles and nuclear weaponry and of world-wide communist aggression.

Q -- But usually we hear isolationism and conservatism lumped together.

A -- Not by people who really have analyzed the situation. Take today. It is the so-called liberals in the administration who are the real isolationists. They have let the alliance go to pot. They believe in turning Europe into a neutral, buffer zone. It is their kind who really think you can split the world up with the communists and then sit back and relax.

Q -- Isn't there any way of coming to peaceful terms with the Russians?

A -- Let's not get the Russian people mixed up with communism. It's communism that is our enemy, not the Russian people. Sure, the world could find peace if just the Russian people were involved. But the communists of this world simply will not let it happen. They are dedicated to changing the world into a communist world. So long as that remains their goal we have only the choice of resisting them, and trying to force them from positions of power, or giving in to them and becoming communists, or communist subjects.

Q -- When you say we should try to force communists from positions of power, do you mean that we have to fight them in a hot war?

A -- Not at all. The best way to avoid a hot war would be to win the cold war -- by using all the non-war weapons we have. We should be applying economic pressures for instance. Communism is in bad economic trouble. Pressure could weaken their whole structure of dictatorship, without war at all. But the present policies are to try and bail the communists out of their trouble. It's like saying we could have beaten Hitler by giving him some chemical plants, or sending along surplus food. Well, the list goes on and on. The West is far stronger than the communist bloc. It could, if it wanted to, put communism right off the track without firing a shot. What I'm afraid of is that if we just twiddle our time away, helping communism, instead of trying to crack it, we'll get to the place where the communists will be strong enough to figure that a hot war is okay -- and they day that happens, a hot war is exactly what we'll have, or we'll have to surrender to prevent it.

Q -- Just now you said that the West is stronger than communism. Haven't you also warned about weaknesses in our weapons programs?



A -- I have indeed. Let's not get the two things mixed up. There is no doubt that today we are vastly superior to the Soviet in overall military strength. But our strength is just what we had under President Eisenhower. He brought it up to the present levels. Since then, under a new administration, we haven't seen a single new weapons program begun. Beside that we have seen a constant pull-back of strength in such areas as that of bombing aircraft and overseas missile bases. We still have the nuclear punch. But we are losing a lot of our ability to deliver it. What worries me, then, is that we may be caught short in the future, with the Soviets going ahead full-steam on advanced weapons, while we sit still and even backpeddle.

Q -- Is this one of the reasons for your opposition to the nuclear test ban?

A -- It certainly is. There was no doubt, after hearing the scientists and the military men testify before our Committee, that the Soviet is ahead of us in tests of the effects of king-sized nuclear explosions. Even people who voted for the treaty admit this. The communists have tested at least twice as much in that range as we have. And it's those big blasts that hold the key to a lot of atom age secrets. You can knock out communications with them. You probably can knock out missiles, even in flight. If the communists really get far ahead we might find that all our weapons have been cancelled out while the communist gun is pointed right at our head, with nothing to guard against it.

Q -- But mightn't the treaty actually ease tensions so much that the communists would abandon any such plans?

A -- There isn't a single shred of evidence to support that hope. Not one really significant action or statement by the Soviet points in that direction. Everything, in fact, points the other way. The only support is wishful thinking by some of our foreign policy people. They expect the communists to behave just the way we would. They simply don't understand communism.



Bob Drury - has P.R. account (Ham. Putnam  
of Concord)

John Chandler - candidate for del. } at large cand.?  
from Warner, N.H.

~~B. Gill~~

~~(1) personal~~

Drury } (1) 1-2 page position papers in speech form.  
Roberts } on subjects:

- (a) social security pos.
- (b) U.N.
- (c) foreign aid
- (d) education
- (e) labor -
- (f) Cuba -
- (g) Russia - recognition (+ China)
- (h) 'Hate' - etc. (Sen's S.R. speech -  
Simpson)

"Rep." + "N.H."

←

"N.H." ← (1) Trade } N.H. sensitive - see incident  
tariff }  
see Tom Shannon - in Wash.

relate these positions to N.H. or to "traditional  
Republicans"



Q-- Senator, your defeat in the New Hampshire primaries is being described in the press as ~~it~~ nothing short of catastrophic. Political experts say the fact that Ambassador Lodge won so handily and carried all 14 of the State's delegate elections has eliminated you ~~again~~ from serious consideration as a Presidential candidate. Would you care to comment on that ?

A-- ~~That's significant to the extent that~~ The journalistic pallbearers who are making arrangements for my political funeral are going to have a tough time getting me into the coffin. ~~I can assure you that~~ I am a very live corpse and don't intend to be buried. Certainly, the New Hampshire primary results were unexpected, although I knew and stated several days before the polls opened that Cabot Lodge was getting powerful financial support from some of the Eastern interests and that ~~his~~ the combination of limitless funds and his image as a New England native son ~~would~~ ~~make~~ could be expected to bring ~~him~~ out a strong vote for him. Except for these two factors, I think I would have <sup>won</sup> ~~carried~~ the popular ~~or~~ vote easily and would have <sup>CARRIED</sup> ~~won~~ at least seven of the delegate races. As it turned out, the well-financed Lodge campaign swept aside New Hampshire's ~~leading~~ best-known office holders in the delegate race. When a State's senior Senator loses a contest for delegate to the National convention, for instance, it is pretty good indication that a steamroller has run over the ~~native~~ voters.

Q--Well, Senator, ~~certainly~~ if the combination of money and "native son" qualities was so important in Ambassador's Lodge's victory, ~~why~~ why didn't it work for Governor Rockefeller. He is not exactly a poor man and he did graduate from Dartmouth college, which is in New Hampshire.

A-- ~~I believe~~ the Governor spent too much time campaigning against me and Republican principles in general. Many voters who might have been expected to <sup>SUPPORT</sup> ~~vote for~~ him otherwise, began to wonder whether he could give them any choice at all in a Presidential election contest with ~~the~~ Democrats.



Q--To get back to the effect of the New Hampshire elections on your candidacy: Do you believe the loss has hurt you enough to endanger your chances of winning the nomination in San Francisco next July ?

A--Very definitely not. In the first place, I have full delegations ~~pledged~~ already pledged to me in several states, all of them much larger than New Hampshire, and I expect to go into the convention with enough strength to win the nomination on the first or second ballot. In addition, Ambassador Lodge is not now and will not be a serious ~~serious~~ contender. His basic popularity is sectional and he is, after all, a member of the Johnson Administration ~~at this time~~. I <sup>ALSO</sup> believe that when the chips are down and the roll ~~roll~~ is called in San ~~San Francisco~~ Francisco, I will receive the votes of a majority of the delegates elected on the Lodge tickets in New Hampshire.

Q\*\*-- What about Governor Rockefeller and former Vice President Richard Nixon ? Don't you think they would share in the spoils if Ambassador Lodge frees his delegates ?

A--In the first place, the Ambassador does not have to, technically speaking, "free" his delegates. New Hampshire delegates are not pledged, no matter whose slate they are elected on. Secondly, I do not think Governor Rockefeller can expect much support from that quarter. His rejection by the New Hampshire voters after his expenditure of so much time and money definitely has derailed his hopes of nomination. Mr. Nixon, whose name was not on the New Hampshire ballot and lacked the enormous financial support of the Lodge campaign, may receive the support of a couple of Lodge delegates and is, I believe, the most serious competition I'll have in the convention next July.

Q--- ~~As in the case of~~ Senator Goldwater, assuming that you ~~do~~ win the nomination, what do you think will be the major issue in the campaign ?

A--Undoubtedly, the collapse of our foreign policy. Just about everywhere in the world--~~Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America~~ Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America-- the policies of the ~~Johnson~~ Kennedy-Johnson Administration



3  
have disrupted the alliances built by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, ~~and~~ have ~~allowed~~ ~~destroyed~~ ~~our~~ respect for ~~this~~ this Nation and have invited Communistic advances.

We are being backed down by petty dictators <sup>SUCK AS</sup> ~~like~~ Castro and rulers of even the smallest Republics, such as Chiari <sup>i</sup> in Panama, in every confrontation. The ~~people~~ American people are disgusted with <sup>THE WAY</sup> the display of cold fear by this Administration <sup>FLIGHTS</sup> ~~and~~ will rally behind the ~~best~~ candidate who <sup>BELIEVES STANDS FOR</sup> ~~can promise them~~ firmness in our dealings with our enemies.

Q-- ~~But~~ Senator Goldwater, President Johnson has pointed out that American foreign policy historically has had been bipartisan and can succeed only if it has the full support of all out citizens. Wouldn't these attacks on the Administration's handling of foreign affairs cause disunity at home and aid our enemies ?

A-- President Johnson has a short and convenient memory. He's <sup>just</sup> trying to get himself off the hook for his administration's most dangerous ~~failings~~ bungling. Mr. Johnson himself was perhaps the loudest critic of U.S. foreign policy during the 1960 campaign and did everything in his power to make it a partisan issue. I think it is ridiculous to assume that we can have ~~foreign~~ bipartisan ~~foreign~~ support for policies which seriously threaten our survival in freedom. It is the duty of all Americans to use every weapon at their command to combat such policies. To do otherwise would, ~~say~~ to say the last, ~~unpatriotic~~ but encourage our enemies in their drive to conquer the world.

Q-- What are some of the major areas in the world where you think Administration policies are failing ?

A-- If I were to list them country-by-country, we'd be here all night. Certainly ~~Cuba~~ Cuba is an outstanding example. There, ~~with~~ we <sup>INVITED</sup> ~~asked~~ Russia to make an island fortress and base for hemispheric subversion by ~~dominating~~ ~~fore~~dooming the Bay of Pigs invasion and we <sup>SINCE</sup> have done everything we could ~~to~~ to protect Castro from those who would overthrow him. This administration has repeatedly pledged itself to ~~never~~ use armed ~~us~~ force, if necessary, to block the export of terrorism and revolution by Castro, but consistently



turns its head in the other direction ~~which~~ such acts ~~are~~  
 are proved. In Southeast Asia, we forced ~~down~~ the pro-Western  
 government in Laos to surrender to a Troika, as Khrushchev had  
 demanded ~~and presently~~ <sup>WE</sup> are refusing to ~~do anything~~ to cut off  
 the flow of arms and troops from North Viet Nam, Red China and  
 Russia into the South Vietnamese war. We continue to baby  
 the pro-Red Sukarno government in Indonesia and offend our  
 friends in the Malaysian Federation. ~~We~~ In effect, we  
 apologized to the Castroites who took over Madagascar and booted  
 our diplomats out ~~of~~ <sup>WE</sup> we have encouraged, through nothing more nor less  
 than diplomatic stupidity, Communist influence in Africa. <sup>WE</sup> We have  
 all but destroyed the NATO alliance and we ~~have~~ condescendingly  
 accepted ~~the~~ the hated Berlin Wall and the slaughters it has produced  
 as ~~an established fixture~~ a permanent fixture. We rushed headlong  
 into a ~~nuclear~~ test ban treaty, which denies us the right to  
 test our nuclear weapons, because the Russians supposedly ~~have~~  
 had mellowed, <sup>11</sup> but they <sup>11</sup> continue to shoot down our planes, killing  
 American boys and commit other barbaric acts which somehow  
 don't seem to indicate any mellowing. Believe me, I could go on  
 and on and on with the subject of foreign policy, but I don't think  
 we'd have time on this entire trip to recount all the failures  
 in this area.

Q--- How about domestic issues; do you believe these will have any  
 great bearing on the elections next November?

A--Very definitely. President Johnson seems to be making a big  
~~thing~~ <sup>ISSUE</sup> out of the poverty ~~issue~~ for instance, <sup>HE</sup> and has appointed  
 Sergeant Shriver, ~~who must know a lot about poverty~~ <sup>PERHAPS</sup> ~~who never had to borrow a dime for a cup of coffee~~, to head up  
 a special poverty agency. When Mr. Kennedy was campaigning for the  
 Presidency, he said 17 million Americans were going to bed hungry  
 every night. Now President Johnson says we have around <sup>40</sup> million <sup>3</sup>  
 people who live on the edge of poverty. That is a <sup>23</sup> million  
 increase ~~in~~ four years and I would think the people would want  
 him to explain how and why his administration accomplished this.

*Handwritten notes in left margin:*  
 Will Vietnam be...  
 We've signed...  
 some from...  
 tell the...  
 already...  
 political

*Handwritten initials:* J



Civil rights will be an issue that figures to cause Mr. Johnson some ~~difficult~~ difficulty in keeping his party together. No matter what he does or says, he can't satisfy Hubert Humphrey and Dick Russell at the same time. ~~Unemployment~~ The Administration has been unable to do anything about unemployment, which still remains ~~at~~ in the neighborhood of 5.5 per cent, and all the programs which proved failures in the 30s are being tried again with the same dismal results. ~~This will plague the Democrats some too.~~ Inflation continues to boost living costs and cut the value of the dollar and there is no prospect of ~~reversing~~ reversing this trend unless the Government stops spending like a drunken sailor and ~~reverses~~ ~~policy~~ learns that no one, government or housewife, can spend more than comes in.

eg.

Q--- Senator Goldwater, I know you have declined to state your preference for a vice presidential running mate in the event you win the nomination, but I wonder if you'd care to comment on prospects of the Attorney General Robert Kennedy winding up on the ticket with President Johnson ?

A--Well, ~~it is obvious that~~ there is a strong and well-organized campaign going on to ~~gather~~ force Mr. Kennedy's ~~name~~ vice presidential candidacy on President Johnson and it is obvious that the President doesn't like it. Come convention time, though, and I think President Johnson will accept Mr. Kennedy if it ~~would appear~~ is the opportunistic thing to do. The frequent criticisms of the Kennedy family he voiced prior to the 1960 convention did not, for instance, ~~prevent~~ stop him from accepting the vice presidential nomination.



7

Q---You have said the United Nations Charter should be revised.

In what respect ?

Principally

A---To make it unquestionably positive in the provisions it already sets forth but which are misinterpreted and abused by the UN itself. There shouldn't be any question, for instance, about this Nation ~~being outvoted by~~ <sup>HAVING THE SAME VOICE AS</sup> Russia, which was given three votes to our one. Other revisions would establish ~~some equity~~ further equity in this respect. At present, according to no less a supporter of the UN than Secretary of State Rusk, ~~some of the~~ <sup>COUNTRIES</sup> nations representing something less than 10 percent of the population of UN member-nations can outvote the free world in the General Assembly. There also should be some way to make UN members pay up ~~on time~~ their dues and assessments or shut up. I don't think ~~we~~ the American taxpayer should have to finance ridicule of the United States by Communists and their fellow-welchers.

Q--You recently charged that Ambassador Lodge and Governor Rockefeller failed to perform their share of the campaign work in 1960. Would you explain that charge ?

A--Well, that is nothing that I thought up. This is something the professionals in our party have been saying on the basis of their own experiences with these two men.

Q--Your statement that you would send the Marines into Cuba to turn in Guantanamo's water has been attacked pretty widely. Do you think that suggestion was ~~an~~ extreme ?

A-- No. This Administration sent in a force of invaders at the Bay of Pigs and guaranteed that ~~it would~~ Castro would cut off their water. President Eisenhower dispatched Marines to Lebanon without ~~expecting~~ bringing on ~~himself~~ such outcries of protests. Experience has shown that firmness is greatly respected by the Communists and is beneficial to the free world.



8

Q--Do you plan to make an issue of Governor Rockefeller's recent divorce ?

A--No, I don't believe in projecting such personal matters into a campaign. Unfortunately, the press and Governor Rockefeller already have done so. In his campaign literature, Governor Rockefeller graphically points up the divorce with pictures of his first marriage and a caption explaining that he has since remarried. There also are several photographs of him with his new wife. I wouldn't say he is exactly trying to sweep the divorce under the rug.

Q--Do you think Ambassador Lodge's victory in New Hampshire will make Viet Nam an issue in the campaign ?

A--It is and was an issue before he won in New Hampshire.

Q--Should the Ambassador be blamed for our reverses<sup>als</sup> in Viet Nam ?

A--I don't think he should be ~~blamed~~ saddled with ~~such~~ responsibility for ~~what~~ a fiasco in which so many Kennedy-Johnson Administration spokesmen have had a hand. Perhaps he should come home and tell the American people how it all happened, however, ~~particularly~~ particularly if he ~~has~~ decides to seriously seek the Presidential nomination.

Q--Do you think the press has been fair in its treatment of you and its reporting of your campaign ?

A--By and large I think they've been pretty fair. Of course, some ~~of~~ reporters seem to delight in taking me apart, but I don't know of anyone in politics who isn't subject to attacks from some quarters. It probably would get pretty dull if all newspapers said only nice things about everybody. My statements and actions have been distorted far ~~more~~ more by my political opponents than they ever were by the press.



9

Q-- Your recent statement that our missiles are unreliable brought a sharp denial from Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Which one of you is right ?

A-- That depends upon which one of Mr. McNamara's statements

~~you~~ you are referring to. ~~Today he insists the missiles~~  
~~are reliable~~ For public consumption, he says <sup>our</sup> ~~the~~ missiles

are reliable, but before Senate hearings he says they aren't.

On February 20, 1963, Mr. McNamara admitted to a Senate Armed Services Committee that this nation does not have a single missile weapons system ~~that~~ that has passed reliability tests.

Q--Do you plan to see General Eisenhower while you are in California ?

A--Yes, I very definitely would not want to come this far and not spend a little while with the former President.

Q--How do you think we should handle the Cyprus question ?

A--I think it is entirely a NATO matter, not one for the UN

to handle. ~~By sending the United Nations~~ Sending the United Nations into Cyprus gives Russia and all the other Communist countries a voice in ~~what~~ any settlement. NATO could insure the peace without any prospect of a subsequent Communist infiltration.

Q-- Would you favor repeal of the Rumford Fair Housing Act ?

A--I think this is a matter for the people of California to decide for themselves. If enough Californians want it repealed, that is the way it should be. I certainly would not attempt to force ~~myself~~ the residents of a State to act against their will.

(This is a fair housing act which is due for repeal and there is little chance that the repeal will fail.)