

# **THE ROCKEFELLER RECORD**

Edited by JAMES POLING

*A Political Self-Portrait* **The  
Rockefeller  
Record**

*Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York · Established 1834*

***Copyright © 1960 by James Poling***

***All rights reserved.***

***Designed by Laurel Wagner***

***Manufactured in the United States of America  
by the Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, N.Y.***

***Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 60-7927***

## Preface

The surprising emergence of Nelson Rockefeller as a major presidential candidate is one of the most unexpected and intriguing political phenomena of the postwar years. Although he bears a legendary name, Rockefeller was not particularly well known at the voters' level even in his own state, and his decision to seek the governorship of New York, in 1958, was greeted with derision by most Democrats and many Republicans. He was a political amateur—or so it was assumed—who had never before run for elective office. In challenging Averell Harriman he was taking on a strongly entrenched, politically experienced incumbent. And he was bucking a Democratic trend of landslide proportions. The polls all said he didn't have a chance.

Rockefeller's spectacular victory over his Democratic opponent was the dramatic highlight of an election year that saw his party take one of its worst batterings of the century. His stunning reversal of the almost universal Democratic trend aroused immediate national interest. The press began to examine him. Endless columns were devoted to his obvious sincerity, his boundless energy, his indestructible élan, and the "Rockefeller charm" which was thought to have mesmerized the voters of the Empire State. His expansive smile was described as the best political trademark since the days of the Teddy Roosevelt grin. He was broad-shouldered, he was handsome, and he was chronically in need of a haircut. He was a personality. He was a winner. Now at last Nixon had a serious rival, the most formidable kind of opponent he could encounter.

The new Governor's political style so captivated the press that it paid little attention to his other qualities. Only a few pundits and political analysts concerned themselves with his political thinking. Too much was written about his charm and his grin, too little about what he stood for.

Consequently, it's doubtful if one American voter in a thousand outside of New York State knows Rockefeller's political views, even though he could conceivably become the next President of the United States. But even if he should not become our next President, or even a candidate for the office, there is good reason for us to familiarize ourselves with his views. At fifty-one, he has emerged as one of the most powerful voices in the Republican Party and he will unquestionably play a role in our national political drama for many years to come.

The part he will play concerns us all. The two-party system is in jeopardy. The bitter struggle between the liberals and conservatives within the Republican Party has been an issue through the last five national conventions. Much depends on the outcome. The Republican Party can sink into a permanent minority status, or reshape its forces and continue serving the nation as a living, effective political instrument. Nelson Rocke-

feller's views and beliefs could have a decisive bearing on the outcome of this internecine struggle, and help determine whether our democratic system is destined to return to robust health or grow increasingly anemic.

The purpose of this book, then, is to present Nelson Rockefeller's views and beliefs *in his own words*, selected from the many addresses and statements he has made over the years. It is said that a man's words mirror his mind. Since we are dealing here only with Rockefeller's public utterances, we cannot claim that we are presenting a complete picture of his mind. But it is a comprehensive picture of his public thinking. Every significant thought he has put on public record has been sifted. The result is, in a sense, a political self-portrait. Here, in his own words, is where Nelson Rockefeller stands in public life. For many his name has long been followed by a political question mark. This is his answer.

A biographical sketch of the Governor has been added to give the reader the necessary background material and acquaint him with the little-known details of Nelson Rockefeller's public career.

Readers whose curiosity has been aroused by this book may wish to consult others. The ones I found most helpful are *Those Rockefeller Brothers, An Informal Biography of Five Extraordinary Young Men*, by Joe Alex Morris (New York: Harpers, 1953); and *A Rockefeller Family Portrait, from John D. to Nelson*, by William Manchester (Boston: Little Brown, 1959). Allan Nevins's *Study in Power, John D. Rockefeller, Industrialist and Philanthropist*, two volumes (New York: Scribner's, 1953), is an invaluable source of background material.

The magazine and newspaper sources are voluminous. I drew on material from the files of *Business Week*, *Current Biography*, the Department of State *Bulletin*, the *Journal of Commerce*, *Esquire*, *Foreign Affairs*, *Fortune*, *Harper's*, *Life*, *Look*, *National Review*, *Newsweek*, *The New Yorker*, *Parade*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *The Reporter*, *The Saturday Eve-*

ning Post, Time, Western World, the Boston Daily Globe, the New York Post, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York World-Telegram and the Sun. Signed articles that aided me were Stewart Alsop's "Battle of the Millionaires," *The Saturday Evening Post* (October 25, 1959); Noel F. Busch's "Nelson A. Rockefeller," *Life* (April 27, 1942); Leo Egan's "Can Rockefeller Save the G.O.P. in New York?" *The Reporter* (October 30, 1958); Geoffrey T. Hellman's "Best Neighbor," *The New Yorker* (April 11-18, 1942); William Manchester's "Nelson Rockefeller's Moral Heritage," *Harper's* (May, 1959); Richard Austin Smith's "The Rockefeller Brothers," *Fortune* (February-March, 1955); Theodore H. White's "A Voters' Choice of Millionaires," *Life* (September 22, 1958); Richard L. Wilson's "Can Rockefeller Knock Off Nixon?" *Look* (April 28, 1959); and Gay Talese's "Impressionistic Sketch of a Governor," the *New York Times Magazine* (March 29, 1959).

I owe a particular debt of gratitude for the generous help given me by Richard Amper, Betty Buttfield, Bea Collins, Martha Dalrymple, Joe Alex Morris, Bill Poole, Nelson Rockefeller, Isabelle Savelle, and the anonymous compilers of that most helpful of all research tools, the *New York Times Index*. And to my wife, my heartfelt thanks for her invaluable assistance.

J. P.

# Contents

I. NELSON ALDRICH ROCKEFELLER	1
1. <i>His Background</i>	3
2. <i>His Career</i>	17
II. ROCKEFELLER SPEAKS	43
1. <i>On the Democratic Principle</i>	45
Democracy and the Christian Ethic · The Brother- hood of Man · The Freedom of the Individual	
2. <i>On Government</i>	53
Local vs. Federal · Fiscal Policy · Taxation	



<b>3. <i>On Domestic Economic Policies</i></b>	<b>66</b>
Roles of Private Capital and Government in a Growth Economy · Climate for Economic Expansion · Inflation · Recession · Pump-priming vs. Tax Cuts · Local Economic Councils	
<b>4. <i>On Foreign Trade and Foreign Policy</i></b>	<b>78</b>
Diplomacy and Economics Inseparable · World Role of U.S. Capital · Our Stake in Free World's Economic and Social Progress · Our Negative Foreign Policy · A Positive Approach	
<b>5. <i>On Labor and Agriculture</i></b>	<b>100</b>
Labor Policy · Trade Unionism · Collective Bargaining · Right-to-Work Laws · Unemployment Insurance · Equal Opportunity · Vocational Rehabilitation · Pension Rights · Legislation Safeguarding Union Funds · Agricultural Policy · Practical Farm Aid	
<b>6. <i>On Public Health</i></b>	<b>113</b>
Socialized Medicine vs. Private Initiative · Government Support · The Health Insurance Problem · Rehabilitation · Geriatrics · Medical Costs	
<b>7. <i>On Education</i></b>	<b>123</b>
The Crisis · Planning for the Future · More State Aid · Financial Security for Teachers · Our Educational Goal	
<b>8. <i>On Civil Rights</i></b>	<b>132</b>
A Moral Issue · Legislation Necessary · A Positive Program Needed · The World Watches	
<b>9. <i>On Housing</i></b>	<b>139</b>
Urban Blight and Renewal · The Middle-Income Housing Problem · Private Capital Required · Housing for the Aged · Slum Rehabilitation · Rent Control · Discrimination in Housing	

10. <i>On Organized Crime</i>	152
Mobilizing Against Crime · Training Standards for Police · New Laws · Coordinating Law Enforce- ment Efforts	
11. <i>On National Security and Defense</i>	158
Cost of Survival · Weapons Technology · Waste and Duplication in the Services · Inadequate Stra- tegic Planning · National Complacency · Reorgani- zation of Military Establishment Necessary · Rec- ommendations · Up to Congress	
12. <i>“And in conclusion . . .”</i>	168
III. PROGNOSIS	171
<i>Prognosis</i>	173



**I...NELSON ALDRICH ROCKEFELLER**



# 1 . . . His Background

As far as Nelson Rockefeller is concerned his lineage begins with his grandfather. Although he qualifies for membership, he has never joined the Rockefeller Family Association, comprised of descendants of Johann Peter Rockefeller, a German who came to New Jersey in 1720 and later acquired large land holdings. Nelson is uninterested in genealogical attempts to track down his European forebears and unimpressed when he is told he may also be a descendant of the Marquis de Roqucfeuil and George, Duke of Clarence, a brother of Edward IV of England. He has no interest in family trees and he was never more amused than on the occasion when a haughty Philadelphia dowager referred to him as "that New York boy

who married into the Clark family." For him, the family history begins with the rise of old John D., Sr., who founded the Standard Oil Company, dominated the oil industry at the turn of the century, and became the country's first billionaire.

It isn't surprising that Nelson should consider his grandfather his only significant progenitor; there would be no family history worth relating if there had been no John D. But, in simple justice, much of the credit for the Rockefeller fortune *and* the fact that it has been spent unselfishly for three generations must be given to old John D.'s mother, Eliza. She set the course of the family history when she set her son's character. She is the unsung heroine of the Rockefeller saga. If John D.'s father had been the guiding influence in his life there would be a different story to tell. John D. might still have made his billion; but it's doubtful if there would be much left of it today, or if his descendants would be as dedicated as they are to the public weal. Nelson's great-grandfather, William (Big Bill) Rockefeller, was well-known, if not notorious, in some circles, but he was never known for his altruism or his thrift.

Big Bill called himself a "botanic physician" or "herbal doctor." Actually, he was a patent medicine pitchman who worked state and county fairs and small villages. Before going into his pitch he would play a violin on his hip or demonstrate his skill as a marksman with a .22 rifle to attract a crowd. He had the gift of eloquence, and his skill in the art of extracting dollars from the innocent in exchange for harmless elixirs has left Senator William Langer, North Dakota, with a vivid memory of the ease with which Big Bill unloaded two hundred dollars' worth of nostrums on the Senator's father.

Big Bill's children thought of him chiefly as a big, bearded, laughing giant who handed out five-dollar gold pieces on his rare and unexpected visits to his family. Shortly before the Civil War, he abandoned New York as a base of operations and headed west—he wished to avoid a discussion of certain

legal matters with the sheriff of Cayuga County—and his visits thereafter grew even rarer. When his wife died he didn't come to her funeral. No one knew where to reach him.

(Big Bill was reputed to have a sense of humor. Had he lived, he would probably have enjoyed a rich, sardonic chuckle when the voters of Cayuga County favored his great-grandson for Governor of New York by a majority of 19,025 to 12,225.)

Eliza Davison Rockefeller was made of different stuff. She had to be. While Big Bill was off peddling elixirs on the midways of the American frontier, she was raising five children. She nursed them through a series of homes in New York's Finger Lake district, then settled her family in Lake Forest, a small town near Cleveland, Ohio.

According to one old newspaper account, Eliza was "a power for good" in the community. She was Scotch, stern, and extremely pious. Liquor, dancing, and card playing were the Devil's allies and she fought the good fight against them all of her life. She was a particularly formidable opponent of the demon rum. In company with other temperance workers, she would invade saloons and pray for mankind's release from the bondage of alcohol. An inexorable puritan, she created an almost fanatical religious atmosphere in her home and the essence of her devotion, freed of fanaticism, still lingers on in the homes of her descendants.

But Eliza passed her puritanism on intact to her son. It was her conscience, rather than Big Bill's lack of it, that made John D. what he was. He may have inherited his horse-trader shrewdness from his father, but it was Eliza who put the fear of God in him and taught him that, "Willful waste makes woeful want," and that, "A man of good words and not deeds is like a garden full of weeds."

John D. became known for his piety early in life. He began tithing before he reached his teens and never departed from the practice. At seventeen he was a trustee of Cleveland's Erie Street Baptist Mission, and he served as Sunday school superintendent of the mission for over thirty years. When he



married, he chose a wife whose piety matched his own: Cettie Spelman, a young schoolteacher who had formerly been his high school classmate. Between them they gave their children—three daughters and Nelson's father, John D., Jr.—a parochial upbringing that by modern terms seems crushing. Life in the old titan's household, according to his son, centered around the morning Bible reading, evening vespers, and a weekly prayer meeting. Missionaries' lantern slides were sometimes shown to introduce a lighter note.

But there was something of Big Bill as well as Eliza in old John D., and he sincerely believed that a man had a right to "get all the money he honestly can." And in building his monopolistic empire he sometimes employed cut-throat business tactics that, while not uncommon in the early days of American industry, were still as sharp as any of his mountebank father's practices. But he could never wholly ignore Eliza's teachings, and the more his wealth grew, the more he tried to clear his garden of weeds. The most munificent fruits of Eliza's schooling were of course the many philanthropic organizations her son founded and supported with contributions running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

When he died it was said that John D. had left his family more than money; that he had also bequeathed them his puritan conscience. His spiritual bequest was actually Eliza's gift to the family. To truly understand a Rockefeller a picture of Eliza kneeling in prayer in a saloon must be borne in mind. Her spirit still hovers over the family, prodding her descendants into good works. Not that they are meddling dogooders; Eliza's fanaticism is no part of their moral heritage. But every living Rockefeller has a puritanical desire, or perhaps need, to lead a constructive life. They regard their money as a public trust over which they have been granted stewardship, rather than a personal possession which they are free to spend as they will. Nelson has said that he would like to use his wealth and whatever ability he has in a manner that would best contribute to the progress of society. Eliza would

never have put it quite that way, but she would have applauded his ambition.

Nelson was born in Bar Harbor, Maine, July 8, 1908, at a time of crisis in his father's life. John D., Jr., as he has always been called, was bored with earning money. He was nursing an unspoken desire to leave the family business. After years of careful training for the succession, he wanted to abdicate as heir to the mightiest industrial empire of its time.

The heir apparent was then, and still is, a shy, gentle, idealistic man who wears his somewhat old-fashioned virtues with modesty. At ten he took, and has kept, a pledge against the use of liquor, tobacco, and profanity. He has "a passionate awareness of the outside world," and our national parks in the Great Smoky Mountains, the Grand Tetons, the Shenandoah, and on Maine's Mt. Desert Island, all established with his money, are enduring monuments to his love of nature's grandeur and beauty. He is responsible too, for the preservation of the Hudson River's Palisades and California's ancient redwoods, to the annoyance of the gravel and lumber industries. His pleasures have always been simple and unostentatious: music, swimming, skating, camping trips with his boys, and picnics at Pocantico Hills, the family's 3,000-acre estate overlooking the Hudson thirty miles from New York. Eliza, however, would never have approved of his love of dancing, which he enjoyed into his sixties, or his open admiration of the Radio City Music Hall Rockettes.

After his graduation from Brown University, in 1897, he went to work at 26 Broadway, which became the Standard Oil Trust's headquarters when John D. shifted his base of operations from Cleveland to New York City. As he sat behind his roll-top desk exploring the inside world of business, he found to his dismay that with each passing year it grew increasingly distasteful to him. John D., Jr., might have had the makings of a capable financier—he once bested J. P. Morgan in a business deal—had balance sheets and all they stand for

held any interest for him. Instead, he found them dull and bloodless.

The move east had exposed John D., Jr., to some fresh and provocative new minds. He had been profoundly affected by E. Benjamin Andrews' course in ethics, at Brown. His new pastor, W. H. P. Faunce, a highly liberal minister, was urging him to follow a constructive bent and not waste time gathering in still more millions. And he had come under the influence of Frederick T. Gates. In addition to being head of the American Baptist Education Society, Gates was John D.'s adviser on philanthropic matters. He once warned John D., "Your fortune is rolling up like an avalanche and unless you distribute it faster than it grows it will crush you and your children and your children's children."

More than any other man, Gates helped stem the threatening avalanche. He had vision, imagination, and a fresh concept of philanthropy that found expression in his brain-children, the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission, the General Education Board, and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. In 1913, it became apparent that these endeavors in education, medicine, and public health were overlapping and causing wasteful duplication. Gates and his new disciple, John D., Jr., became the prime movers in the establishment of the Rockefeller Foundation, an organization set up to eliminate the duplication, and then to coordinate a world-wide attack on poverty, ignorance, and disease. It was the first philanthropic institution scientifically designed to do the greatest good for the greatest number. As an initial endowment, John D. gave the Foundation a hundred million dollars.

Under the influence of men like Gates, Faunce, and Andrews, John D., Jr., grew less and less interested in the family's international oil interests and increasingly preoccupied with its global philanthropy. To his mind, curing 7,000,000 people in North and South America of hookworm was more important than producing 7,000,000 barrels of oil. It was an investment in the future of society to spend \$80,000,000 to revive

moribund Chicago College and convert it into the University of Chicago; the same sum spent on a new refinery could produce nothing but additional dividends.

In 1910, two years after Nelson's birth, John D., Jr., finally resolved his inner struggle. At thirty-five, after having been "anxious and troubled" for over a decade, he resigned from his business posts and announced that he would thereafter devote his full time to the family philanthropies. His announcement could have led to unpleasantness. But, happily, father and son had always been close. John D., Sr., concealed his disappointment. His son, he said, had a right to his own mind. Then he began to rid himself of the stock he'd been holding to assure his son's succession to the throne. He replaced it with massive trust funds, set up for his children and grandchildren.

As a consequence of his father's action, Nelson, his sister and four brothers, grew up in a curious environment in which such universal traits as the acquisitive instinct, the urge to make money, and the desire to get ahead were wholly lacking. The customary emphasis was reversed. Money was not something to be acquired, it was something that had to be *spent*. To complicate further what was obviously an unnatural situation by ordinary standards, the accident of birth also thrust Nelson into an atmosphere of tremendous power, wealth, and prestige and at the same time denied him the right to revel in any of them. Instead, he had to abide by his father's firm code: "Every right implies a responsibility, every opportunity an obligation, every possession a duty."

It was probably a unique as well as an extraordinary environment to be born into. But in spite of it, Nelson's childhood was unremarkable and in some ways commonplace. His father saw to that. In a Princeton speech he once said, "Even in this machine age there are certain things that demand personal attention. The business of being a father is certainly one." John D., Jr., made the business of fatherhood a full-time responsibility.

He had six children. Nelson was his second son and third

child. He was preceded by the only daughter, Abby, now Mrs. Jean Mauzé, and by John D. Rockefeller 3rd, who has succeeded his father as supervisor of the family philanthropies. After Nelson came Laurance, a business man and member of the New York Stock Exchange, with a deep personal interest in conservation and cancer research. He was followed by Winthrop, an ardent and active supporter of civil rights and integration, who conducts agricultural experiments on his model farm in Arkansas, and is also head of the state's Industrial Development Commission. The youngest son is David, a banker, scholar, and economist whose chief extracurricular interests center around urban redevelopment.

The children's mother was the former Abby Greene Aldrich, daughter of Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, one of the most powerful Republican leaders of his day in Congress. Mrs. Rockefeller was a perfect foil to her husband. She was liberal where he was strait-laced, gregarious where he was retiring, and as gay as he was shy. The Rockefeller tradition grew healthier and lost much of its somberness when she exposed the family to her love of the theatre, art, music, literature, and light-hearted parties. (She once said she wished she could give a party every day.) And although her father-in-law was shocked when he learned that she refused to keep a household budget, he was fond of her and admired the manner in which she taught her children to defer to their elders, to be polite and modest, to listen and learn, and to develop within themselves a true sense of purpose.

On the surface, Abby Aldrich and John D., Jr., seemed to have little in common. Actually, they were a devoted and congenial couple. Their children were fortunate. Because their parents supplemented each other so well, they received a more normal, balanced upbringing than they might otherwise have had.

In matters of moral decorum, it's true, old Eliza's puritanism prevailed over Abby's more liberal inclinations. Each morning at a quarter of eight, Nelson listened to prayers and Bible-

reading—as his three sons and two daughters did while they were growing up. Liquor was never served in his father's house—a custom that Nelson hasn't perpetuated, though he limits himself to an occasional glass of sherry or Dubonnet. Along with the other boys, he was offered a prize of \$2,500 if he would refrain from smoking until he was twenty-one. He won the prize and still doesn't smoke—primarily because he doesn't enjoy it.

His training in handling money began the day he was given his first allowance of thirty cents a week. At the same time, he was given a ledger and taught to keep a record of his expenditures. Once a week, John D., Jr., would examine the account book. If Nelson's records were satisfactory he received a reward of a nickel, otherwise he was fined a nickel. In college, a monthly accounting was required of him. When Nelson went on a round-the-world honeymoon, he carefully entered all of his expenses in a ledger; keeping a watchful eye on money had become a habit with him.

Money over and above his allowance had to be earned. The going rate for hoeing the garden was ten cents an hour, and the same amount could be earned by catching a hundred flies. A shoe shine paid five cents. Other chores could be performed at equally unremunerative rates. At one point, Nelson branched out and went into the business of raising rabbits for laboratory use, but he wasn't quite so enterprising as it would seem. He had a captive market: the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

For recreation, he was taught to swim, skate, ride, and sail a boat. And while he was always adequately supplied with toys and playthings, there was a family rule that none of the Rockefeller children were to be given the biggest or best of anything. (One of Nelson's brothers has said, "In college I remember feeling that responsibility was the only thing I ever had more of than my classmates.")

In the winters, Nelson lived in the nine-story family mansion on West Fifty-fourth Street, since torn down to make way

for his mother's favorite project, the Museum of Modern Art. His summer vacations were usually spent at Seal Harbor, Maine, where the family maintained a house, or at the family estate in Pocantico Hills. Here his father and mother as newly-weds had planted spruce and hemlock on the slopes leading down from the main house. And here, too, John D., Jr., weakened and indulged in his only extravagant gesture as a father; he built his children a \$500,000 playhouse with bowling alleys, squash and tennis courts, and a swimming pool. Four of John D., Jr.'s sons now have homes at Pocantico Hills and a fourth generation of Rockefeller children, Nelson's grandchildren among them, today picnic under trees planted by their great-grandparents.

John D., Jr., distrusted private schools; he thought they bred snobbishness. Nelson and his younger brothers were sent to Lincoln School, a coeducational institution sponsored by Columbia University to test some of Professor John Dewey's ideas in progressive education. Its student body was made up of youngsters of every race, creed, and color, drawn from every economic level through a system of scholarships the Rockefellers helped finance. No distinctions were made at Lincoln; the son of a Harlem cook was on a par with an heir to millions.

Nelson remembers Lincoln with pleasure, and thinks the school helped develop his aptitude for getting along with people in all walks of life. He recalls the usual playground scuffles and black eyes, learning to play tunes on a harp, and enacting the role of a beggar in a school play. By Lincoln's standards, he was only an average student, perhaps even below average in spelling and arithmetic. But he believes that being forced to compete with his "intellectual superiors" at Lincoln was a healthy experience. (He sometimes says he doesn't have a high I.Q., and when asked how he knows, he always answers, "Oh, I took one of those tests at Lincoln.")

In his senior year at Lincoln, the school employed a new teacher and Nelson greeted her with the remark, "You're new

here and I've been around for quite a while. If you need any help, let me know." He obviously acquired early in life the self-confidence for which he is noted.

Nelson decided to go to Dartmouth because he felt it was the most democratic of the Ivy League colleges. The first thing he encountered on the campus was something that seemed to him to be essentially undemocratic and the antithesis of what he'd expected of Dartmouth—the fraternity system. With an aplomb seldom found in a freshman, he immediately published a strong denunciation of fraternities in the school's newspaper. Sometime later he mellowed and joined Psi Upsilon, without producing an essay outlining his second thoughts on the subject.

His other activities at Dartmouth were more conventional. He skied, served as editor of the school pictorial magazine, made the soccer team, and entered campus politics. The total lack of interest in clothes which leads him to appear today in color combinations that clash, and wear rumpled double-breasted suits that do nothing for his powerful, stocky figure, was already in evidence; most of the time he wore sweat shirts and corduroy pants. Suits were held in reserve for dances and the Sunday School class he taught during the four years he was in college.

He received an allowance of \$1,500 a year. It had to cover everything—board, room, tuition, books, clothes, and travel. Ten per cent had to be set aside for church and charity contributions, and if he didn't save an additional ten per cent his father thought him a spendthrift. Nelson was usually broke. Although many of his classmates had cars, he could only afford a bicycle. Sometimes he had to work in the school cafeteria to raise money to finance a date. And he was often obliged to borrow from more affluent classmates. According to one story, probably apocryphal, a professor once met him on the street and said, "Nelson, you must come to dinner sometime." "Thank you," Nelson replied. "How about tonight?" Supposedly, he had only twelve cents in his pocket at the time.



Nelson's roommate, John French, Jr., a brilliant student, made Phi Beta Kappa as a junior. Nelson's competitive instinct ("Frankly, I love competition.") was immediately aroused. Up to that point, he'd been content to get by with passing grades. But in his senior year, goaded by his roommate's example, he concentrated on his studies—he was an economics major—and earned himself a Phi Beta Kappa key too. "When John heard the news," Nelson recalls, "he swore he'd never wear his key again—it had lost all meaning." French says the story is untrue, but that Nelson's wry devaluation of his own accomplishment is quite typical of him.

Nelson's classmates remember him as a friendly affable young man whom they all knew as "Rocky." He was free of affectation, full of drive and energy, and had a kind of irrepressible determination to do big things. While he instinctively favored direct action, he was mature enough, they say, to have learned the importance of looking before leaping, of gathering his facts before popping off on a subject.

His senior honors thesis, nevertheless, was a bold, almost defiant leap, even though he had gathered his facts to the best of his ability. He wrote his thesis on the subject of his own grandfather, refuting the charges of the muckrakers of the day who had portrayed John D., Sr., as an economic robber baron. Nelson has always been proud of the family name and has always defended it. He and his brothers regard it as their greatest asset, worth more to them even than their money. When they summarized their philosophy for Joe Alex Morris, author of *Those Rockefeller Brothers*, they made this clear.

"What we really have," they said, "is our name. That is our big asset. It opens doors and, as our money is dispersed, it is of far greater value than anything else as long as it remains a good name. Seeing that it does must be our first consideration. There is an old saying: 'Shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations.' We have to avoid a third-generation climax. We have to put our time and our money to work building something new."

A week after his graduation from Dartmouth in 1930, Nelson married Mary Todhunter Clark, a vacation-time neighbor of the Rockefellers in Maine whom he had known since he was sixteen. "Tod" Rockefeller—a member of an old Philadelphia family and granddaughter of the late president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, George B. Roberts—is not the conventional product of an exclusive girls' finishing school. Among other things, she is a collector of rare plants, an amateur ornithologist who maintains bird-watching stations on two continents, and a woman with an independent mind and strong convictions. Although she became a Republican early in life, at one time she found the party so lacking in vision and so reactionary that she switched to the Liberal Party for three years. She returned to the fold when President Eisenhower was elected.

The young couple spent a year circling the globe—the trip was a wedding present from Nelson's father—and then returned to New York. Their first home was an apartment on E. 67th Street. They now live in a triplex Fifth Avenue penthouse. The living room is hung with Matisse murals. Pictures by such artists as Van Dongen, Picasso, Paul Klee, Dufy, Dufour, and Van Gogh hang somewhere in the apartment, too, but Mrs. Rockefeller is never quite sure where; when Nelson gets an urge to rehang pictures, he rehangs them, no matter what the hour. Art is a hobby he takes seriously. His collection now includes over a thousand oils, lithographs, and etchings, mostly modern, and some 1,500 examples of the primitive arts of the Americas, Africa, Oceania, Asia, and Europe. In 1954, he founded the Museum of Primitive Art.

The Rockefellers maintain four other residences—a house in Foxhall Road, Washington, D.C.; one at Pocantico Hills; another in Seal Harbor, Maine; and a ranch house atop a hill on their 112,500-acre ranch in Venezuela.

Their first child was born in 1932. They now have five children and five grandchildren: Rodman, twenty-seven, father of Meile Louise and Peter; Ann, twenty-five (married to an

Episcopal minister, Robert L. Pierson), mother of Clare Marie, Joseph Anthony, and Mary Louise; Steven, twenty-three, husband of a Norwegian girl, Anne-Marie Rasmussen; and the twenty-one-year-old twins, Michael and Mary.

Nelson has conscientiously passed on the Rockefeller tradition to his children. But with each succeeding generation the tradition changes slightly; something new is added and the emphasis shifts. John D., Sr., was primarily concerned with saving souls. John D., Jr., believes it is as important to keep people healthy as to save their souls. Nelson is in complete agreement with both ideas, but he has taught his children that people must also be given security. That, he feels, is the third goal to work toward.

## 2 . . . His Career

Nelson Rockefeller played a dual role at the beginning of his career. In the mornings he worked in the Chase National Bank, over which his uncle Winthrop Aldrich presided, and in the afternoons in the renting department of Rockefeller Center, then under construction. He left no indelible impression on the world of banking, which he soon abandoned. But as a renting agent, he gave an impressively zealous, youthfully brash performance. This turned out to be the exact formula needed to inject vitality into his father's ailing real estate venture.

Rockefeller Center, a \$125,000,000 project, was still in the preliminary stages of construction when the 1929 depression struck. It held every promise of becoming a gigantic white elephant. At one time in the 1930's the big skyscrapers were mort-

gaged for \$45,000,000, and operating at a four-million-dollars-a-year loss. In the depths of an economic slump, Nelson's assignment was to rent no less than 5,000,000 square feet of floor space.

His approach to his assignment was characteristic; he reorganized the Center's renting department. A business associate of Nelson's has said, "He likes big, broad ideas and large-scale action. He is instinctively an organizer, sometimes a relentless and overwhelming organizer whether he is running Rockefeller Center . . . or organizing the National Conference of Christians and Jews Brotherhood Week . . . or merely buzzing around one of his own parties seeing that nobody is having a dull time. 'Well, let's get organized,' is a familiar phrase to his family, friends, and associates, and one that he is just as apt to apply to plans for going to lunch as to a \$3,000,000 project for the development of farming in Venezuela."

Nelson's reorganization of the Center's rental office called for more than luring potential tenants with attractive rents and facilities. It also involved buying up their long-term leases in other buildings in order to speed their entry into Rockefeller Center. Rival landlords screamed with fury. One filed suit for \$10,000,000 damages.

Nelson's reaction was typical. He reorganized again, this time setting up a subleasing office for the sole purpose of finding tenants for the space from which Rockefeller Center was drawing its own clientele. The subleasing unit was so successful that tempers soon cooled, and the suit was dropped.

In 1938, Nelson became president of the Center and promptly established an employee pension plan for members of the Center's staff, the first such plan to be offered to all employees of a major firm in the field of building ownership and management. At the time the Center was still not making a profit. In the next decade, during which Rockefeller became chairman of the board, its annual gross income grew to over \$20,000,000, and the mortgage was paid off. The Center now

belongs to the Rockefeller brothers and their sister, a gift from their father.

Nelson paid his first visit to South America in 1935. The trip changed his life. He at once saw the possibilities inherent in the South American economy, and was immediately attracted to the people. In Venezuela he also discovered the vast difference between living standards inside U.S. oil compounds and outside, and found that few U.S. executives knew Spanish or had any contact with the Latin American world beyond the oil compound fence. He was so interested in the region that, on his return home, he enrolled at the Berlitz School and began to study Spanish two hours a day.

On his second visit to South America, in 1937, he began to develop some definite ideas about the region. The importance of the southern hemisphere's natural resources to the economy of the United States was obvious, and it was clear to him that mutual benefits could result from a closer union of the Americas. With the proper cooperation, he believed much could be done to raise the standard of living in the depressed areas of Latin America, and to improve public health and encourage economic progress. Such progress, he was convinced, would inevitably benefit the United States. It would not only open large new markets to U.S. business, it would also build stronger friends and allies to the south.

Rockefeller's travels through Latin America in the late 1930's also opened his eyes to a situation that our State Department seemed to be ignoring. All twenty Latin American countries were riddled with Nazi infiltrators. German agents were not only operating as propagandists and spies, they even controlled the major South American airlines, a number of important industries, and many radio stations and newspapers. As a result, some key Latin American countries were rapidly being alienated from the United States.

In Nelson's opinion, the lack of understanding between

the two hemispheres was a threat to our national security. His concern increased when the European war broke out. As a private citizen, he initiated a series of talks in 1940 with a group of men familiar with Latin American affairs. They explored the whole problem of inter-American relations and in June—as Hitler's panzer divisions rolled over France—they submitted to the White House a memorandum suggesting an integration of all the defense and economic affairs of the Americas.

(This was the first time Rockefeller employed what the *New York Times* calls his "staff-study approach to serious problems." He is a firm believer in round table government, in the bringing together in conference of the best brains he can find. Under his guidance, over thirty committees of experts in their fields are now seeking solutions for the many problems besetting New York State.)

As a result of the memorandum he had inspired, Nelson was summoned to the White House. He went to keep his appointment with President Roosevelt in an uneasy frame of mind. He was a Republican and a member of a staunch Republican family, and his memorandum had been sharply critical of the State Department's South American policies. To his surprise, he found Roosevelt in complete agreement with the ideas set forth in the paper, which proposed establishing a separate government agency to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the war to increase trade and improve official relations with Latin America. The President was so wholly in accord with the proposal that in August, 1940, he created what became the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and appointed Rockefeller its Coordinator.

Nelson had held only one other government position, first as a member, then vice-president of the Westchester County Board of Health. This hardly prepared him for the complexities of official Washington. When he arrived in the Capital, most of the professional New Deal politicians regarded him as a thirty-two-year-old neophyte who was more to be pitied than

scorned. They took it for granted that his newly created agency would be swallowed up quickly by someone with greater experience in political infighting. At first, it looked as if they were right.

Nelson stepped into his new job with high optimism ("I'm optimistic about everything.") and immediately stubbed his toe. As one method of counteracting Nazi propaganda, he launched a \$500,000 advertising campaign in Latin American newspapers to publicize the new United States effort toward better hemispheric relations. Sumner Welles, who had opposed the creation of the Coordinator's office from the beginning, protested to the President. The State Department hadn't been informed of the project, Welles complained, and it had got under way in many countries before our ambassadors knew anything about it. Furthermore, the ads were appearing in some pro-Nazi newspapers and not in some pro-American papers and, anyway, the whole approach was too flamboyant.

The President wrote Rockefeller a sharp letter, rebuking him for not keeping the State Department informed and ordering him to stay in line in the future. Nelson made no rebuttal. Instead, he immediately arranged to have the State Department informed of every action contemplated by his office. One mollified State Department official said he was deeply impressed by Nelson's humility and his willingness to "eat crow and start all over again after being slapped down."

It was later disclosed that Nelson *had* outlined his Latin-American advertising campaign to a representative of the State Department, who had neglected to pass the information on and then been unwilling to admit that he'd been advised of it once the matter became controversial. Nelson had simply accepted the buck, instead of passing it on, hoping to bring a quick end to a quarrel that otherwise might have slowed up his work.

Nelson's knack for getting on with a job made a healthy impression on official Washington. He committed a couple of other early faux pas on the job, too, and his attempts to bull-



doze his way through red tape brought him into conflict with such formidable Washington figures as Milo Perkins and Wild Bill Donovan. But once he'd learned not to lead with his chin he began to make substantial progress. Congress showed its approval by increasing his budget from its original \$3,500,000 to \$19,000,000 and, eventually, to \$45,000,000, though many congressmen had predicted that the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs would develop into the greatest boondoggle of them all.

Under Rockefeller's direction the office coordinated in every conceivable direction. One major operation was an information program designed to smother Nazi propaganda. Through press, radio, films, and cultural exchanges, a steady flow of news and propaganda material stressing the mutual interest of the American Republics in democratic institutions was sent into Latin America. Because of its success, this program was merged after the war with what is now the Voice of America.

Knowing that poverty, disease, and malnutrition were related to the political instability plaguing some Latin American countries, Rockefeller established within the Coordinator's office an Institute of Inter-American Affairs to conduct programs in the fields of health, sanitation, and agriculture. It was given an initial allocation of \$25,000,000 and, on a cooperative basis with individual Latin American republics, developed scores of health centers and hospitals and set up numerous nursing, sanitation, and agricultural training programs. The Institute's pioneering work is being continued today through the International Cooperation Administration.

In the field of economics, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs scored heavily against the Nazis. It arranged for the United States to absorb within its stockpiles the raw materials which South and Central American countries had formerly been selling in Europe, blocking off an important source of supply to the Germans.

In 1940, Rockefeller sent four staff investigators south.

They uncovered the details of the machinations through which Germans had gained control of many of the major airlines of Latin America, and turned their findings over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC at once put up \$8,000,000 to enable local companies to buy out the lines and place them under local control.

Rockefeller's aides also investigated over 6,000 Latin American firms that profited out of their dealings with U.S. industry. A thousand of these firms, it was found, were contributing to Nazi organizations in South America. Three Uruguayan wool exporters, for example, together made a profit of \$750,000 in 1940 from the sale of wool to the U.S. and turned \$225,000 of this over to the local Nazi party. A blacklist was compiled of eighteen hundred pro-Axis individuals and companies with which many U.S. firms were unwittingly doing business. The list was given to the Department of State, which set up a Division of World Trade Intelligence and quickly eliminated this important source of revenue to the Nazis.

In recognition of his accomplishments, Nelson was elevated to Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American Affairs in 1944. In this capacity, he served the country far better than he or anyone else realized at the time.

At the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City, held six short weeks before the April, 1945, opening of the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, Rockefeller signed the Act of Chapultepec on behalf of the U.S. Government. This reciprocal assistance pact provided guarantees of territorial integrity and political independence not only from aggression from outside the Western Hemisphere, but also from aggression within the hemisphere itself.

Nelson's next assignment was the conference for the organization of the United Nations. At this conference there was strong opposition—much of it from our own State Department—to the idea of writing into the U.N. Charter a clause permitting the member nations to form such regional defense pacts

as the Act of Chapultepec. Convinced of their importance, Nelson enlisted the aid of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, then chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. Between them, their stubborn insistence on having such a clause written into the charter tied the conference in a snarl for ten days. The opposition finally crumpled.

Nelson had been thinking in terms of Latin America. But as it turned out, if the clause he fought for had not been incorporated in the U.N. Charter, today there would be no such postwar defense alliances as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), or the Baghdad Pact.

While the United Nations Conference was the setting for one of Rockefeller's most significant achievements, it was also the scene of his temporary political undoing. Despite the fact that the Peron dictatorship in Argentina was thoroughly unpopular with the United States public, it was Administration policy to bring Argentina into the U.N. As a representative of the Administration, it was Nelson's job to work for Argentina's admission. (What he thought of the question has never been publicly disclosed, although later, in private life, he did criticize Peron for his failure to live up to his wartime promise to rid his government of Axis sympathizers.)

Under Rockefeller's guidance, the State Department's efforts to get Argentina into the U.N. succeeded—and the public howled. Edward Stettinius promptly resigned as Secretary of State, to be replaced by James Byrnes, wielding the customary new broom. Rockefeller was among those Byrnes permitted to "resign."

Nelson returned to private life at a time when the United States was becoming increasingly preoccupied with European affairs. Knowing that this trend would dash Latin America's hope that war-inspired U.S. aid to them would continue into the postwar era, he planned to make up in part for the government's failure to carry through the program he had helped

set in motion. What he had in mind was in a sense a forerunner of Point Four, the United States' postwar technical assistance program for aid to underdeveloped areas of the world menaced by Communist expansion.

To carry out his ideas, Nelson formed the International Basic Economy Corporation (IBEC), a remarkable experiment in privately financed international cooperation. Rockefeller believed then, as he does now, that the greatest common need of the world today is increased output of food and industrial production, and that the key to higher living standards for the world's marginal areas is the application of modern tools and skills to their problems of production. IBEC was established—mostly with Rockefeller money—to provide backward countries with some of the private capital, management, technical skill, and machinery they so badly need. IBEC invests only in enterprises that benefit the people of the area in which its money is spent, and prefers to operate when possible in partnership with local capital. Its goal is at least to begin the important task of shifting the load of labor to the machine, of making more goods available to more people, of freeing men and women from heavy toil and providing them with a higher standard of living.

IBEC translates into action one of Rockefeller's deepest convictions. In announcing the formation of the corporation he said, "The sooner all of us recognize the fact that the welfare of the world is indivisible and that our freedom and the freedom of peoples of other nations are inseparable, the sooner we will be able to face the gigantic task of raising the standard of living of peoples of all lands. It is a matter of mutual self-interest—the brotherhood of Man. . . . The United States Government can make international agreements, can loan funds, and can cooperate in innumerable ways, but it cannot go abroad and develop the production of goods and services where they are badly needed. . . . If the job of economic cooperation is to be done and done effectively, it's got to be done with the help of private enterprise. . . . The record of the last century shows

that capital then went almost invariably to the area promising greatest profit. Today this is not enough. Today capital must go where it can produce the most goods, render the greatest service, meet the most pressing needs of the people. Wherever it goes, it is the function of capital to serve and not to exploit."

Despite its philanthropic cast, IBEC is a business corporation intent on earning dividends on its investment. From the company's inception Rockefeller has hoped through its example to lure other private interests into making capital investments in the lesser-developed areas of the world. And he is realistic enough to know that IBEC's example will be seductive only if the Corporation's enterprises return a fair profit, as the majority of them have done in recent years.

IBEC began operations in Latin America, slowly expanded, and has now ventured as far afield as Italy, India, Africa, and Iran. Its interests are immensely varied. Among its many construction activities it has built refrigerated warehouses and thousands of economical concrete houses. When an earthquake toppled five towns in El Salvador in May 1951, the IBEC housing corporation promptly rebuilt them.

In Latin America, in cooperation with local capital, IBEC has organized food production and distribution companies, a fishing fleet, a hog production company, a hybrid seed corn company, a pasteurized milk company, and many similar ventures. IBEC's supermarket program has spread from Peru to Italy. A branch of IBEC, the Economic Development Corporation, was set up in Bangkok, Thailand. IBEC has even opened a mutual fund for small investors in Brazil. It has had some failures, of course; but even so, IBEC has sustained Nelson's belief that modest profits can be made on investments in marginal areas.

To supplement the work of IBEC, Nelson, with the aid of his sister and brothers, also set up AIA (American International Association for Economic and Social Development). AIA is IBEC's philanthropic twin. It supports and develops

projects that have no commercial potential, and is mainly concerned with providing people in underdeveloped areas with the education, health, training, roads, supervised credit, etc., they need to improve their standard of living. According to the charter of AIA, the association is motivated by: "First, a faith in the inherent dignity and worth of the individual and in the capacity and desire for self-improvement of human beings of whatever nationality, race, creed, or color. Second, a conviction that the welfare of each nation and person in the modern world is closely related to the welfare and opportunities for advancement of all people of the world."

Because of Nelson's interest in South America, AIA concentrates in that area, where it supports farm-to-market road building programs, nutrition information programs, and training programs in farm operation and management. It sends instructors into marginal areas to give courses in sewing, carpentry, canning, poultry-raising, vaccination, tree grafting, and seed selection. AIA has helped fight epidemics and inaugurated supervised credit plans for small farmers. It sends out mobile health clinics and station wagons equipped with 16-mm. sound projectors that show movies in village plazas, mixing documentaries on nutrition, child care, and sanitation with sport films and comedies. AIA tries to go wherever it is most needed, to do what is most necessary.

As head of IBEC and AIA, Nelson seemed to South America's class-conscious officialdom something of a novelty. He refused to make distinctions. He insisted on talking to people as well as personages, ranging far and wide to exchange ideas with workers, fishermen, farmers, and storekeepers. He would visit the home of a peasant farmer to see what AIA had done, or might do, for the family. Or he would leave his official companions baking in the sun while he talked to a laborer on an IBEC construction job. According to an associate who made a trip to Venezuela with him, "Nelson goes a little like a mad man from daybreak until dusk and then wants to talk things over with the experts until midnight."

It has been said that Rockefeller “invented” President Truman’s Point Four Program. Nothing, Nelson says, could be further from the truth. Point Four was an inevitable outgrowth of the troubled days in which it was conceived. In 1949–50 it was clear to all that wide differentials in living standards create a fertile soil for Communist exploitation, and that raising the living standards of underprivileged people is an obvious way to check the spread of Communism. Yet there can be no doubt that the Point Four Program owes much to the pioneering efforts of IBEC and AIA. President Truman acknowledged this debt when he appointed Rockefeller chairman of his fourteen-member International Development Advisory Board, in 1950.

The board was assigned the task of drafting the basic blueprint for our technical assistance program abroad, and while some of its recommendations were accepted by the President and the Congress and written into Public Law 535: An Act for International Development. Nelson, nevertheless, resigned when the law was adopted. Clinging to his conviction that the effectiveness of Point Four depended to a great extent on the degree to which private enterprise participated in the program, he had fought for the formation of an International Finance Corporation, designed to cooperate with private capital in the financing of overseas ventures which could further the aims of Point Four. His proposal had been summarily rejected.

(The idea was finally enacted into law in 1954. Nelson’s failure to get it passed in 1952 was probably his most bruising encounter with one of the basic political facts of life: Appointed government officials can do just so much; they can propose, but only elected government officials can dispose.)

Feeling that Point Four was to be exclusively a bureaucratic operation, he wrote a letter of resignation that clearly stated his position. He said he felt that he could “best serve the program of international economic development by again concentrating on the role of private initiative in this field.”

He resigned on November 5, 1951, and spent a year with AIA and IBEC. On November 30, 1952, he was again recalled to public service, this time by President-elect Eisenhower, who appointed him chairman of the Advisory Committee on Government Organization. The committee was asked to recommend changes that would increase government economy and efficiency. On behalf of the committee, Rockefeller sent thirteen reorganization plans to the President in late 1953. Ten of these plans were submitted to Congress and became law, including plans to reorganize such basic agencies as the Defense Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Agriculture Department.

When the President appointed Rockefeller to his Advisory Committee he also gave him a special assignment: Draw plans to bring the whole complex maze of federal health, education, and social welfare agencies together into a single cabinet department. This was an idea that had first been proposed in the early 1920's but no administration had ever been able to put it across. There had always been too many obstacles to overcome, too much behind-the-scenes maneuvering on Capitol Hill, too many conflicting viewpoints to be reconciled.

Organizing the new department was the most challenging government job Rockefeller had yet faced. It involved, among other things, welding together the Public Health Service, the Social Security Administration, the Office of Education, the Food and Drug Administration, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and St. Elizabeth's Hospital; six independent agencies that were by no means eager to relinquish their autonomy. Many complex questions had to be answered, decisions pleasing to experts and congressmen alike had to be reached, legislation had to be drafted, and the bill had to be nursed through a series of congressional committees and then through Congress itself. By Washington standards, the new department was created in record time. Under Rockefeller's leadership, in less than five months the Advisory Committee drew up legislation that won congressional approval for an



idea that had previously been rejected for three decades.

The new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was added to the Cabinet in April, 1953. Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby was named Secretary. In June, Rockefeller was made Under Secretary. He was to act as "general manager" of the new department, Secretary Hobby announced, and take day-to-day charge of the operations of the 35,000 member staff. (Playing second fiddle to Mrs. Hobby, many think, gave Nelson postgraduate training in self-discipline.)

Rockefeller became far more than office manager of the new department; most officials, in fact, went to him for answers. In the summer of 1953 he successfully fought off the attempt by the Bureau of the Budget to cut HEW's appropriation twenty-five per cent. This marked the beginning of his running battle with the ultra-conservative team the Alsop brothers christened the Budget-Firsters—George Humphrey of the Treasury; Rowland B. Hughes, director of the Bureau of the Budget; John B. Hollister, director of the International Cooperation Administration; and Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State.

Rockefeller can be given major credit for piloting through Congress, with a unanimous vote in both houses, a bill providing for an expansion of the federal-state rehabilitation program. He helped prepare the legislation that resulted in an expansion of Social Security to cover almost ten million additional workers, and which increased benefits for retired workers and their families, widows, and dependent children. He also helped develop the legislation that authorized the White House Conference on Education, a bill broadening the federal-state hospital construction program to provide more nursing homes and chronic-disease hospitals for aged persons, and a bill providing federal aid for school construction in localities that lacked the resources to meet their own building needs. He failed completely, however, in his attempt to bring a little logic and uniformity to the confused crazy-quilt of

federal programs granting aid to states for such things as child welfare and vocational education.

At Eisenhower's request, Nelson left HEW at the end of 1954 and became Special Assistant to the President for Foreign Affairs. The President wanted him to attend meetings of the Cabinet, the National Security Council, the Council on Foreign Economic Policy, and the Operations Coordinating Board in order to equip himself for his more specific assignments. These were to assess the psychological aspects of U.S. foreign policy and to conduct broad studies to develop a long-range view of several critical problems involving national security.

In 1955 there was growing pressure for some kind of agreement with Russia that would end the cold war, or at least lessen the threat of an atomic holocaust; pressure that led to the first "meeting at the summit." Prior to this summit conference, Rockefeller gathered together a panel of experts at Quantico, Virginia, where various proposals were outlined in preparation for the summit meeting. One suggestion that emerged from these panel discussions was for a revival, in somewhat altered form, of the old Baruch aerial-inspection plan. Rockefeller, who accompanied the President to Geneva, urged Eisenhower to present the plan as the "open skies" proposal. And even though the Russians turned it down, the "open skies" plan scored one of our few clear-cut propaganda victories over the Soviet. Later, Nelson helped develop the Atoms-for-Peace Plan and the late, lamented Asswan Dam plan.

At the same time, his disenchantment with his role in government was increasing. Over an eighteen-year period he'd served under three Presidents, but always as an appointee. And although he was reasonably proud of some of his achievements as an administrative official, he was far from satisfied with the ultimate outcome of many of his efforts. Starting at the age of thirty-two, he'd been the able custodian of our country's Latin American affairs for five war years, only to see our hemispheric relations curdle after his return to private life.

As head of the Point Four Advisory Board, he'd watched helplessly while congressional and bureaucratic potshots riddled his most important policy recommendation. Being a Republican, it was at first easy for him to rationalize these frustrations; they could be blamed on the Democrats.

But after three years of service in a Republican administration, he still found himself frustrated. Outside of HEW, he couldn't see that he had accomplished much. As Special Assistant to the President he had lobbied for a more decisive American foreign policy, fought for a more imaginative and realistic aid program in Asia, and pleaded for more health, education, and welfare at home. He'd championed a reorganized, revitalized Department of Defense, and argued for sending more economic help and fewer guns abroad. And inevitably, in the rough-and-tumble infighting of White House politics, he had found himself in bruising conflict with the conservative Budget-Firsters. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey thought him an impractical do-gooder; the director of the Bureau of the Budget, Rowland Hughes, called him a spendthrift; John Hollister, of the International Cooperation Administration, considered him a visionary; and about the kindest epithet he ever earned from Herbert Hoover, Jr., was "starry-eyed." A close associate of Nelson's says, "He would come back from one of the tongue-lashings Hoover gave him holding onto himself like grim death to keep from losing his temper."

Rockefeller even had the rug pulled from under him while he was fighting to put through one of the President's own measures. In 1954, Eisenhower sent Congress a special message on health and recommended "the establishment of a limited Federal reinsurance service to encourage private and non-profit health insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families." Nelson strongly favored the idea, knowing that sixty-three million people had no health insurance or any hope of getting any unless a bill embodying the President's proposal became law.

Such a bill (S 3114) was drawn up, and Rockefeller went to Capitol Hill to fight for its adoption. The American Medical Association immediately and bluntly labeled the measure a step toward socialized medicine, despite the fact that it was specifically designed to encourage private health insurance groups to extend additional coverage to needy families. As soon as the AMA raised its omniscient voice, the White House's enthusiasm for S 3114 waned. The bill was left to die in committee, along with Nelson's hopes for it.

In 1955, Rockefeller decided he'd reached a dead end in government. He could no longer blame his political frustrations on the Democrats or even the Budget-Firsters. The fault, he now knew, lay with the offices he had held. He'd learned that only elected officials can make true progress in our form of government. When he puts his ideas and principles before the people and wins the approval of the voters, the elected official is given a mandate for action. The appointed official, on the other hand, is limited to carrying out the ideas and policies of his superior. Rockefeller, knowing he was in a political cul-de-sac, wanted to break out into the open. In November he resigned from the Eisenhower Administration.

When he returned to New York early in 1956 there was some talk of asking him to run for mayor of the city. He quickly backed away from the proposal, insisting that he was more interested in resuming the presidency of IBEC, his chairmanship of the board of Rockefeller Center and in helping his brothers supervise the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, with its annual expenditure of four million dollars on charities and special projects.

His rejection of the proposal obviously didn't stem from a lack of interest in the city's welfare. He had been active in his hometown affairs for years. He served as Chairman of the Mayor's Business Advisory Committee for long-range development of business and industry in New York City. He was also head of the city's committee for the Victory Clothing Collection

which gathered 250 million pounds of clothing for war-destitute Europeans and Asians.

In addition, Rockefeller was perhaps more responsible than any other single person for the establishment in New York City of the permanent home of the United Nations. In 1946, he was a member of the Mayor's Committee designated to persuade the U.N. to make its headquarters in New York. The Flushing Meadow site, which the committee offered the U.N., was rejected because it was too swampy. Other cities bidding for the United Nations had more attractive sites to offer, and a final vote was due on December 11. Rockefeller had gone to Mexico early in December but he immediately flew home to organize a desperation-drive to keep the U.N. in New York. But no suitable sites seemed to be available. On the evening of December 10th he called his father in a despondent mood and told him he didn't know what to do next. John D., Jr., then suggested the East River site where the U.N. now stands, and added that he would be happy to donate the property to the United Nations if it could be purchased for no more than \$8,500,000. With less than twelve hours to go before the United Nations vote, Nelson and a few friends worked all night to complete purchase negotiations. They got the legal papers to the U.N. just moments before the Assembly was called to order to make its final decision.

Some people believe that Rockefeller did not want to run for mayor of New York because he already had higher goals in mind. His associates deny this. They claim that in 1956 the furthest thing from his mind was seeking elective office. Before deciding on any future course of action, he wanted first to clarify his own ideas on national and international affairs. Nelson himself has said nothing that throws light on the debate, but if the clarification of his own thinking was indeed his primary objective, he approached his problem in typical Rockefeller fashion: he sent out for expert help.

When he left Washington Nelson had an uneasy feeling

that the country was drifting and not making full use of its vast skills, immense resources, and superior system of government. The United States had a mission, but it seemed to him to lack an understanding of that mission.

Rockefeller discussed the situation with his brothers and convinced them that something should be done, that a searching, nonpolitical study of the state of the Union should be undertaken. "We'd better find out where we stand," he told his brothers—fifteen months before Sputnik I.

Out of these talks came the Special Studies Reports, financed by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The studies began early in 1956. The plan was to ask the best brains in the nation to apply themselves to such problems as United States domestic policy, foreign policy, education, social objectives, military security, even democracy itself, and make recommendations for the future. It was hoped that the reports would help give the nation new direction, a new sense of purpose.

Four "Rockefeller Reports" have been published, covering military security, foreign economic policy, education, and domestic economic and social objectives. Still to come are reports on international objectives, manpower, the democratic process, and the moral framework of national purpose. The impact of the published reports is hard to measure. If the report on military security is a reliable yardstick, their effect has been considerable. Within weeks of the publication of the military report, President Eisenhower sent to Congress a program for reorganizing the Defense Department. It was probably no coincidence that significant parts of his plan bore a striking resemblance to the basic changes proposed by the Rockefeller study. At the same time, Defense Secretary Neil McElroy called in as consultants on Pentagon reorganization a number of generals and admirals and two civilians, one of whom was Nelson.

The reports also seem to have helped Rockefeller make up his mind about his future course of action. At least, when the question of his public service next arose there was nothing

shy or hesitant about his reaction. He jumped at the chance. (When he accepted the Republican nomination for Governor of New York, he said in his speech, "I don't need to tell you I was not drafted for this nomination. I worked and fought for it. . . .")

Leo Egan, the *New York Times* reporter who covered Rockefeller's gubernatorial campaign, says that Nelson's candidacy was born of a chance curbstone meeting with L. Judson Morhouse, the Republican state chairman. At the conclusion of the 1956 Presidential campaign, both men attended a meeting of wealthy Republicans to discuss ways and means of paying off the campaign deficit. When they left the meeting Rockefeller and Morhouse found themselves standing side by side on a Fifth Avenue curb looking for taxis. They began to talk about their party's future and soon forgot about taxis.

At the time of their sidewalk talk nothing was said about the possibility of Nelson's running for office. But Egan is certain that the idea took root that night in the minds of both men, and there is evidence to support his belief. Judson Morhouse is a shrewd professional politician, not given to aimless gestures. Shortly after the chance encounter, he arranged Rockefeller's appointment as chairman of a special commission set up by the state legislature to revise the state constitution. His sudden display of interest in Nelson could hardly have been fortuitous.

Morhouse watched from the sidelines while Rockefeller conducted commission hearings in various parts of the state. Public reaction was favorable and Morhouse was encouraged in his belief that he was on the right track. He then had a private poll taken. It showed that while Averell Harriman led Rockefeller by a sixty-forty margin, Nelson was still the strongest opponent the Republicans could run against the incumbent. Now Morhouse was sure of himself, but he had to win over the Republican county chairmen.

It wasn't easy. Rockefeller's liberal views disturbed many of the old-time upstate leaders. Others found his wealth and

family name a liability. One county chairman said, "Hell, only Democrats can get away with running somebody with a lot of inherited dough."

Morhouse talked with every county leader in the state, backing his arguments with the findings of his poll. Rockefeller followed him up, paying personal visits to over fifty of the state's sixty-two county Republican leaders. That clinched it, according to Morhouse, who says, "Once the county leaders talked to Nelson they'd swoon—we had ecstatic reports coming in from all over."

In surprisingly short order, Morhouse and Rockefeller had signed up enough delegates to the state Republican convention to be assured of winning the nomination. Former Republican National Chairman Leonard Hall—one of the four hopefuls who withdrew at this point from the race for the nomination—announced his decision with an amiable grumble and said, "The guy's got magic. All politicians get to be pretty good smilers and handshakers—that's our stock-in-trade. But when Nelson goes upstate and shakes hands with some leader's wife, she gets weak in the knees, like he was some damned prince or something."

On August 26, 1958, the New York State Republican convention nominated Nelson for governor by acclamation. By Labor Day, Rockefeller was on the campaign stump, attracting larger crowds than even his most optimistic followers had expected.

He organized his campaign in much the same way he initiates a new million-dollar IBEC business venture. As soon as he was sure of the nomination, he had experts in various fields prepare for him a set of twenty-five analyses of the major problems of New York government, for study and reference purposes. These bound volumes were at his side throughout the campaign.

The campaign itself was handled rather like an industrial sales promotion program. Under Judson Morhouse's overall direction, five departments were set up: promotion and



publicity, research, headquarters operation, organization management, and special groups. The heads of these departments met with Morhouse daily, and experts were called in to these policy meetings whenever they were needed.

One of the most significant of the special groups to join the Rockefeller campaign was one comprised of former Willkie supporters, many of them making their first active contribution to the Republican cause since the Willkie presidential campaign of 1940. Oren Root, former chairman of the Associated Willkie Clubs of America, became chairman of the Citizens for Rockefeller Committee. Willkie's old supporters seemed to see in Rockefeller something highly reminiscent of their idol.

According to labor columnist Victor Riesel, Rockefeller also received support of a passive, indirect nature from one of the least likely sources imaginable, considering his party affiliation. Riesel, an intimate of many Liberal Party leaders, wrote in his column of June 29, 1958:

Roosevelt named John, like his father before him, has been seeking out labor leaders—but for another party. Recently John Roosevelt conferred with Liberal Party people, seeking their support for Nelson Rockefeller's drive for the governorship on the Republican ticket. . . . He's being assured of one thing. If Rockefeller does get the G.O.P. nomination, the Liberal-Labor people will run the quietest campaign they've ever put on the road against a Republican.

(Nelson was guest of honor, along with David Dubinsky, labor leader and member of the Liberal Party, at the National Urban League's presentation of its 1958 award to Jacob Potofsky of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union. In accepting the award, Potofsky spoke of his delight at the "reunion of that fine firm with the good old American name of Dubinsky, Potofsky and Rockefeller.")

The Rockefeller name alone was enough to win Nelson

support in some quarters. The family's contributions to Negro education, aid to Israel, and low-cost housing for Puerto Rican workers undoubtedly won him votes from ethnic and minority groups that ordinarily support the Democratic ticket in New York.

While the state Republican organization was delighted to see its candidate drawing votes from groups usually antipathetic to the GOP cause, many of the party's old hands were worried about Rockefeller's ability to win over the general public. He was a tyro who had never run for office before and they were afraid he might conduct an amateurish, ineffectual campaign. Their fears were soon allayed. One old party pro, in fact, ended up saying, "Now I'm convinced God meant Nelson to be a politician."

From the beginning, Rockefeller handled himself with the skill of a practiced professional. In Olean, N.Y., he let party bosses wait while he visited a W. T. Grant store to shake hands with its clerks and buy some taffy. In a restaurant in Batavia, his breakfast coffee grew cold as he table-hopped, shook hands with the waitresses and visited the cook in the kitchen. He paid a call on Grandma Moses, drove a sulky at the Rensselaer County Fair and, while the cameras clicked, solemnly accepted a fifty cent campaign contribution from a bashful Brownie Scout in Wellsville.

He went everywhere. In one upstate county a newspaper editor said, "No other Republican has campaigned up here since Teddy Roosevelt. They've always taken us for granted." And wherever he went he displayed his huge engaging grin, a vast amount of enthusiasm and vitality, and a convincingly earnest manner. Rockefeller isn't a particularly skilled orator. He belongs to the soft-sell rather than hell-and-thunder school and speaks in a direct, straightforward manner, seldom wasting time warming up an audience. Yet somehow, he always manages to project his unquestioned sincerity—and to a politician, this is a quality beyond price. But there is more to being a born politician, of course, than an engaging personality

and a talent for meeting people at all levels. Some substance is required.

The voters Rockefeller met in the course of his campaign were surprised by his range of interests and information. Dunkirk steelworkers were impressed by his knowledge of production processes and his ability to ask intelligent questions about their work. He not only understood the problems plaguing Harlem's Puerto Ricans, he could discuss them in fluent Spanish. Kingston's textile workers discovered that he was fully aware of the many economic problems besetting their industry, and farmers in northern New York were startled to learn that "this city fellow" knew the difference between a thruway and a farm-to-market road.

Then too, Rockefeller had a platform to offer the state's voters. Because of television, elections are in danger of degenerating into popularity contests, and it is already difficult to tell whether a victorious candidate's personality or platform should be given major credit for his victory. Rockefeller was a highly effective television campaigner, making telling use of his much-discussed charm and broad smile. But he still managed to present an image of a serious man who knew what he wanted to say and thought it well worth saying.

He recognized that the nation's richest state was harassed by many problems, including race conflict, a housing shortage, metropolitan decay, a soaring budget, and an increase in crime and juvenile delinquency. And he offered the people a platform of many planks, including a major housing program; an organized attack on crime and corrective action against juvenile delinquency; a plan for attracting new industries to the state to help carry the increased tax burden; a program of major medical insurance for all wage-earners; increased aid to education in this technological age; and a plan to make possible the transfer of pension benefits when workers change jobs.

It was a liberal, humanitarian platform by any standards, but definitely no more so than the platform offered by the

Democratic incumbent, Averell Harriman. As a result, a curious and surprising feature of the campaign was the inability of the two candidates to discover any issue on which they had vital differences of opinion. Nevertheless, there was a vast difference in the votes they received. With a Democratic avalanche rolling over the country in November 1958, Rockefeller defeated his Democratic opponent by an overwhelming margin of more than half a million votes.

It was an upset that left the nation's political soothsayers stunned and confounded. At first they solemnly debated whether Rockefeller had won because of his personality or because of his platform. Then, almost in unison, they reached a decision: both had played a part in his victory. It was a triumph of common sense over tiresome hair-splitting. It had finally occurred to them that the American voter has always said of his favorite candidate, "I like him and I like what he stands for, too."



## **II...ROCKEFELLER SPEAKS**



# 1 . . . On the Democratic Principle

A public figure who has to say a few well-chosen words on the subject of democracy faces a thankless task. By now, no matter which of the two poles of the democratic ideal the orator represents, everything has been said, and, except in rare instances, only the platitude and the sweeping generality remain. If the speaker thinks of democracy in terms of constitutional government, property rights, and anti-statism, he rings what changes he can on John Randolph's famous line, "I love liberty but I hate equality." If he is an egalitarian who sees democracy in terms of majority rule, human rights, and a welfare state, he can't hope to improve on the crisp motto of the frontier in Jackson's day, "Every man is as good as the next—and a damned sight better."



Both political philosophies, of course, have one thing in common. The Constitution, properly excerpted, will support either point of view. As a result, any public pronouncement about the principles we Americans live by must inevitably cite the Constitution as the keystone of our democracy. It is here that Nelson Rockefeller goes further than most speakers. He naturally recognizes the Constitution for what it is, but he also believes that the democratic principle was originally inspired by the Bible. Our political structure is, he thinks, "rooted in the concept of the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God."

Because of his moral heritage, he thinks of the democratic principle not as a political concept but as an extension of the Christian ethic. When he took his oath of office as Governor of New York on his grandmother's Bible, he was making a symbolic as well as a familial gesture. He instinctively equates democracy with religion, and political freedom with spiritual freedom.

Rockefeller has made this clear on many occasions. In November, 1948, for example, he went to San Francisco and addressed the annual dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in these words:

"Brotherhood is a mandate of religion and the essence of democracy. We have been taught from childhood the principles of respect for people which are imbedded deeply in our Western civilization. Both Christianity and Judaism revolve around their mutual teachings of respect for every child of God. We believe that God is the Father of all men and therefore that all men are brothers. This spiritual concept, shared by other world religions, is the binding force of our disrupted, war-torn world. When everything else is said and done, there stands the bedrock foundation of the unity of mankind. We are all one family. We are all brothers.

"Christians and Jews have common teachings of these principles. The most important one is the double command-

ment, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength and mind,' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' It is a central teaching of the Jewish law and Christ gave it as the answer to the question, 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?'

"The democratic ideals of the western world flow from these religious teachings. In the United States we have expressed them in such words as these: 'All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights.' 'We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all.'

"Indeed equal rights and brotherhood are the very fabric of our life. Therefore, brotherhood is a personal thing. It begins with you and me. Before we make demands on other people or criticize them we had better test ourselves.

"What do we really believe deep inside about other people? Do we live our beliefs or only talk about them? Do we practice brotherhood in our homes, teaching our children by both word and example that every person must be respected? Do the schools we operate give equal opportunities to all children? What about our business practices? Do we in business welcome all people into our offices and factories on the basis of individual merit? Are our labor unions open to all? Do business and labor give equal chances for promotion?

"After we have asked and honestly answered these questions of ourselves and our own groups, we can then, with clear conscience, ask our neighbors to join with us . . . to make brotherhood a reality. . . .

"There is an urgency about this . . . which we all sense and which we may not be able to put into the proper words. People everywhere are seeking desperately for a new spirit of brotherhood and hope. If we can build that hope through brotherhood in our nation, we can then give the moral and spiritual leadership which strikes at the very roots of conflict, disunity, and misunderstanding. We need to match our ma-

terial help with the moral leadership which is even more important to the reconstruction of our battered world.

“If we want other peoples to join us in standing and working for a world of free men, we must first of all prove by our lives that democracy will do what we say it can.

“If we do this, we cannot fail.”

Ten years later, in April, 1958, Rockefeller developed the same theme in even greater detail while speaking in New York before the Annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee:

“We in this country have a rich heritage in terms of our beliefs in the worth and dignity of the individual. It is a heritage that is importantly rooted in Judaism. To Judaism we owe our great, fundamental concept of the brotherhood of man under . . . a God of mercy and of love. To it we owe our faith in moral law, as laid down in the Ten Commandments, and our respect for all law, as the handmaiden of civilization. To it, in large measure, we owe our concepts of mutual helpfulness and social justice as an expression of God’s love and concern for every human soul. . . . Christianity has built its own edifice on these strong foundations . . . [and] America is the political expression of this great Judeo-Christian heritage. In the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, the Founding Fathers sought to make explicit in law what was implicit in the teachings of the prophets and in Christ’s teachings as to the sanctity of the human person.

“Out of these deeply spiritual beliefs has grown our whole concept of political freedom and the freedom of economic opportunity which has contributed so much to their realization.

“Thus, in our country, today, we have both a political framework and an ethical climate dedicated to the freedom of the individual to develop his own capacities. As yet, we have

not fully realized the full potential of this ideal. Bigotry and prejudice continue to plague us in many ways. . . .

“But it is the recognition and constant enhancement of this principle of individual worth that has given a sense of direction to our lives as a people. It is the realization that freedom is for all men, everywhere, and not for us alone, that gives universal meaning to our purpose.

“As Lincoln said, ‘The great principle that has bound us together was the sentiment in the Declaration of Independence, which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but to the world, for all future time. It was that, which gave *promise* that in due time, the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men.’

“And he [Lincoln] returned to this theme later in describing the purpose of the Union. ‘Its leading object,’ he said, ‘is to elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life. . . .’

“We are just beginning to understand the implications in the fact that millions of oppressed people throughout the world are, for the first time in history, resting their eyes on the distant hills of hope. They have caught from us and our Judeo-Christian heritage the concept and meaning of the freedom of the individual to develop himself to his full stature as a spiritual being.

“This is the great moment of challenge for us, the opportunity to respond to these rising hopes, to join with these people in a common effort to achieve this great common objective.

“This can be a tremendous human adventure, in the American tradition. To join with others in freeing men everywhere from persecution and prejudice, from sickness and want—to join in ‘lifting the weight from men’s shoulders,’ as Lincoln foresaw would be our destiny—is the great challenge before

us. Both our heritage of freedom and our material capabilities are powerful instruments to use in the furtherance of such a purpose. . . .

“The truly great and challenging frontiers of the future are not geographic or even scientific. They lie in the freeing and development of the human spirit to its fullest stature. When we have conquered that frontier, we shall truly have done the Lord’s work. . . .”

Nelson Rockefeller firmly believes that in the ruthless ideological struggle of our times, our way of life is in grave jeopardy unless we *practice* democracy to its fullest extent. In a statement issued just before the people of New York were to go to the polls, in November, 1958, he said:

“We live in a moment in history that urgently demands the best we can give. Our era is an era of awesome outward symbols—electronic brains, rockets to the moon, satellites that orbit in the skies.

“These are the dramatic measure of our achievements. But they are not the final measure of man. They are not the measure of our destiny.

“The ultimate measure of this nation and this age will be found in the spirit, the realm of principles for which we stand.

“We as a people shall finally prevail or perish, not by the force of nuclear energy, but by the force of our moral energy.

“America, since its inception, has been a promise that men, given freedom and the will to enrich that freedom, could build and grow and prosper beyond the grandest dreams of the past. This is the meaning of our nation—of America itself.

“We must never neglect this promise of America—this promise of freedom. We must never risk a passive attitude toward the moral values that carried us to greatness.

“In today’s divided world, our nation cannot be content merely to survive. It must also move forward. We shall gain

strength among nations abroad only as we prove democracy at home.

“These things we, as a people, are called upon to do—not as occasional gestures to invite approval or respect but for one everlasting reason: because we believe in them.”

Later, in his Inaugural Address, January, 1959, he spoke of ways to improve the operation of the democratic process.

“I speak to you today, obviously, as citizens of America and of the free world.

“We can serve—and save—freedom elsewhere only as we practice it in our lives.

“We cannot speak of the equality of men and nations unless we hold high the banner of social equality in our own communities.

“We cannot speak of the rule of law among nations of the world unless our own laws faithfully serve the needs, and guard the rights of our own citizens.

“We cannot be impressively concerned with the needs of impoverished peoples in distant lands if our own citizens are left in want.

“We cannot hope to spur economic progress and prosperity in the world unless . . . [we] help to lead America herself toward new horizons of well-being and equal opportunity for all our citizens.

“We cannot pretend to help inspire new young nations in the ways of freedom and its institutions if our schools do not enable our own youth to be enlightened citizens.

“We cannot hope to serve the cause of peace among nations if classes or factions in our own society war among themselves.

“Thus does our role in the world and our duty to ourselves coincide as if they were one. We are called upon to conduct ourselves like free men, with the will and the wisdom to make freedom work. . . .

“We shall never surrender to the belief that man is a soulless device made to serve a machine or state. We know that the state—and machines—are properly conceived and designed to serve man.

“We shall never yield our faith in the spiritual nature of man—not a common creature of the same forces that rust iron and ripen corn, but a creature truly designed to serve his Maker and his own true good, his own full promise.”

In short, Rockefeller sees democracy as the social and political expression of the Golden Rule. And he is aware too that the original democratic aspirations of the Founding Fathers have not all been achieved.

Nelson is too practical a man ever to think in utopian terms but, nevertheless, he has a good many thoughts on what we should do to approximate more closely the democratic ideal.

## 2... On Government

“Let’s face it,” Rockefeller once told an interviewer, “the Government is involved in almost every phase of our lives, more so than many people realize or are willing to admit. You’ve got to recognize the fact first, and accept it, in order to control government and protect the role of the individual.”

The remark reflects his approach to what is probably the central question in government today. The American people—perhaps without quite realizing it—are constantly demanding more and more social legislation at every level of government. The result is not only an ever increasing extension of government services but also a growing centralization of power in Washington and the specter of increased governmental control of the people. The critical question is: How to enlarge the fabric of government without at the same time narrowing



the people's rights? A parallel question is: How to build a structure of government on which the citizen can lean more and more heavily without at the same time weakening his sense of personal responsibility?

These are complex questions and there are no easy answers. Rockefeller sees local self-determination as at least a partial answer. He prefers a "seeping up" rather than a "trickling down" of government power, service, and control. Local governments must try to cope with their own dilemmas, turning to the state only when the problem is too big for the locality to handle. The state, in turn, should try to meet its own internal issues to the best of its ability before asking help of the federal government. ("Washington has its role, but I think state and local governments have got to stand on their own feet, face their own problems, and deal with them. When they've done that, then they can turn to Washington and say we need your help in this specific matter.") To his way of thinking, no level of government has a right to *expect* help from a higher echelon. It must first show that it *merits* help.

In 1954, Rockefeller attended a hearing of the House Committee on Appropriations on the proposed 1955 budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He listened while an official of the United States Public Health Service begged for more money so that his agency could enlarge its nationwide training program. As soon as the witness finished testifying, Nelson spoke up:

"If I may interject, Mr. Chairman," he said, "you are getting only one point of view. Experience shows, I think, that every technician always wants to see his program bigger, he wants to see more people in it. I don't say it is empire building; I think it is sincere. But I think in the federal government the tendency is to want to take over more and more of these programs. . . ."

"I think this testimony you are developing is very interesting, but I just want to make the point that you are getting from it only the federal point of view and that this is a federal,

state, and local program with the principal responsibility in the hands of the state and local groups, and that this should be kept in mind. . . .

“For twenty-one years I have been a member of the board of a local county health organization, and vice chairman for the last eighteen, so that I have had an opportunity to see in a very intimate way the growth of these services to the community; and to come to understand that the vitality and strength of these services grow out of the responsibility of the citizens in those communities in taking the lead in meeting their local needs. . . . My philosophy is that everything possible should be done for the health of this nation, but that more than one group should service the nation’s health; not just the federal government. There is a place in the picture for the federal, state, and local governments, as well as these tremendous private organizations throughout the country. It is a question of finding the balance and keeping the thing moving forward as a joint effort. I think that is the great strength of democracy in this country and the great strength of our federal-state structure and local structure. . . . While we sit around this table, true, we are only considering the federal point of view, but there are other groups in this, too, and we’ve got to mesh them into the total picture and let the federal government play only the part which is right for it to play.”

Rockefeller has never faltered in his belief that a proper exercise of local authority is essential to a proper overall balance in government. He argued for it while he was an official of the federal government and continued to argue for it when he became a candidate for state office. One of the important planks in his platform, in fact, was a proposal for a new and unique state agency, to be set up for the sole purpose of helping local authorities achieve more and better home rule. (“To me, home rule does not mean that the state should abandon its responsibilities to the municipalities. Rather, it means giving local governments greater flexibility in running their own affairs, within a framework of overall state concern and

interest. I'm for that. Moreover, I believe that county boards of supervisors should have the right to fill vacancies in certain elective offices. I see no reason why the governor should be authorized to fill these vacancies. That simply encourages political interference with local authority. Basically, the problems of a locality should be met by the people who live in it and care about it.")

He introduced his plan for a new state agency at the outset of his campaign in an address to the County Officers Association of the State of New York:

"The time has come, I believe, for the establishment of a state Office of Local Government to assist local officials in the enormous tasks which devolve upon them:

"A place to coordinate present state services to localities.

"A place to furnish technical assistance and research aid to municipalities.

"A place to which local government can turn for help and get the answers. . . .

"This central agency at the state level to assist local officials on local problems can provide needed channels of communication and cooperation for the solution of problems that reach beyond local jurisdictions. . . .

"The Office of Local Government, which I propose, could also provide a channel for the state government both to learn about local problems and to benefit from local experience. Not all wisdom resides in the state government."

When he was elected Governor, one of his first recommendations to the New York State Legislature was for "the adoption of legislation to create an Office of Local Government within the Executive Department . . . to provide a focal point for achieving more effective and efficient state-local relations." The bill creating the new agency was passed by the Legislature with only one change: after solemn deliberation the lawmakers

decided to call it the *Office for* Local Government instead of the *Office of* Local Government.

Where his fiscal policies are concerned, Rockefeller is a balanced-budget man who believes government—whether state or federal—should pay its way out of current earnings. (“We must stop living beyond our means [and] re-establish sound fiscal policies, based on the principle of pay as you go.”) Throughout his campaign he tried to drive this point home to the voters. In speech after speech he said:

“We need strong, sane action to restore our state’s financial integrity. If I am elected Governor I will take such action.

“First, I will tell the people the truth about state finances. I will put the facts before them, clearly and honestly.

“Second, I will develop a consistent, comprehensive budget system for the state. I will put an end to the shell game of transferring money: from the War Bonus and Mental Health Account into the General Fund; from the General Fund into the Capital Construction Fund; from the Capital Construction Fund back to the War Bonus and Mental Health Account; and so on.

“Third, I will develop a real capital budget plan for the state [showing] the status of the state’s capital construction program, the projects under construction, their estimated ultimate cost, and when they are to be completed. Such information is basic to intelligent decisions on the part of the Legislature and the people. I shall see that they have it.

“Fourth, my program calls for long-range fiscal planning. . . . We need to look ahead, make plans, recognize potential crises and avert them, not wait until we are in the middle of a mess.

“Fifth, I shall return to the policy of building up state reserves in good times in order to have a reserve to draw on if revenues start declining.

“Sixth, I shall review our entire tax structure to make it

fair and equitable and productive of jobs and income for our people, to encourage small business, agriculture, and industrial expansion.

“Seventh, I shall make a drive for efficiency and economy in state government. . . .

“Last and most important of all, I shall use all the powers of our state’s greatest elective office to put an end to the economic drift that is draining factories, payrolls, and job opportunities out of our state. New industry and new business must be attracted. And our plants must be encouraged to expand their operations here, not move out of the state. These are the keys to more and better jobs and high incomes for all of our people.”

In his inaugural message to the state Legislature in January, 1959, he placed his major emphasis on his fiscal program:

“New York’s first urgent need is to put its financial house in order. The time is overdue for facing fiscal realities and making hard decisions. It is imperative that sufficient revenues be collected to meet the expenditures of state government . . . a balanced budget is mandatory, and the need for additional revenues is immediate. . . . Much as we deplore the fact, conditions require additional tax revenues now. The situation confronting us calls for forthright action.

“A sound fiscal structure is basic to our economic and social progress. Over the long run, increased state expenditures can and should be financed by an expanding state economy, which will produce more job opportunities, greater income, and increasing revenues for government under a stable tax structure.”

The new Governor embarked on a program to stimulate the growth and vitality of the state’s economy as soon as he entered office. His approach to the job was characteristic of his whole approach to government; by nature an organizer,

he promptly formed entirely new agencies to handle the problems that seemed most critical to him, instead of assigning their roles to existing units of state government. He apparently believes that redesigning the formal structure of government produces quicker action and greater efficiency than a renovation of the old structure.

On the evening of April 15, 1959, three and one-half months after he launched his program, he made a progress report on a statewide telecast to the people of New York:

“The great Empire State has not been growing fast enough. Therefore, I consider it my first responsibility to see that your government takes every step possible to assure a live and growing economy in which industry, business, and agriculture can prosper, can expand production, so that they can employ more and more men and women, create more jobs and more earnings, which are basic to the economic and social life and health of our community.

“Now it was for this reason that I asked the Legislature to establish a Commission on Economic Expansion, made up of representatives of labor and business, agriculture, and other elements of the community. Its sole purpose will be to study and advise, to guide the government on creating policies and handling its operations so as to encourage increased job opportunities through growth and expansion in our state.

“This Commission will work closely with me and the Department of Commerce. Its first assignment is to study the problem of unemployment and the necessary steps to increase jobs.

“But we can't have a prosperous economy without certain fundamental services. The two most important of these are adequate transportation and adequate power.

“When I took office on the first of the year, the field of transportation was in a critical condition. . . . Therefore, I recommended to the Legislature the establishment of an Office of Transportation, and this has been achieved. But the situation

was too critical to wait for the creation of a new office; immediate action was needed. So I had a special study made of the transportation problems relating to railroads and buses. As a result of this study, I sent an urgent message to the Legislature outlining my proposals. (To Rockefeller, staff-studies are a necessary tool of government. *Ed. note.*) The Legislature promptly laid the groundwork for solving the problem. The new laws made possible, first, railroad and bus tax relief to reduce mounting deficits that had been causing the reduction of service. Second, an arrangement . . . for the purchase of new passenger cars for lease to railroads.

“Cooperation between the railroads and the state will help insure the continuation of vital service to our communities. At the same time, buses that serve our communities throughout the state have received much needed assistance and encouragement in the form of tax relief. So the new Office of Transportation will now have a solid foundation on which to help the hard-pressed transportation companies to build and expand their services for the future within New York.

“In the field of power, the Legislature, at my request, passed a law creating a new Office of Atomic Development, an agency to plan and coordinate atomic development and regulation within the state, and to recommend needed changes in state laws. In addition, this new agency is . . . authorized to sponsor such studies as may be needed to recommend a positive program for the development of atomic energy within the state, including the encouragement of nuclear projects by private industry and the furtherance of nuclear research and education. Up to now all efforts in this field have been left to the federal government.

“Thus you can see that the Legislature has given my administration the tools to do what needs to be done [to] insure opportunity and security for the people of the great Empire State now and in the future. But we can't achieve these objectives without recognizing the importance of sound management of the state's affairs and fiscal policy.

“On taking office, I was faced with the fact that the state had been borrowing more and more money to pay for its essential services to the people, services that should have been paid for out of income.

“The Legislature . . . on my request . . . passed new taxes which would insure the financial stability of the state and at the same time protect the growing needs for basic human services, schools, housing, and hospitals, not only for today but for future generations.

“Everyone knows that you can’t get something for nothing. Without the new taxes we would have had to cut back essential services or mortgage our children’s future. There was only one choice.”

Paradoxically, his decision to increase taxes in New York State was an act for which he has been heartily praised as well as thoroughly condemned. The praise comes from those who appreciate that it took a great deal of political courage for him to initiate new taxes at the very outset of his term of governorship, and from those who approve of his insistence on placing the state’s economy on a sound basis. The condemnation comes from the average taxpayer—who humanly resents additional levies on his income even though the services and capital expenditures he himself demands of his state government are rising in cost, nationwide, at the rate of nearly twelve per cent a year—and from those who believe that the Governor should have tried to bridge the gap between the state’s income and outgo by borrowing or bond financing.

During his campaign, Rockefeller had repeatedly said, “I will tell the people the truth about state finances. I will put the full facts before them.” True to his promise, in a television speech on February 2, 1959, he told the full and unvarnished story of his new taxes. The facts of fiscal life, bluntly and objectively presented, are seldom soothing and, certainly, none of his listeners could have enjoyed the story, any more than the narrator could have enjoyed telling it. But for anyone who



wants to know how Rockefeller's mind works when he is faced with an acute problem in government financing, it is a revealing address:

“. . . I have just presented this afternoon to the joint session of the Legislature, my recommendations on next year's budget and on taxes. I want to tell you what I have recommended and why. . . .

“There was very little chance for me to make major changes when I assumed responsibility for the state's finances at the end of last year. . . . You must remember that the expenditures required in this budget are largely the direct results of laws enacted and administrative decisions made months and years ago.

“Over the past four years, state expenditures have increased by about fifty per cent. During this period state income has increased by about only thirty-three per cent. The gap between income and expenditures has widened perilously. . . . To meet the obligation in the year ahead, the state will need \$424 million more than our present taxes will provide. . . .

“This great gap . . . must be bridged. And it must be done in a manner consistent with the following objectives: First, maximum efficiency and economy. Second, minimum use of bond financing—the interest that must be paid on bonds makes the cost of capital construction projects more than fifty per cent higher to you, the taxpayer. Third, an end to the depletion of our reserves. Fourth, re-establishment of sound fiscal policies, based on the principle of pay as you go. In short, we must stop living beyond our revenues.

“I have carefully weighed all the alternatives and have concluded that under the circumstances the best plan for meeting the budget gap of \$424 million this coming year is as follows:

“\$277 million from new taxes.

“\$100 million from the sale of bonds.

“\$47 million from the Capital Construction Fund reserves.

"I hate to recommend tax increases, but neither can I, as Governor of New York, disregard the state's responsibilities in matters which desperately concern all of us. . . . I have recommended six major changes in the state taxes.

"First, legislation which has already been enacted to increase the state gasoline tax from four cents to six cents per gallon, and the tax on diesel fuel from six cents to nine cents. The yield of this tax increase is expected to be about sixty-nine million dollars. . . .

"Next, we have recommended an increase of two cents per pack on cigarettes and a tax on cigars and other tobacco products. This will bring the state cigarette tax to five cents per pack. Twenty other states have taxes of five cents or higher. And this tobacco tax will yield, we estimate, forty-seven million dollars.

"Third, I have proposed that the state's revenue from horse racing be expanded by increasing the number of racing days. The yield of this is estimated at five million dollars.

"Fourth, I have proposed certain changes in estate taxes which are expected to produce ten million dollars in additional revenue.

"Fifth, and this is the one you've probably been reading about, I am proposing that the withholding method now used by the federal government for collection of personal income taxes be adopted by the state. There are good reasons for this.

"It will be a convenience, and it will protect the great majority of conscientious people of the state who pay their taxes from those who, year in and year out, have successfully evaded payment of state taxes.

"The sixth proposal is closely tied to this withholding principle. I have recommended that the federal uniform exemption of \$600 for each member of the family be established, but with a \$10 credit which is the equivalent of another \$500 exemption. At the same time, I am recommending that additional higher tax brackets be added to the rate structure which increases the tax on the upper income groups from one to

three per cent. In addition, I am proposing a further change in deductions. I am recommending an increase from \$500 to \$1,000 in the maximum flat deduction you can take in lieu of itemized deductions. The amendments to the personal income tax—withholding and the rate, exemptions, and deductions changes which I have outlined, are estimated to yield \$150 million in additional taxes for 1959–60.

“These are the recommendations I made to the Legislature this afternoon. The proposed income tax revision has been designed so that all income groups would pay about the same proportion of the total income tax as they do under present rates. Over two-thirds of our state taxpayers who are in the lower and middle levels, now pay twenty per cent of the tax; and under my proposed plan this group will still pay only twenty per cent of the total tax. The average increase for persons earning up to \$6,000 (the large majority of our taxpayers) will be less than one dollar a month. If the Legislature accepts my recommendation, the tax on your 1958 income will be forgiven 100 per cent. I hope the principle features of the new tax plan are clear to you.

“As I have outlined them, and with a stepping up of our economic growth rate, it should be possible to achieve our goal of pay as you go, and restore fiscal soundness to the great Empire State. It will be through economic growth, through more job opportunities and higher incomes, that we will have the base from which to provide the state services we must have for our expanding population.

“But remember, putting our financial affairs in proper order is only part of a broader goal. Economic growth is not an end in itself, nor is a balanced budget, but they are means to an end. The real objective is the enrichment and development of individual and family life for all in our state. . . .”

At a news conference a few months after he had pushed his tax-increase program through the Legislature, Rockefeller told the press, “I felt very badly about it. It was a diffi-

cult program to put through, but in the long run it will lead us to a sense of security and confidence. I think the people are beginning to understand the necessity for the program. We in New York will not be caught as other states have been caught, unfortunately, without funds, leading to real hardships for the people of the state.”

He was asked if he thought the fiscal situation in Michigan, which ran out of money to pay its employees, had “gotten him off the hook with the voters” in respect to his own tax program.

His answer would have pleased old Eliza Rockefeller. “I didn’t feel I was on any hook,” he replied. “I did what I thought was right.”

### 3... On Domestic Economic Policies

The major challenge to the United States in the years immediately ahead, it is widely believed, will be to attain a rate of economic growth sufficient to meet our national aspirations and international obligations. Rockefeller is among those who see this as the cardinal problem now facing us. When he appeared on the national television program, "Meet The Press," in July, 1959, he unhesitatingly named "sound, solid economic growth" as the most important national issue of the day.

To achieve the growth necessary to maintain our dominant position in the world community will obviously require a considerable amount of skill, vigor, and vision on our part. Nelson Rockefeller has always insisted that the one segment of our society best able to furnish these prerequisites is private enter-

prise. "The main impetus for accelerating our economic development," he has often said, "will have to come from business enterprise and private capital investment, with the encouragement of government."

He elaborated on this belief in his first message to the New York State Legislature, when he said:

"The elements of a favorable climate for economic expansion include:

"Recognition of the fundamental identity of business and labor in economic growth.

"Stability in labor relations, supported by responsible and progressive policies on the part of labor and management.

"A fair tax structure that will provide maximum encouragement to growth.

"Sound and fair administration of social insurance laws, aimed at carrying out the legislative intent of the programs, while at the same time preventing abuses.

"An adequate and healthy transportation and commuter system.

"Adequate development of power, including nuclear energy.

"Adequate credit facilities for economic growth.

"Effective development of natural resources, including particularly conservation of water resources.

"Active support by all the agencies of government of policies calculated to create the best possible climate for job opportunities and economic growth."

Rockefeller wasn't content to rest on these broad generalizations. As we have already seen, he fostered, within the first few months of his administration, the enactment of measures giving tax relief to railroads and bus lines and clearing the way for the private development of nuclear energy within the state. He showed his concern for labor by broadening the coverage offered by the unemployment insurance law.

His interest in stimulating private business and industrial activity led him to establish a Commission on Economic Expansion, as previously mentioned. He also formed study groups to diagnose the anemic segments of the state's economy. Recognizing the importance of construction to the economy, he sought ways for stimulating the building trades and the field of heavy construction. He gave special attention to the problems of small business. Ways were sought to simplify the many reports, forms and procedures required by the state government for the launching or carrying on of a business. And an analysis was made of the adequacy of credit facilities and the availability of investment capital, with a view toward the greater encouragement of small business and new enterprises.

He also inaugurated a full-scale review of the state's tax structure, to see if revisions in the tax laws might not stimulate economic growth. Rockefeller has never been under any illusions about the importance of the profit motive in business ("This incentive has made production, industrial, and agricultural, what it is in the United States today."), and he believes that a fair and equitable return on capital investment should be encouraged by every legitimate means, including changes in the tax laws to stimulate the flow of capital.

He thinks it is particularly important to the growth economy for which we are striving to encourage United States capital to venture outside our national boundaries, and he believes this can best be done by revising our corporate tax laws. He first began to advocate this in 1951, when, as chairman of President Truman's International Development Advisory Board, he made a series of speeches to the Economic Club of New York, the Executive Committee of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, and other similar groups, in which he said:

". . . There is very little incentive for capital to go abroad, and private capital flows on the basis of incentive. The reason

largely is this: that our tax structure in this country has been developed as part of a national program. Our income has been very high. Our sense of responsibility to the people is high. And therefore as the wealth has accumulated, the taxes have gone up, and there has been money available to do the things which we want to see done for the people of our own country—the schools and the roads and the health facilities, etc.

“Private capital still flows in this country because there is security within our own borders. . . . But when capital goes out of the United States it runs into tremendous complications . . . and therefore, the risks for capital going abroad are very much greater. If the returns were comparably greater, that might be one thing. The returns are often great. But they are not great enough so that capital is willing to support the risks and then pay the high taxes which still apply on earnings from abroad as they do on earnings from at home where there is full security.

“Moreover, the payment of a United States tax on top of a foreign tax places the company operating abroad at a competitive disadvantage against local and other foreign companies which are not taxed at home on income earned abroad—and companies in some eighteen foreign countries are not required to pay taxes on what they earn in other lands.

“Lower taxes, incidentally, are one of the attractions which underdeveloped countries can offer foreign capital. This inducement is nullified by applying high United States tax rates to income earned in these countries.

“And so we suggest that income from foreign sources should be free of United States tax to the extent necessary to stimulate the flow of private capital to underdeveloped areas. This could be accomplished by the adoption of the principle that income from business establishments located abroad should be taxed only in the country where the income is earned and should be wholly free of United States tax. It is generally accepted that this exemption should be extended to income



received by United States corporations from investments in foreign lands and United States corporations deriving substantially all of their income from business abroad.”

Rockefeller is well aware that providing the necessary stimuli for economic growth is only one of the problems confronting the government at a time when a sustained industrial expansion is regarded as basic to our national well-being. There is also the problem of keeping a growth economy from getting out of hand, of devising measures to control the two dread specters that continually haunt any thriving economy—inflation and recession. One of his major speeches on the subject of economics was delivered to the Rochester, N.Y., Junior Chamber of Commerce in March, 1958, just as the 1957–58 recession was reaching its lowest point. In this address he dealt at length with the dilemmas facing an expanding economy:

“Ours is traditionally a *growth* economy. Historically, we have increased our national product by an average of three per cent each year, and the tempo of increase has been stepped up to an average of four per cent in the decade following World War II. . . . All of our institutions, and all of our expectancies, have been geared to growth, including the annual increases in the living-standard expenditures of our expanding population, the extraordinary security requirements here and abroad thrust upon our government by the exigencies of a cold war that is not of our choosing, the exceptional needs confronting us in education, health, roads, and other public welfare fields, and the capital investment funds needed to keep our industrial base growing at a pace necessary for the support of our growing requirements in all of these fields.

“It is true that we have never succeeded in maintaining an even pace of economic growth. In some years we have fallen below the average growth trends; in others we have failed to make any gain at all, and our output has even fallen short of what it was in the preceding year. This hap-

pened by a marginal amount in 1949 and more seriously in 1954. But since the depression thirties, our economy has quickly recuperated and gone ahead subsequently at a sufficiently accelerated pace to sustain the growth trend.

“As a nation, we now are solemnly committed to prevent serious, sustained periods of depression with their appalling human and economic costs. We believe that we have the requisite tools and sufficient knowledge of their use to achieve this goal. But our commitment to sustain a full-employment economy is too new, our experience in the employment of the known measures is too limited, and particularly our capacity for marshalling responsibly the necessary public and private disciplines is insufficiently tested to allow us to proceed with completely confident assurance. The degree of tolerable divergence from a straight trend line of growth has yet to be established. We are aware that a commitment to a full-employment economy involves steering a course between the rocky Scylla of cumulative recession that feeds on itself and the whirlpool Charybdis of inflation that leads to its own destruction—and the margins of the channel boundaries between the two dangers are imperfectly charted. . . .

“You might very reasonably question the relevance of my raising the specter of inflation at a time when the immediate problems so obviously are concerned with arresting a downward spiral. I fully agree with the logic of dealing with first things first. But I believe that some appreciation of the longer term prospect will help us in deciding what present and future actions are appropriate and likely to be effective.

“I recently have been associated with a project organized by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund in which many very distinguished citizens have devoted a great amount of time and thought to a consideration of national policy issues. One report on *International Security: The Military Aspect* already has been published. The best evidence we could obtain indicated that federal outlays for national defense expenditures alone would have to be increased in the neighborhood of

three billion dollars each year over the next several years to take care of specified programs vital to the nation's defense. . . .

"But national defense expenditures account for only one segment of combined federal, state, and local government activities. Current expenditures for goods and services on other government functions at all levels are of approximately equal magnitude. Combined state and local government expenditures alone have been increasing recently by a three billion dollar annual rate. . . .

"Even with the greatest imaginable exercise of restraint . . . it would be unrealistic to expect that overall government expenditures for goods and services can be prevented from increasing at an average rate of less than six billion dollars per year between now and 1965, and this may considerably understate what is either practicable or desirable.

"Since our population is increasing at about a one and three-fourth per cent annual rate, consumer expenditures for goods and services would have to increase by an average of at least six billion dollars each year between now and 1965 merely to hold *per capita* levels of consumption *from falling below what they were in 1957*. To provide *the increases in per capita standards* that consumers have enjoyed over the past ten years would absorb over twice that amount of additional output each year—a required annual growth in output of more than twelve billion dollars. I don't think that any of us would seriously expect the American public's desire for constantly improving living standards to fall below what it has been in the last decade, *if* it has the purchasing capacity to satisfy its wants.

"It is reasonably conservative then to add the annual six billion dollar increase in combined government expenditure expectations to the twelve billion dollars of potential consumer spending as a gauge of increased *annual demand* for goods and services between 1957 and 1965.

"But such increases on the *supply* side cannot be pro-

vided by our present industrial establishment. If we could keep our total output of goods and services increasing between 1957 and 1965 at the average four per cent per year rate that prevailed between 1946 and 1957, it would provide a growth in total output averaging about twenty billion dollars per year. On the past record this would call for increased private capital investment in plant, equipment, and inventories of something approaching three billion dollars annually. This, in turn, would be an additional claim on the total annual production and would have to be added to the eighteen billion dollars of government and consumer demand increments.

“When we add everything up, there are clearly foreseeable demands upon our economy for an average annual increase in total output of goods and services of well over twenty billion dollars a year between now and 1965—enough to keep it geared to the highest sustained rate of advance that it has ever achieved. On that basis, our long-term economic problems for as far ahead as we can reasonably foresee are likely to be those involved in avoiding *inflationary pressures* which, as we have learned through painful experience, must be held in check to avoid excessive price rises that inevitably undermine progress and lead to collapse.

“How is it, then, that we find ourselves now in a position where we are faced with exactly the opposite concern—of how we can bolster the *demand side* of our economy sufficiently to check the downward swing of production and keep it from falling so substantially that it could feed upon itself and revive in men’s minds the memories of the 1930’s.

“The best answer I can offer is that while our economy is enormously productive, it is equally complex, and adjustments in its several segments are continuously in process, some of which will always be running counter to the dominant trend. We have many formidable instruments for dealing with pressures that tend to push us too far to one side or the other, but we are only at the threshold of learning how we can put them to effective use—that is to check excesses in one direction

without precipitating too great an impetus in the opposite direction. There are a number of so-called 'built-in' stabilizers upon which we depend to counter downward swings of disastrous dimension—the outflow of unemployment insurance payments as wage payments fall and unemployment mounts; the automatic fall in tax receipts which means that government will be spending more than it takes in if it maintains expenditures at the prevailing levels; the accumulation of bank reserves as loan demand slackens, which should result in increased credit availability on easier terms; the theoretically balancing effect of agricultural price supports. All of these have some effect, but the influence that some of them exert operates only after considerable delay. The thirteen or fourteen billion dollar decline in our economy's total output from the third quarter of 1957 to the first quarter of 1958 emphasizes the swiftness of reversal that can take place when a number of the continuing adjustments that our economy normally makes happen to cumulate on the downward side. . . .

“In considering sound policies for the termination of a recession it is important [to see] that business and consumer confidence are not seriously impaired. This, of course, is the key factor to preserve. It is essential to the restoration of prosperity. If the Administration and the Congress wait too long in the hopes of a change and it doesn't come, then there is real danger of losing this confidence; of the recession feeding on itself. Then the government will be forced to take drastic action, resulting in huge deficits from both spending and tax cuts and the ensuing renewed inflation. The world situation is also involved. We are living in a critical time—a real depression in the United States would importantly increase Communist prestige in the economic field on top of the gains they have made in the scientific field with their Sputniks. It would reduce United States influence among free people just at the time when it is most needed, and seriously weaken the free world's economic strength. Of course, this is why the United States government has already taken steps to ease credits, stimulate

recovery of home building, accelerate government spending on the highway project, raise and extend unemployment compensation, and why the President has stressed the importance of trade agreements and foreign economic aid.

“The question is what additional steps are needed in exercising government responsibility to end the recession—major public works programs or a sizable tax cut.

“First, let’s take up a major public works program. There is already a large program under way. A massive new one would be slow in taking hold. A large public works program would do little to check the recession this year but would sharply increase spending next year and the year after when the economy may well be experiencing inflationary pressures once again. In other words, a huge public works program to deal with the recession would not solve our economic problem this year and probably add to our troubles next year.

“In my opinion, a tax reduction is clearly a sounder method of dealing with a mild recession. But the character of the tax cut is just as important as the amount. It must yield maximum psychological benefits to the taxpayers generally, both in the high and low income brackets and to business as well as to individuals. It must be designed to stimulate investments as well as consumption buying and thus result in speeding re-employment and recovery. It is true that a tax cut would involve a return to deficit spending just as a huge public works program would. But the way in which a deficit is created makes considerable difference in the functioning of the economy. A public works program serves to enlarge government enterprise and government spending, while a tax cut serves to enlarge private enterprise and private spending. While both one or the other will tend to augment private income, a tax reduction will do it faster. Therefore, lower tax rates will in the long run be offset in considerable part by an increase in national income. Once federal expenditures go up, they seem to have a habit of remaining high even though the original stimulus is gone. On the other hand, tax reductions tend to act as a restraint on gov-

ernment spending. Therefore, government deficits caused by tax cuts are likely to be of shorter duration and hence less of a permanent inflationary threat.

“Now let’s turn to the responsibility of the private citizen in dealing with a recession. It certainly is not a government responsibility alone. All areas of the country are not affected alike. The percentage of unemployment differs widely by industry and by community. Therefore, an across-the-board program from Washington is by no means the answer alone. . . .

“Why don’t the communities, and states for that matter, throughout the nation set up community and state councils with representatives of business, labor, civic, and other groups and provide them with competent professional staffs on the model of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers? Such committees would really know what’s going on at the local level, where the problems are, what the real hopes and aspirations of the people are, and who could deal decisively with the problems. . . . It’s in the tradition of our country. It’s the very essence of our basic belief in the responsibility of the individual.

“We as a nation have accepted full employment as a goal. As I said before, it is like walking a tightrope between inflation and recession. If we are to be successful in achieving this goal, we can’t just leave the management of our economy to Washington. . . . Such local councils could not only deal with the long-range problems of economic growth and development, industrial training and employment, housing, highways, schools, recreational facilities, civic and cultural development . . . but could go a long way in cushioning the impact of recession in terms of human suffering and the re-establishment of growth and prosperity. They could speed up planned programs in such fields in times of recession. They could slow them down when there was more private activity than could be accommodated. By obtaining the cooperation of local industry and accelerating promotion of new products, vigorous

sales, price policy, accelerated maintenance and modernization together with plant expansion, they would have a substantial impact on unemployment. They could obtain the cooperation of local labor leaders in connection with bargaining policies. . . .

“In addition, they could support, with the voters and local officials, funds for accelerated public improvements and local school construction tailored to meet the special conditions in the particular communities.

“In summary, may I say that it seems to me there is a dual responsibility—that of public and private groups—in finding the right steps essential to terminate promptly and effectively the current recession and to do so in a way that will not throw us back into an inflationary spiral. It can and must be done. If we as a nation can succeed in meeting our problems of economic stability and growth, and of social progress, then maybe we can do more on a cooperative basis abroad—more to build for peace and human progress throughout the world.”



## 4... On Foreign Trade and Foreign Policy

“Intercontinental trade may after all prove to be the best safeguard against the intercontinental missile.” This succinctly expresses one of Rockefeller’s strongest convictions. He believes that our overseas economic policies are as important to the realization of our long term foreign policy goals as our military preparedness, and that our best hope for preserving world peace lies in expanded world trade. To his way of thinking, foreign policy and foreign trade are so tightly interwoven they cannot be considered apart.

His reasoning is clear. We have learned the hard way in recent years, with the aid of Communist prodding, that a nation’s political stability is in direct ratio to the economic status of its people. Yet in the free world today, one-third of

the population produces eighty-six per cent of its manufactured goods, while two-thirds of the people, sprawled over seventy-five per cent of the free world's land mass, produce less than fifteen per cent of such goods. This gross inequality, therefore, is more than a challenge to us to prove our capacity to foster economic health in the rest of the world. It is a demand on our economy to double its overseas exertions in order to preserve the stability of the free world's structure. When our way of life becomes the free world's way of life, Communism will be reduced to impotence. But as long as our way of life remains ours alone, the free world, ourselves included, will be vulnerable.

The dangers inherent in the free world's economic imbalance have long been a source of worry to Rockefeller. Fourteen years ago, in 1946, he told the annual meeting of the Academy of Political Science:

"A nation's foreign policy can only be a reflection of its domestic policy. Our foreign policy will be a bankrupt foreign policy unless it is backed by a progressive democracy. If the forces that make up a democracy at home can demonstrate to the world the ability to produce or create a sound economic structure, to progress socially, they have at the same time demonstrated that democracy offers to the people of the world not only the promise of political liberty but the promise of economic advancement.

". . . But let us be frank and realistic. As a nation particularly blessed in a world of suffering and poverty, we can either carry on with a breadth of vision which permits us to encompass our own realistic self-interest in terms of the general welfare and prosperity of the people of the rest of the world, and increasingly become a generating force in a new era of world prosperity and human well-being, or there is real danger that we may become the most hated and feared country in the world, thus undermining our own security and well-being as well as that of the people of other lands.

“The traditional modes of international economic collaboration are no longer sufficient. We need new and broader avenues of international economic relationships based on the principle of individual freedom and initiative within a framework of inter-governmental cooperation.

“The international exchange situation is such that we cannot hope to deal decisively with the economic and social developmental problems of the world exclusively on a loan basis. To accomplish these objectives United States equity capital, technical know-how, and managerial skill must go forth on an unprecedented scale and take part in the economic and social development of the world on a partnership basis.

“Unless the real wealth of the people throughout the world is increased, unless we cooperate so effectively with the hundreds of millions of people in such areas as Europe, Asia, and Latin America . . . that they become productive to a point where they have sufficient earning power to increase their standard of living . . . we cannot hope for permanent peace and security in the world. In order that the United States play the part which is its responsibility in accomplishing this result, we must be prepared to take the steps which will be necessary to stimulate and supplement the existing institutions for the flow of equity capital.”

Later, in 1949, while testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee during the preliminary hearings on President Truman's Point Four Program, Rockefeller described in some detail the steps he feels the United States must take to play its part in stimulating the free world's economy:

“Mr. Chairman, we are now . . . considering a long-term measure to deal with the continuing basis of our relations with the other nations of the world, a basis to meet the evolution that has taken place in the world.

“How are we to accomplish this? How can we help get more buying power in the hands of the other peoples of the

world? How can we help them get more dollars without just giving it to them? It seems to me that is the essential problem.

“If we are to help achieve greater buying power in the hands of the peoples of other countries, we must help them step up their economic development, the productive capacity of their labor, in order to produce larger volumes of goods at lower costs, thus putting greater earning power into the hands of labor and consequently greater purchasing power in the hands of the people.

“The only way that can be accomplished in the majority of the countries of the world is through increasing the availability of capital, technical, and scientific knowledge, and managerial experience. We benefited from capital coming from Europe. We benefited from technical knowledge coming from Europe, and from the managerial experience of the highly industrialized nations of Europe. And as our economy developed and evolved and our standard of living rose, it is interesting to note that our volume of trade with those industrial nations of Europe also rose.

“So, if increased exports from this country depend on greater buying power in the other countries of the world, it is to our interest to see that their economies develop. However, they might increase their buying power in their own local currencies, and that alone would not solve the problem. Unless they have dollars, they cannot buy our goods. . . . So we come to the other half of the question: How do they get the dollars?

“In the last analysis, there is only one fundamentally sound way in which these people can be assured of getting dollars. This is for us to increase our imports through the purchase of their goods. . . .

“However, if we are going to buy more from these countries it has to be on a competitive basis. We cannot import goods into this country from abroad that cost more to make, and for which we pay more, than locally produced goods. The American public is not going to pay a premium for goods coming from abroad. That has worried many countries. How

are they going to be able to sell their goods to get the dollars? And are we going to be willing to import goods on a competitive basis?

"It goes right back to the question of developing their economies. In order to sell more to us, they have got to be able to produce goods cheaply enough to compete in our markets. That means that they have to increase the man-hour productivity of their labor. The only way that can be done is through the industrialization of production. . . . As the output increases, the cost of the product goes down and it becomes competitive.

"Immediately the question is raised: How about goods from cheap-labor areas flooding our markets? Is that going to threaten the whole foundation of our industrial society and our high standard of living?

"I think really it is not we who are in a highly industrialized economy who should fear competition but the cheap-labor people themselves. Figures published by our own government indicate that the productivity of labor in the United States is about two and one-half times as great as the average production of the sixteen E.C.A. nations. In some underdeveloped areas of the world, our labor can produce more than forty times the labor of those countries. . . . And it is obvious that unless these cheap-labor nations are able to increase the productive capacity of their manpower, they are not going to be able to raise the standard of living of their people, since their manpower cannot earn more money and thereby increase their buying power.

"Thus we find an intimate relation between economic development in other countries and our foreign trade, both from the point of view of their capacity to buy from us and the point of view of their ability to produce the things which we buy competitively from them.

"Now, let us come to the last question, which is the real hurdle. . . . If we increase imports, what is that going to do

in the United States? . . . What is that going to do to our own producers?

“There is no question that it is going to cause dislocations of a temporary character, that there will be isolated dislocations in labor and capital. However, in my opinion, if our policy to increase imports is synchronized with the policy of helping other nations to produce more goods and to increase their buying power, then, as they sell more here, they will have more dollars to increase their imports from us. That will stimulate the lines of production in which we are competitive, and these lines should be able to absorb the displaced labor and capital from our less competitive lines of production. Thus, on an orderly basis, there should be a gradual evolution in our economy.

“We happen to be uniquely fortunate and to have a high degree of self-sufficiency. However, that does not mean, if other parts of the world can produce certain things cheaper than we can, that we should not buy such products from them and sell them the things which we can produce more cheaply. Quite to the contrary, by producing and exporting those goods which we can produce in large volume and at lower cost and importing those in which our production is less efficient we will permit man the world over to make the most effective use of his labor and therefore increase to the maximum his earning power.

“We have here the basis of an integration of the economic life of our now interdependent world. Therefore, it is evident that the things that are necessary for us to do in our own best economic interests are also in the best interests of the people of other countries.

“As I see it, this program involves a close cooperation between the government and the people. Government must perform two basic functions. One is the program of direct technical aid which is provided for in the Point Four bill. The other is the creation of a framework, through both domestic

legislation and inter-governmental treaties and agreements, which would permit business, labor, and private capital to do the main job which has to be done.

“The role of private citizens falls also into two parts. There is the part of business, labor, and finance. And there is also the very vital part of private philanthropic and educational institutions. We must move forward on all fronts together.”

One crippling obstacle to the formulation of an enlightened and effective United States foreign trade policy is the lack of any true public awareness of the importance of our stake in world economic and social progress. As a result of the government's inability to formulate a program that wins full public support, our foreign economic policies, Rockefeller feels, are all too often merely a series of nervous reactions to a series of individual crises. And these sporadic responses unfortunately tend to accentuate the difficulties of each specific crisis at the expense of the over-all picture.

The crucial importance of a sustained and farsighted foreign economic policy must, he thinks, be brought home to the people. As he told the National Conference of Social Workers, in 1952:

“Any discussion today of the basic economic factors affecting the standards of living of the people of the United States must take into consideration the relatively new factor of our growing dependence on other nations and peoples. To an increasing degree we are learning that however vitally important our own national welfare is, it cannot stand alone in the world. . . . Our national interest, progress, and security are vitally entwined with the interests, progress, and security of other areas.

“When Karl Marx developed the thesis of the inevitability of revolt in nations that had achieved a high degree of capitalistic development, he premised it upon the concept that,

under capitalism, the rich would become richer and the poor poorer, until the explosion point was reached.

“The fact that things have not developed in this pattern is due in large part to the fact that the distribution of income has not, in the least, conformed to the Marxian prediction.

“This has been demonstrated in particularly clear terms in the United States, where all segments of the population have reaped broad benefits from the progressive upward trend of our national production.

“However, as between nations the record is not as good. There is some disquieting evidence to document a thesis that some nations of the world, and the United States in particular, are steadily increasing their per capita income while others, particularly among those in the so-called underdeveloped areas, are not making sufficient economic progress to hold, let alone increase, the per capita levels of living of the masses of their populations. This disparity, not alone in levels, but also in trends, is bound to create unrest and turmoil, and the evidence of this is widely apparent in the world today.

“One thing that too few Americans realize is the extraordinary shift that has taken place in our own economy as a result of the tremendous expansion in our industrial capacity. . . . [Because of our] unparalleled increase in the consumption of raw materials, we are now dependent upon areas outside of our borders for about a third of the basic minerals used in our industries.

“In other words, we are no longer self-sufficient. . . . Our national security both from the point of view of social well-being as well as from the point of view of military strength, depends on the cooperation of the other free nations of the world.

“If through disruption or alienation these supplies of raw materials were cut off, the effect upon the economy of the United States would be devastating. Similarly, if the economies of the world upon which we are dependent do not progress with a pace comparable to ours, it will not be possible for us



to preserve the progressively upward trend of our economy which is essential to our continuing economic health.

“To an important extent, the other nations of the world similarly are dependent upon the continued strength and vitality of the United States economy. The economies of these other countries are crucially dependent upon United States exports of food, machinery, and equipment, which represent twenty per cent of total exports of the world. At the same time, our imports of the products of other nations help supply them with the necessary foreign exchange to buy the things which as yet they do not manufacture themselves.

“Throughout the world it is widely recognized that the maintenance of a strong United States economy, and particularly its resulting foreign trade, is essential to the maintenance and growth of the economies of most of the other peoples of the world.

“The people of the United States are to an increasing degree learning the lesson of what is meant by a genuine community of interest with other peoples, and more and more this conviction is being translated into the established foreign policy of the United States. . . .

“It would seem to me that we are led by logic to [the conclusion] that the United States must, among other things, give more effective leadership in the development of a continuing cooperative program for economic and social development and rising standards of living throughout the free world.

“The growing dependence of our industrial strength on imported raw materials and foreign trade makes this imperative from the point of view of our own future security and well-being. Unrelated emergency programs of economic aid and technical assistance to meet individual crises are not enough. . . .

“Some people would have us believe that in the present emergency we cannot afford to concern ourselves with these problems, that the only thing that counts is military strength,

but I say to you that . . . in the face of the threat of Russian imperialism it was never more essential than today for the underprivileged of the free world both at home and abroad to have tangible and continuing evidence of our spiritual and moral dedication to their cause.”

Nelson’s foreign economic and trade policies place heavy emphasis on the Western Hemisphere and, particularly, the countries of Latin America. Many people regard this as a personal idiosyncrasy, a reflection of his own personal fondness for the lands below the Rio Grande and his deep interest in the projects he and his brothers have developed in those countries through IBEC and AIA. In all probability, his inclinations have influenced his thinking to some degree, but there is at least one far more compelling reason for his preoccupation with the affairs of this hemisphere. He first spoke of this consideration in an address before the Women’s National Republican Club, in April, 1952:

“Why inter-American cooperation when we are faced with an international crisis?

“I should like to tell you of a speech made in 1944 by General Embick, who was Chief of War Plans during the war. He had been held over because of his brilliant record, even though he had passed the age of retirement. He was also Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board; and in 1944, at a closed session of the Board, he made this speech, which has since been released.

“He said that, after the war that was then going on, there would be only two areas of the world that could make war: one would be Russia and the other would be the Western Hemisphere—not the United States, but the Western Hemisphere. And then he went on to describe what would be the essential requirements of the capacity to make war in the future, whether it was for offense or defense. He said there were four such requirements: manpower, raw materials, indus-

trial capacity, and land mass. And he said that the two areas he had mentioned were the only two in the world possessing those four essential elements. He then went on to give this bit of advice. He said that the balance of power between those two areas would be China.

“Well, here we are, with China gone, and with General Embick’s basic prediction having been proved true.

“The United States alone does not have the manpower, does not have the raw materials, does not have the land mass, even to wage a defensive war. We therefore find ourselves dependent for our own security, our own freedom, on the other twenty nations (or, if we include Canada, as we must, the other twenty-one nations) of the Western Hemisphere.

“Now let us look at it from an economic point of view, from the point of view of economic and social security in our own country. Let us get a little perspective on our situation.

“With six per cent of the people of the world, with seven per cent of the land area of the world, this country now has more than fifty per cent of all the industrial production of the world. At first, one might take great satisfaction and pride in that and get a sense of security. And yet, as we examine the situation further, we find that, while we have this tremendous industrial productive capacity, we are dependent for one-third of the raw materials used in that industrial production on sources outside our own borders. In the case of rubber, manganese, and chrome and tin, practically all our supply comes from abroad; in the case of lead and aluminum, half of our supply; in the case of zinc and copper, a quarter of our supply.

“You may ask where these supplies come from. Well seventy-three per cent of these imports come from the so-called underdeveloped areas—and, to sharpen the focus, thirty-three per cent of them come from the Western Hemisphere.

“Therefore, from the point of view of our current economic stability, our high standard of living, our employment,

our enjoyment of the luxuries of life, which are dependent on this great industrial machine, we find ourselves dependent on the Western Hemisphere for these raw materials.

"It isn't only that. During the past two years and the current year, this country has been expanding its industrial capacity by about twenty-five per cent. You may say: 'Well, twenty-five per cent—what's that?' The answer is that twenty-five per cent of our industrial capacity equals the entire industrial capacity of Great Britain. . . .

"The twenty-five per cent that is being added in three years represents about sixty billion dollars' worth of production a year—and, by the end of next year, that will all be going into armaments. It is added on top of our regular normal economic life, so that we won't have to cut down on our civilian consumption and lower our standard of living.

"However, we have to get additional raw materials for that purpose. We can't increase our own production of raw materials, and therefore it means more raw materials from abroad. In reaching for those, we found that we pushed the prices up and we took raw materials from others, and Europe has been suffering from a very difficult situation partly as a result of that.

"But that isn't the only story. Let us hope that in a few years—we don't know how many—this armament program can be cut down, that there will be a reduction in the need for this tremendous outpouring of war materials. If that happens, what will we do with those plants, with that sixty billion dollars' worth of industrial capacity a year? We can't close the plants and turn labor out of them; those men have to work. The standard of living of the country has risen; we can't stand a drop of those proportions in our standard of living in this country without extremely difficult political and social repercussions. Neither can we increase our consumption at that rate.

"We therefore find ourselves faced with the problem of

where we are going to sell the output of this productive capacity. We have to look abroad—and again we look to the underdeveloped areas.

“In the past, people perhaps felt that you could just get raw materials and export goods to other countries without taking into account the attitudes or feelings of those countries. But I am happy to say that today this is no longer true. It isn’t just governments that make decisions, it’s the people. We know the problems that Great Britain has had in Iran, and the cutting off of the supply of oil. We know what has happened in China, and we know about the loss of the manganese to this country. We therefore cannot take for granted the availability of these materials. Nor can we take for granted a rising standard of living in these areas, which is the only basis that will provide for greater markets. We therefore find ourselves dependent for our own economic and social security, as well as our military security, on the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. . . .

“As it is, however, inter-American unity has lost much of its vitality, its momentum and direction. . . . During these post-war years [the United States] has continued to deal with problems in the Western Hemisphere, as it has in other parts of the world, on a spot basis, only after they have reached crisis proportions. Few long-range plans have been worked out—plans needed to meet the growing economic and social problems of inflation, shortages of food, inadequate transportation, and the necessity for increased productivity. These difficult local or inter-American problems have not been anticipated.

“By allowing the strength and unity of the Americas to weaken we are undermining our own strength. Without a strong and united hemisphere the United States cannot continue to meet the tremendous obligations which it has assumed in other parts of the world. Our relations with the twenty other American Republics must be a matter of first concern, not of last concern.

“The present situation is one which cannot be corrected

overnight. Disunity and unrest in many parts of the Americas are far more widespread and serious than most people in the United States realize. . . .

“. . . There must be built through the United Nations and the Organization of American States a stronger framework for inter-American relations within which there is greater integrity, respect, and justice for all. Within this framework, problems must be tackled with the least cost and greatest dispatch. We must develop new international tools if the financial and economic burdens are to be shared. We must make far more use of the great creative forces of individual initiative in carrying out this work through people-to-people ties. . . .”

Nelson’s most complete foreign policy statement, perhaps, was a speech he made at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in December, 1957, at the annual meeting of the Life Insurance Association of America. The crux of his argument was that our future well-being depends to a very large measure on the effectiveness with which we build people-to-people ties within the world community. It is a speech worth reprinting almost in its entirety:

“It is a particular pleasure to have the opportunity of talking with you on the subject of our international relations.

“We are fortunate as perhaps no other people in history in having achieved a degree of material well-being for more of our people than in any previous society.

“The chief threat to this security is from abroad, despite all that remains to be done at home.

“It would be easy to speak about specific aspects of the threats from abroad—the Middle East, the Soviet satellites, and intercontinental missiles, etc.

“However, these threats are symptoms of more deep-seated problems, specifically of the revolutionary forces that confront us in the world today and our lack of a clear national purpose in relation to them. This makes it difficult for us to estab-

lish priorities in our planning, to shape events in advance, and thus to avoid a crisis coming upon us. Unfortunately, we often do not know a problem exists until it has become a crisis.

"We *have* had a clear national purpose in terms of our domestic life.

"The original motivating force which impelled people into an unexplored continent was a belief in spiritual independence and human dignity.

"And ever since our whole political and social history has shown the importance of the role of purpose. One has only to look at the Federalist papers to see its clear design in the minds of the Founding Fathers which produced a political structure at once the stablest and most progressive in the world.

"But in foreign policy our purpose has been on the whole negative. We have primarily wanted to be left alone to work out our own destiny. Our historic position has not been too different from that of many of the neutral nations of today who also want peace without prior involvement. When we have intervened abroad it has usually been a belated recognition that our security and that of other free nations were directly challenged. . . .

"Even our notion of peace has been essentially passive. We have considered it the absence of war, rather than concerning ourselves with the concrete set of active relationships among states on which peace ultimately depends.

"But a passive stance is no longer enough.

"It always causes us to lag behind events.

"Our actions too often become haphazard and determined by Communist initiatives or other pressures. . . .

"Constantly digging oneself out from under avalanches started by others hardly conveys a sense of direction. In short, if we do not shape events we will become their prisoner. *We need to find a new and broader orientation*—a larger sense of purpose. Just as when a young person grows up his focus which has always been centered on himself and his family

broadens out to encompass the world around him, so we as a nation must broaden our awareness and understanding of the world around us. This involves our acceptance of the reality of the revolutionary forces which exist in the world—their character and inter-relationship.

“Four revolutions are occurring simultaneously:

“First, the breakup of the old system of world order through imperial alliances and the appearance of more than fifty new sovereign nation states.

“Second, the surge of rising expectations and population growth.

“Third, the ever accelerating rapidity of scientific development.

“Fourth, the unholy alliance of international communism and Sino-Soviet imperialism.

“With relation to these revolutions we should be clear about two things:

“We must discard the assumption that our international problems would end if the Soviet Union were somehow miraculously transformed.

“And we should realize that a negative stance with relation to these forces is not being true to ourselves, for many of them were inspired or produced by the American example and American actions.

“Let’s look back for a minute. The American Revolution . . . proclaimed a new doctrine of political equality and the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and happiness.

“The French Revolution followed a decade later with its call for Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

“This started two revolutionary trends:

“First, the breakup of the system of empires, which had for so long provided the basis of world order and trade; and—

“Second, the creation of a large number of free sovereign nations, first in the Western Hemisphere and Europe, after the Second World War in Southeast Asia, and now in Africa.

“At the end of the eighteenth century, Simon Bolivar, the



great liberator of South America, saw that no new sovereign nation could be in position to defend its own borders nor to provide an economic level of life which could satisfy its people without help from the outside. He was the first to advocate the free association of free sovereign nations who could work together in their common interest. Thus he was pointing the way to a new basis for international order.

“This leads us to the basis of the second revolutionary force.

“During the nineteenth century, the doctrine of social equality was added to that of political equality. . . . As a result, most governments in the West gradually undertook programs dedicated to social and economic justice.

“The coincidental advent of the Industrial Revolution gave tremendous impetus both to the need for and the possibility of realizing these objectives.

“The level of the well-being of the citizens of the West began to rise.

“The U.S. especially was successful in translating its political philosophy into economic and social reality. The spectacular material achievements and power of our country and the extraordinary rise in our standard of living have had a profound effect on the peoples of all lands, particularly of the underdeveloped countries and newly independent nations.

“These new political and social concepts, and the tremendous industrial development have been responsible for the surge of the great revolutionary force of rising expectations among the people the world over.

“People who had never known hope before are feeling increasingly that they have a chance for a better life—that the world possesses the means of producing more than the bare necessities for survival, and that they are entitled to their share.

“This hope is a constructive force and one with which we sympathize deeply. The difficulty is that too many don’t

understand that results require a patient process of education, organization, and capital formation.

“Underdeveloped and newly independent areas too often seek to absorb in a few years political, social, and industrial developments which have taken 150 years in the Western World.

“These pressures are further complicated by an unprecedented surge of population growth.

“For instance, when most of us in this room were born there were less than 100,000,000 people in the United States. Today there are 170 million.

“At our present growth rates, by 1980 there will be 260,000,000; by the year 2000 there will be 307,000,000—almost equal to the population of India.

“And should these rates continue, it is estimated that in 100 years there would be over a billion people in the United States. Even with our great resources, the problems we face are tremendous. But they are nothing compared to those faced by the peoples of the underprivileged areas.

“The rates of population growth in the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa are running even higher than ours—at a rate which will double their populations in the next thirty years.

“While the productivity of these areas is also going up, the truly frightening indications are that the population growth is rising even faster. The result is that these areas of the world face the possibility of a declining rather than a rising standard of living—this in the face of the surge of rising expectations and the weakness of the world’s political structure.

“As things now stand, it is hard to see how the seventy or more independent nations of the underdeveloped areas can cope with the impact of this situation.

“This brings us to the third revolutionary force being felt throughout the world—that of scientific discovery and development.

"It is a revolution that . . . opens up new and undreamed of vistas of opportunity for the future, but at the same time undermines the very basis of our security.

"On the one hand, these revolutionary developments in science may well hold the secret to abolition of poverty and want.

"On the other hand, new and frighteningly destructive weapons-technology is bringing about a situation where incredible devastation could be triggered without warning. This factor alone makes it clear that the construction of a peaceful international order has never been more important.

"And lastly, let us consider the revolution of the Sino-Soviet Communism.

"In the midst of this world-wide upheaval, there has been released an ideological and imperialist force bent on conquering the world through any and all means. . . .

"Neither Chinese nor Soviet Communism recognizes any of the traditional or conventional concepts of diplomacy—either in negotiation or agreement. Because they consider negotiations only as a tactical tool to encompass the downfall of the noncommunist world, their word means nothing and they do not consider their treaty agreements as binding.

"Thus where the revolution of rising expectations is, on the whole, produced by the desire of newly awakened peoples to *enter* an international system based on the principles of respect for human and national dignity, the thrust of Communism is to *overthrow* such a system.

"To quote their own official declaration made only a short time ago: 'Marxism-Leninism is in principle against petty-bourgeois humanism which operates under the slogan of defense of an abstract human being and humanity in general.'

"We must face up to the fact that much of the danger of Communism lies in its strong sense of purpose and direction. In a world where so many institutions are changing or collapsing, it appears to offer something tangible, something to which to cling.

“The loss of liberty it entails may be less meaningful to people who have never known freedom than to us.

“We as a nation are interested in stability—therefore our goals require long-range plans and constructive programs.

“The Soviets are interested in instability. Their goal is to heighten tensions, promise all things to all people. But they have only one objective in mind: ultimate world domination.

“We want peace—the Soviets want victory.

“Thus we and the rest of the free world face grave peril. Never before has *all* mankind been so dangerously threatened.

“To master and guide the revolutionary forces in the world will require positive motives on our part. It is not enough to know what we are against, it is also essential to know what we are *for*.

“Only in this manner can the world-wide revolution, which we ourselves have helped to spark, move into constructive channels.

“If the United States is to play its rightful role of leadership in creating such a structure, it can only do so if we as a people really understand the nature and implications of the basic revolutionary forces which exist in the world; if we recognize that we as a nation cannot live apart from the rest of mankind—either materially, politically, or spiritually; and if we recognize that the world has reached a point in its development where the well-being of nations and peoples cannot be achieved except within a framework which can encompass the world as a whole.

“Out of such an understanding, we can develop the necessary sense of national purpose based on our heritage of moral and spiritual beliefs.

“The effect of achieving a national purpose related to the world as a whole will be to . . . establish priorities in our plans and actions and give continuity to our objectives.

“Specifically, our objectives must include:

“First, to create the sense of security, confidence, and direction which can help to shape events and avoid crises.

This requires the establishment of a workable, acceptable framework for world order and development.

“The United Nations is prevented from providing this framework because of the Soviet Communist Bloc, which seeks to bring about a totalitarian world organization.

“Therefore, the only way in which the true hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world can be achieved is to develop communities of sovereign nations within the structure of the United Nations as provided in Article Fifty-One of the Charter.

“There must be regional and functional groupings encompassing all nations of the free world, whether neutral or not.

“We have a basic pattern for developing such a structure of free world communities in the work of the twenty-one American republics during the past one hundred years. It provides a foundation on which to build.

“As these communities, regional or otherwise, gain in strength and cohesiveness, they will be able better to cooperate among themselves and bring about an even larger consensus.

“This is in fact the greatest prospect for strengthening the United Nations and for fulfilling the high hopes held for it at its beginning.

“Second, to foster within this framework existing and new international institutions designed to assist in meeting functional needs. Institutions such as the World Health Organization, the International Bank, International Finance Corporation, and the Monetary Fund.

“These institutions are the best tools for facilitating joint actions by the sovereign nations in their struggle to meet the needs of their people and the pressures caused by their growing populations.

“Imaginatively designed institutions on a world or regional basis can help bridge the gap between free enterprise and state regulated economies and facilitate the flow of capital to needed areas.

“Third, we must face squarely the totality of the Sino-

Soviet Communist threat in all its phases—political, psychological, economic, and military.

“By effectively carrying out the first and second objectives we should be able to minimize the Communist efforts to capitalize on this period of emerging hopes in order to subvert and enslave the free peoples of the world.

“In the military field there is no time to lose in taking certain fundamental steps, particularly:

“A national program of scientific education, training and basic research; the reorganization of the Defense Department to permit overall strategic planning and weapons development, centralized direction and financing of research and development, unified commands, flexible and decisive handling of any limited war which might be forced on us, military cooperation with our allies on a basis of true partnership and mutual respect.

“Such a program must be adequately financed and our national economy protected from distortions in the process.

“Only thus can we provide for ourselves and the free world the time and opportunity to achieve the positive goals of humanity.

“And last (but by no means least), we must face squarely at home the basic problems of equal opportunity in education, in work, in social welfare; face squarely the fact that we cannot achieve our international goals by giving up our social gains.

“But to accomplish these goals we must get rid of the softness and waste that have crept into the fibre of our democracy.

“In conclusion, may I say that our determination to follow such a national purpose can give new meaning and value to the lives of every American, as well as to people throughout the world. Let us rededicate ourselves to the great and basic beliefs of our nation.”

## 5 . . . On Labor and Agriculture

In 1914, Rockefeller was perhaps the most hated name in the ranks of American Labor. That was the year the United Mine Workers struck the Ludlow mines of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, a Rockefeller-controlled enterprise. The company's local management retaliated by bringing in strike-breakers, and state militiamen to guard them. The infamous Ludlow Massacre resulted, when the militia fired into the ranks of the assembled strikers and their families, killing two women and eleven children as well as several workers.

Thirty-five years later, the New York State president of the C.I.O. referred to the five Rockefeller brothers, in a speech, as exemplary models of what a rich man's sons should be. And according to newspaper accounts, at this point, "All of

the labor leaders present stood up and applauded." Still later, in 1958, the national president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., George Meany, publicly praised Nelson as a "dedicated, aggressive liberal."

The name Rockefeller is obviously no longer a handicap in labor circles. And for an excellent reason. Both by deed and word, Nelson and his brothers have championed the cause of organized labor, under responsible leadership, in the sincere belief that labor's voice must be heard in a truly democratic society.

Nelson outlined his thoughts on Labor in a formal policy statement issued during his campaign:

"I wish to express to the working men and women of this state the deep convictions I hold regarding their welfare. This is something very close to my thoughts and feelings . . . supported by my twenty years' experience as an employer, of harmonious and constructive relationships with labor unions in New York City.

"I cannot speak of the welfare of working men and women without stating at the outset my fundamental philosophy concerning employment, full employment, and our economy. . . . We not only must have employment, but *full* employment. Every person who is willing and able to work should have a good job at good wages, under good working conditions, and with reasonable security. Until that is accomplished, we shall have failed to achieve the full potential of our economy and the full benefits of our democratic society.

"A vital role in the evolution of our high standard of living and in the dynamism of our economy has been played by organized labor. Better wages, hours, and working conditions, the elimination of sweatshops, child labor, and other abuses—these are all goals toward which organized labor has worked successfully. Positive programs of unemployment insurance and social security have been added with the support of labor.



“The role of responsible trade unionism has not been solely economic. Unions have been a great source of strength and dignity for millions of workers, both foreign and native born. Particularly for people who have come from abroad seeking freedom and opportunity, the union has helped them adjust to a new society. Indeed, in our complex and industrialized society of today, it is essential that workers have unions to give them collective strength and an opportunity for self-expression. Free labor has worked for these goals on behalf of all workers, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

“Finally, unions have contributed greatly to their communities. They have worked for better schools, better housing, better planning. They have supported sound community objectives and improvements. They have also helped citizens become more conscious of their social and political responsibilities.

“Just as I believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, so also I believe in the American tradition of majority rule. When a union is legally certified as a bargaining agent, it means it has won a majority vote of the workers. It then bargains on behalf of *all* employees under its jurisdiction.

“I am, for this reason, opposed to a so-called ‘right-to-work’ law. I believe such a law would weaken collective bargaining and would tend to undermine the basis of existing labor relations in our state. Furthermore, I would like to point out that the term ‘right-to-work’ is misleading, because it does not guarantee employment. . . .

“Under my administration, we will continue to go forward with intelligent labor legislation and it will be equitable and beneficial to all. And it will be administered fairly to carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

“One important labor issue facing the next governor and Legislature of our state is that of legislation to protect union funds paid in by workers. I am in favor of such legislation. I believe members of a union are entitled to full information as to the financial operations of their union.

"The great majority of men who lead and manage labor unions are completely honest. They have recognized that financial abuses exist in some unions, and have taken action to eliminate them. The A.F.L.-C.I.O. unions have adopted a Code of Ethical Practices, and have taken disciplinary action against violations. But the labor unions cannot do the necessary job themselves in every instance.

"I believe that government should support these efforts by legislation. A constructively drawn bill in this area would reinforce the work the majority of unions are doing to protect themselves and would help to prevent a few individuals from blackening the good name of labor as a whole. . . .

"There are other problems and other areas for further improvement. I shall dedicate myself to the solution of these problems with the help of management and labor. . . .

"My main labor program rests on adherence to the principle of the negotiation of all disputes by labor and management. The state should avoid any action which discourages genuine collective bargaining. In a dynamic economy such as ours, the labor-management relationship is never static. It is a highly complex one and will be so for years to come. But sincere collective bargaining has proved the most effective method for promoting the best interests of management, labor, and the public. Except where the public interest is vitally affected, state government should not interfere with labor-management negotiations.

"Underlying all of our actions in the field of labor and management relations is our fundamental belief in individual worth and human dignity, equal opportunity for all. I am confident that we can effectively solve our mutual problems if we never lose sight of human values."

The labor program Rockefeller submitted to the New York State electorate was both broad and farsighted. It looked to the future and reflected his awareness of the fact that these are changing times on the industrial scene, times calling for

either the alteration of existing legislation or the writing of entirely new laws to meet the new needs that are arising. A succinct description of his nine-point labor program was embodied in a speech to the Schenectady County Republican Committee, in October, 1958:

"If I am elected Governor, I will seek to maintain a climate in which responsible labor and responsible management can work in harmony. With this in mind I propose the following:

"1. A program to make possible continuation of hospitalization and group life insurance for retired workers.

"Today many of our older workers lose these benefits when they retire. Because of their advanced years, these older workers usually cannot obtain new policies. Yet these later years can be the very time when the benefits are most needed.

"To develop the program to continue these benefits after retirement will involve working out difficult cost factors and administrative problems. These can be overcome and will be. Our senior citizens are entitled to this protection.

"2. More jobs and better incomes through an economic development program. To this end I have proposed the creation of a Special Commission on Economic Expansion to help New York State attract new industry and encourage the expansion of existing industry.

"3. A vigorous new program for assistance to workers displaced by automation or other technological change. This program will include extended unemployment insurance benefits for displaced workers, and a real job retraining program to fit these workers for new jobs.

"4. Extension of our unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and disability benefits programs to cover workers employed by firms having one or more employees. At present unless a worker is employed by a firm having at least four employees he is not entitled to all of these benefits.

"5. Expanded and more effective programs for rehabilitation of disabled workers and for placement of the handicapped in paying jobs. Many of the handicapped have skills and abilities that our nation cannot afford to lose.

"6. Equality of opportunity in employment for all competent persons, regardless of race, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, or age.

"7. State legislation to help unions in the safeguarding of union funds. . . . I believe members of a union are entitled to full information on the financial operations of their union. I will work with responsible labor representatives to develop the best legislation for dealing with this problem.

"8. Forthright opposition to so-called 'right-to-work' legislation. Just as I believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, so do I believe in the American tradition of majority rule. The so-called 'right-to-work' laws violate this tradition.

"9. Work with management, labor, and insurance companies to try to develop a plan to make possible the transfer of pension rights when workers change jobs. At the present time most workers are entitled to certain pension rights if they continue to work for their present employer until they reach retirement age. However, in too many cases if a worker leaves his job, he loses these pension rights and has to start from scratch to build up new pension rights. When plants close down workers may lose their pension benefits.

"The older a worker gets the harder is his choice of whether to stay in a job or take a new one. It means also that older workers find it difficult to get jobs because of the cost of the company pension system. This can work a great hardship on men and their families and it decreases the mobility of our labor force.

"The difficulties involved in developing a workable, sound plan are great. Financial and administrative questions are involved which require careful study.

“This program will go far toward helping improve the welfare of every working man and woman in this State, and their families.”

Within three months of his election, Rockefeller had marshalled through the New York State Legislature a measure broadening the state’s vocational rehabilitation program for disabled workers, legislation protecting more employees with workmen’s compensation and disability benefits, and a bill giving unemployment insurance protection to 150,000 workers in single-employee firms. More significantly, he had also succeeded in getting legislation to safeguard union funds enacted, for the first time in any state or in the nation. This important, pioneering law was designed to reach both corrupt union representatives and unscrupulous management. In describing the bill to the Legislature the Governor said:

“I should like to outline briefly the provisions of the bill comprising the Labor and Management Improper Practices Act. This Act covers five main areas—

“1. Fiduciary obligations and prohibited financial interests of union officials:

“In this area, the Act first sets forth a general statement of the fiduciary obligations of union officers and agents. It then prohibits these officials from acquiring specified financial interests in businesses and in transactions with their own union; bars them from receiving certain payments, loans, or gifts from businesses; and delimits the lending or investing of union funds.

“2. Obligation of employer associations, employers, and labor relations consultants:

“The Act prohibits employer associations, employers, labor relations consultants, and others from participating in or inducing any of the improper acts of union officials.

“3. Enforcement:

“Where a union official has committed any of the wrongful

acts, the labor organization, its parent labor organization, and its members have specific rights to bring court actions to redress the wrong. If management has participated in or induced the wrong, it is subject to the same judicial remedies as the union official.

“In addition, where a union official has knowingly and wilfully violated the specific provisions dealing with financial interests and wrongful use of union funds, such violation is made a misdemeanor. It is also made a misdemeanor for management knowingly and wilfully to participate in or induce such violation by the union official.

#### “4. Financial reports and accounting duties:

“Unions and employer associations are each required to file annual financial reports with the Industrial Commissioner. These reports, which are public information and must be made available to members, require disclosure of receipts and disbursements, and assets and liabilities.

“In addition, unions and employer associations must keep their books and records of account in accordance with accounting principles prescribed by the Industrial Commissioner. These books and records must be preserved for five years.

“Employers of ten or more persons and labor relations consultants are also required to file financial reports. These reports must set forth expenditures made for specified conduct with regard to labor relations. These reports are public. Books and records reflecting these expenditures must be preserved for five years.

“The Industrial Commissioner is given appropriate powers to assure compliance with these requirements. Wilful failure to comply is made a misdemeanor.

#### “5. Advisory Council:

“An advisory council, composed of three public members, is established for the purpose of keeping informed as to the ethical practices of labor and management, and making periodic reports and recommendations concerning the operation, administration and enforcement of the Act.

“While this bill deals primarily with the question of financial integrity, I am convinced that democratic procedures within labor organizations are equally fundamental to the continuance and strengthening of responsible trade unionism. Regular periodic elections, the right to nominate candidates and the right to a secret ballot are some of the principles which are basic to democratic procedure. State legislation may well be needed to help assure that these principles are preserved in all unions.

“Accordingly, Section Two of this bill provides for a study by the Industrial Commissioner of election procedures and practices within labor organizations in the state. The Industrial Commissioner would be required to report to the Governor and your Honorable Bodies not later than February 1, 1960, concerning his findings. These would be accompanied by his recommendations, if any, with respect to legislation designed to supplement and support the efforts of responsible trade unionists to assure democratic procedures within labor organizations.

“I believe that such a study is essential. If legislation is found to be necessary, I expect to be able to present to you next year a well-considered proposal in this area. Such legislation would be coordinated with any federal legislation which might be enacted in the intervening months.”

In the field of agriculture, Rockefeller lays no claim to authority, although he takes an active interest in three farms he owns in Venezuela and visits them whenever possible. (They are his favorite vacation spot.) Not surprisingly, his farms call to mind certain IBEC and Point Four projects. While they are run as businesses, their primary purpose is to develop hardier and more prolific plants and cattle for Venezuela, and they are, in a way, a one-man good neighbor policy in action.

In public life, Rockefeller has had to deal with agriculture primarily in terms of the improvement of the overall economy of a marginal country. In this frame of reference, he

regards the mechanization and modernization of a country's agriculture as the first step toward its industrial development. Men cannot leave the farms to work in factories, he reasons, unless their companions who remain in the fields are able to increase their productivity sufficiently to feed a growing industrial population. It is a situation calling for a major expansion of government activities in the fields of agricultural extension services and the home demonstration of scientific methods of farming, as well as an enlarged program of supervised rural short- and long-term credit. These are the sorts of agricultural problems with which Rockefeller is most familiar.

Where our national farm problems are concerned, Nelson readily admits he is no expert. And in his only major speech on domestic agriculture he deliberately limited himself to a general discussion of the subject in terms of a balanced economy. He was speaking in the heart of New York State's famed milkshed, to the Genesee County Republican Committee in the fall of 1958:

"Tonight I want to talk about a major segment of our economy—Agriculture. But I am not talking to farmers alone. I am talking to every resident of the state.

"It does not matter whether you are a big city resident, a suburbanite, or a non-farmer in a rural area. It does not matter whether you are a baker or a banker, a business man or an employee, a teacher or a student, an artist or a mechanic. It does not matter where you are or what you do. Each and every one of you is a consumer. As such, each and every one of you has a vital, day-by-day, kitchen-table interest in a sound, prosperous, highly productive agriculture.

"No other aspect of our economy can lay a more just, more intimate, or more basic claim upon the common interest of us all. Yet in no area more than in agriculture is there a greater need for more widespread public understanding of its importance, its achievements, and its problems.

"I do not pretend to be an agricultural expert but I do have



some familiarity with broad economic problems and human needs. And if elected Governor, I will stimulate every possible effort to promote a sympathetic understanding of agriculture among consumers and among other groups of producers.

"Here are some facts which every resident of New York State should know:

"1. Agriculture has magnificently met its primary responsibility for producing and getting to the consumer an abundance of high quality food. Its importance, however, goes far beyond the fundamental job of feeding all the rest of us.

"2. It gives jobs to thousands in the production and harvesting of crops.

"3. Thousands of others find employment in the processing and distribution of food and in providing the many services which bring food from the farm to your kitchen.

"4. New York is one of the nation's greatest agricultural states. It outranks three-fourths of the other states in the value of its farm produce.

"5. Farm purchasing power stimulates the general economy of our state, and farm prosperity spurs every other business and industry in our state.

"As the source upon which we all depend for our daily bread and as a vital economic force affecting the general welfare, agriculture deserves great respect from the people as a whole. From the state government, it is entitled to sympathetic, intelligent, practical co-operation. This is not only essential to a sound public policy, it is a vital safeguard for our own future.

"Our population is increasing every day. As more people need food, the demands upon agriculture grow, too. If agriculture is to continue to meet those demands, it will need practical encouragement and warm-hearted co-operation from its state government.

"Agriculture cannot and must not stand still. It must advance constantly, applying new techniques and more know-how to meeting the ever expanding demand for food. The

continuous and orderly flow of food to market is essential for all our people. These two objectives are vitally important, not alone to agriculture but to every man, woman, and child, to every handler, processor, and consumer of food.

“Nothing highlights that consumer interest more than milk and the dairy products which are required by all of us. New York ranks second only to Wisconsin in national production of dairy products, which account for about half of the farm income of this state. The city of New York, the world’s greatest concentration of consumers, depends on our upstate farms for much of its daily milk supply. In New York City and elsewhere, a shortage of milk or disruption of its delivery is of serious import to millions of human beings.

“The continuous and orderly flow of adequate supplies of milk . . . is due in great measure to the federal-state orders which regulate its marketing. These orders have stabilized prices for dairy farmers. Their importance has been proven again in the last year. Producer income benefited substantially by the extension of the metropolitan federal-state marketing order to many upstate counties and northern New Jersey.

“Secretary Benson, in my opinion, is to be highly commended for his wise decision on this matter. As Governor, I will give milk marketing orders support, co-operating in every way possible to strengthen their effectiveness.

“I am sure that New York agriculture asks no disproportionate consideration from state government. It seeks nothing which is contrary to the general public interest. . . .

“It works with and from the land, but its interests inevitably are mingled with the welfare and prosperity of many rural businesses and countless individuals who are not engaged in farming.

“The farmer is interested, like everyone else, in the best possible education for children, in better highways, water supply, property assessment and taxes, in general economic growth, government spending, and other matters of wide public concern.

“The farmer’s interest in good government, then, is far broader than his natural personal concern for those particular matters which affect his farm operation.”

Faced with the necessity of translating the broad generalities of his address into concrete proposals designed to meet the specific needs of his state’s agriculturists, Rockefeller, as Governor, has sponsored a farm program with five major objectives. It seeks to improve marketing procedures, particularly for the small farmer, and to broaden the state’s agricultural research activities. It calls for a state-wide promotion campaign to stimulate the consumption of milk, and an aggressive drive toward water conservation and the control of water pollution. Finally, it asks for a ten-year extension of the state’s farm-to-market road improvement program. His goal, the Governor says, is to give the farmer “practical” encouragement.

## 6 . . . On Public Health

Rockefeller was an active member of the Westchester, N.Y. County Board of Health for over twenty years. In Washington, he played a major role in organizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and served as the department's first Under Secretary. And during all of his adult life he has shared in the management of his family's vast philanthropies in the field of medical research and care. Public health is a subject with which he has long been familiar.

His views on the role of government in this area are unequivocal. In principle, he is against socialized medicine, feeling that it not only retards medical progress but also lessens the quality of medical care. Progress in the field of health, he says, can best be made through the combined efforts

of private initiative, individual generosity, and institutional philanthropy. Government should take the lead only when it is apparent that its strong support is essential to the public weal. In effect, Rockefeller approaches the problem of public health in the spirit of Lincoln's cardinal principle of government; i.e., what the people cannot do for themselves the people's government must do for them.

We have today at least three pressing health problems that he feels should be receiving stronger support at all levels of government, federal, state, and local, than they are currently getting. First, he thinks the nation's private health insurance plans should be given some form of government backing. He explained why, in 1954, to the Senate Subcommittee on Health, then holding hearings on a bill to establish a federal reinsurance service. The purpose of the bill was to encourage private and nonprofit health insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families. In his testimony he said, in part:

“With the help of the government, through the reinsurance program this bill proposes, insurance companies would be able to take risks up to date some of them haven't felt they could afford to take. . . . In view of the fact that ninety-three million people have some health insurance while sixty-three million have none, that the total bill per year for medical care is running around nine and four-tenths billion dollars and only one and four-tenths billion dollars of that is covered by insurance, I think it is evident that there is room and need for better protection.”

Although the bill died in committee, Rockefeller's faith in the concept embodied in the shelved legislation remained unshaken. And the idea was still foremost in his mind when he outlined his public health program to the Republican committeemen of five New York counties, in October, 1958:

“Tonight I want to talk on a subject about which I feel very strongly—the health of our people. . . . Here are some of the problems and the actions I will take to meet them if I am elected.

“One: The high cost of hospitalization and the doctors’ bills which come with a serious accident or illness can imperil the economic future of an entire family, and leave a legacy of suffering long after the recovery period has passed.

“I will urge consideration of a program of major medical insurance for all wage earners in the state, to protect them against the big bills that occur when serious disease or disability strikes. This coverage would supplement basic health plans. . . . It will not put the state in the insurance or the medical business. There would be no disturbance of the traditional relationship between patients and doctors of their own choosing. It would be another great advance, with the assistance of the government, in strengthening and broadening the scope of our traditional concept of private, voluntary, and nonprofit hospitalization and treatment.

“Private insurance organizations and nonprofit prepayment plans would write the major medical protection. . . . Existing and new major medical plans would serve as credit against the protection I am suggesting. For example, certain expanded benefits of voluntary nonprofit plans are a form of major protection, as are the benefits of many comprehensive group prepayment plans.

“Such a program would not end the heart-break that comes when a catastrophic illness strikes a household. But it could spare our families some of the terrible anxiety of not knowing how they can provide the medical care and support needed by those whom they love.

“There are many difficulties and complications, many cost factors and administrative problems, which are involved in the development of a sound, workable plan. But, by working with the medical profession, voluntary groups, and other interested

parties, I believe these can be solved. Security and peace of mind in these matters is important to all of us.

"Two: Basic health and medical insurance plans should be improved in numerous respects.

"I will work to encourage such improvements as:

"Coverage of doctors' and nursing care outside the hospital, as well as in hospitals.

"Greater coverage of diagnostic services with a view toward prevention and early treatment of illness.

"Continuation of these insurance benefits for people who have retired.

"Coverage of mental illness.

"Continuation of protection during unemployment. One of the greatest gaps in our health insurance coverage has been the fact that the employee who loses his job and cannot keep up his payments loses protection at the time he is least able to pay medical bills.

"Three: New York's death rate from heart disease and cancer is well above the national average. I will see that a vigorous fight against these diseases is carried forward. The state should move as far into research in chronic disease as our medical resources will allow. Our early detection service in each community should be expanded through the local medical profession, and medical training in the newest methods of treatment of these diseases should be broadened.

"Four: Rehabilitation has become a third stage of medicine, after prevention and treatment. Yet New York ranks forty-fourth among the states in rehabilitations achieved annually in relation to population. . . . I will see that rehabilitation services are expanded. I will see that rehabilitation plays a major role in workmen's compensation. The bottlenecks will be removed and programs gotten underway to save human talent and rebuild lives.

"Five: Alcoholism and narcotics addiction have emerged as major health problems. Thousands of people are afflicted

and affected. I will face these two problems realistically. The state should not leave the localities unaided in this struggle.

“Six: Adequate medical care and hospitalization are not uniformly available throughout our state. The explosive growth of our suburban areas has intensified this problem. These are serious and difficult problems to be solved with respect to the costs of medical services. Our voluntary hospitals are faced with mounting deficits, and the costs of medical services of all kinds are steadily rising. I will work to make medical facilities available to more of our people. I will urge programs for care outside of institutions where appropriate. I will encourage the development of more high quality nursing homes providing long-term care at the lowest possible cost. And I will encourage more comprehensive local health services and take measures to increase the supply of public health specialists. Our public and private universities can train them if the State will help with recruitment and broader scholarship programs.

“These are some of the necessary steps which should be taken to meet the health problems that confront us.”

Rehabilitation is a public health problem to which far more governmental attention should be paid, in Rockefeller's opinion. His reasons for urging increased government support of programs for rehabilitating the physically disabled are hard-headed as well as humane. While the social value of rehabilitation is universally appreciated, its very considerable economic value, he feels, is not generally recognized. In 1958, the aggregate earnings of the disabled persons who received training under the New York State vocational rehabilitation program increased from an estimated two million dollars to over eleven million dollars annually, with one and four-tenths million dollars of this going to pay state and federal income taxes. And prior to their rehabilitation, he points out, these same people were receiving over \$800,000 a year in public assistance payments.



In a statement issued from his campaign headquarters in the fall of 1958, Nelson said:

"I want to express my position in an area of great human need. This is the field of rehabilitation of physically disabled persons.

"Rehabilitation is the process of restoring disabled persons to lives of greater usefulness and self-sufficiency through medical treatment and training. It is a heartwarming process. It achieves for the individual a greater degree of independence, satisfaction and dignity.

"It also pays great economic dividends to the individual and to society in the form of earnings, savings in the costs of nursing and other personal care, and savings in public assistance costs.

"Rehabilitation can benefit individuals in every walk of life: the handicapped child, the disabled housewife, the injured workman, and the older person with heart disease or other disabling conditions. Today, rehabilitation also plays an important role in helping to restore certain categories of mentally ill persons to lives of greater independence. The miracles which can be wrought by modern rehabilitation techniques have been dramatically illustrated many times. . . .

"Two major public rehabilitation programs of the state of New York are drifting. . . . One of these lagging programs is the vocational rehabilitation program operated by the state in conjunction with the federal government. I happen to be familiar with this program because I personally participated in the development of the federal legislation which expanded it in 1954.

"I have studied the figures. I find that New York in the last two years has gone backward. . . . [This] means, in human terms, that tremendous opportunities for enhancing human lives by restoring individuals to a status of self-sufficiency are being lost daily.

"The other glaring deficiency in the state's performance in

the field of rehabilitation is the relatively insignificant role that rehabilitation plays in workmen's compensation. . . . Employeecs should benefit to a far greater extent from the rehabilitation services which are supposed to be part of the medical care and treatment provided by our workmen's compensation law.

"My position is clear and simple: there must be a vast, new effort in the field of rehabilitation; an increased emphasis on the constructive opportunities of rehabilitation must pervade all the programs of the state in the field of human welfare."

The third public health problem of major concern to Rockefeller is the by-product of one of the most striking phenomena of our century—the tremendous increase in recent years in the percentage of aged in our population, which has brought about an attendant increase in the number of geriatric patients in need of medical attention. He feels there is an immediate need for government to expand and improve the services needed to deal with this phenomenon. As he said two years ago in an address in Glens Falls, N.Y.:

"There are many things waiting to be done for our older citizens—and here in New York State, nearly one-third of our people are now forty-five and older, and about one and one-half million of our people are over the age of sixty-five.

"If I am elected Governor, I will:

"Step up research and action in the whole field of geriatrics, to give our older people a healthier, more vigorous life.

"Begin a program to encourage more good local nursing homes, so our older citizens can have better care near their families and their friends.

"Encourage more housing suited to the needs of our older people.

“Launch a program to make greater use of the skills and experience of our older workers.

“Recommend better job rehabilitation and expanded job placement services.

“Vigorously enforce the law prohibiting discrimination in employment because of age.

“Work with community leaders to help set up more recreational and cultural programs for our older people.

“One of the most important unsolved problems is how to assure our people the security of health insurance protection in their later years. Too often, it is in these later years, when people most need such assistance, that insurance is not available to them.

“I propose that we re-examine health and group life insurance coverage to make sure that our senior citizens are not deprived of these protections after retirement. . . . They are entitled to them.

“A second unsolved problem is that of the older person who is denied an adequate retirement pension, not because he hasn’t worked long enough, but because he has changed jobs. . . . Today, and as we look ahead, we see the need for mobility in our labor force. The individual who responds to the need of new industries for employees, or who is compelled by automation or other factors to take different employment, should not have to imperil his pension income. . . .

“I promise you that I will take active steps to open fresh opportunity to all our older people—so those who need special care can find it, so those who need a place to live within their means can have it, so those who want to retire can do so in comfort, so those who want to work will find work to do.

“This is not so much what we owe our senior citizens—it’s what we owe ourselves.”

Since his election, Rockefeller has launched a program to develop nursing homes designed to provide long-term care for the aged at the lowest possible cost. He has also expanded

New York State's vocational rehabilitation services, and set up a number of pilot projects to test new and experimental methods of physical and psychiatric rehabilitation. In addition, he has what he calls "task forces" at work studying specific problems in the fields of geriatrics and rehabilitation for which no satisfactory remedies have as yet been devised. Another task force is studying the question of health insurance, trying to find ways to improve existing plans and attempting to devise a comprehensive program to cover all retired workers as well as all wage earners. And yet another task force is examining the pressing problem of the cost of medical care today.

Commenting on his staff-study approach to public health, the New York *Herald Tribune* said in a recent editorial:

The whole state will hail Governor Rockefeller's decision to make a thoroughgoing investigation of the means and cost of combating disease. . . . Behind his decision lies the stark fact that medical costs shot up forty-three per cent between 1948 and 1958. The cause of this is one of the things that the Governor's study will determine. Another will be the availability of medical care throughout the state. . . .

The study will have many ramifications. Nursing homes for those needing prolonged care will come within its field; so, too, will the possibilities for extending increased services to those who are treated at home or who are able to make periodic visits to a doctor's office, clinic, or hospital. Better insurance coverage for such persons as well as for diagnostic services will also be taken into account.

Quite clearly this is an enormous task. . . . It is possible that recommendations for new legislation will result from the inquiry, and be placed before the next session of the state Legislature. It is to be hoped that these will be fruitful and that the major goal of the study, finding ways to keep "medical care within financial reach of the average individual," will be achieved.

As was previously pointed out, Nelson has added a new dimension to the Rockefeller tradition. Old John D. was primarily concerned with saving souls. John D., Jr., believes it is equally important to keep people healthy. Nelson thinks people must also be given security—and it is clear that even in his public health program he is as much concerned with bringing a greater sense of security into people's lives as he is with offering them improved medical service and care.

## 7... On Education

Rockefeller does not think the crisis in American education is being adequately met. Our overcrowded, understaffed, ill-equipped schools are short about 140,000 classrooms. We have at present roughly two million pupils in excess of normal classroom capacity. And some schools have had to drop physics, chemistry, and mathematics from their curriculum because there are no teachers to teach them. At the same time, Rockefeller points out, we face one of the greatest population booms ever; we face a need for more young people trained to work with new techniques in business, industry, foreign affairs, and government; and we face the most desperate need for scientific education in our history, brought home to us by Russia's sputniks.

As Nelson is only too well aware, all of our school problems lead back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing. America's need for good education is immediate and imperative; and good education is expensive. This is a fact the American people have never been quite willing to face. In a recent year when we spent eight billion dollars on liquor, nineteen billion on cars, and only five billion on public education, the newspapers were filled with stories of local school boards operating on "austerity" budgets—by public demand.

Perhaps even more threatening to our school system is the commonly held view that all we require are a few more teachers, some more buildings, and a little more money. Such an approach at a time when we are moving into a crucial era in our history will be disastrous, Rockefeller feels. An educational system that is grudgingly patched up to meet the expediencies of the moment will be forever out of date. We must be as farsighted and aggressive in building for the future in education, Nelson maintains, as we have been in the past in building other aspects of our national life.

Building for the future, he concedes, will be expensive. According to the Rockefeller report on Education, even allowing for increased efficiency in the use of school funds, it is probable that our schools and colleges will soon require at least *double* their present level of financial support to handle our growing student population. The report estimates that, no later than 1967, our educational system will cost the nation in the neighborhood of thirty billion dollars, measured in today's prices. In 1955, the year the report analyzes, the cost was fourteen billion dollars.

Rockefeller believes that an increase of this magnitude calls for a departure from past patterns of financing. Local control of education is both an important principle and a strong tradition in this country, and there has always been strong resistance to any outside encroachment on this autonomy. But there is already a tendency to shift the burden of school support from local to state government. Nationwide, state support

increased from seventeen per cent in 1930 to thirty-seven per cent in 1954. And Rockefeller is convinced that to insure good schools for the future it will be absolutely necessary for state governments to provide localities with even more financing and technical assistance than they are currently receiving. The job, he says, just can't be done over the long pull without state help.

State aid for schools was one of the principal topics he covered in the comprehensive policy statement on education he issued during his campaign:

“For any people or nation, education means light—and strength. And the nation that neither knows nor honors so elemental a truth can only be a dark and enfeebled land.

“As a nation, the United States must know and must live by this truth—and today we are not doing so. As a state, New York must lead the nation, in practice and example—and it is not doing so.

“This is a rude reality.

“This reality decisively affects every aspect of national life. To the individual who is seeking basic material goods, a high school diploma promises, by statistical average, a \$50,000 increase in lifetime income; and a college diploma, again on the average, signifies another \$100,000 in earned income. This is merely another way of expressing the great truth that our society needs and values educated men and women.

“To the national economy, education, and education alone, promises the crossing of new technical and industrial frontiers each year. By 1965 the need for technical and professional personnel in our society will have risen by forty per cent over today.

“To democracy itself, to all the values that we, as a people, are committed to defend, education is nothing less than the source of life. ‘If a nation expects,’ in Jefferson’s words, ‘to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.’

“There is, quite truly and simply, no other way to survive.



Neither the weapons of war nor the devices of diplomacy mean more to our national safety and to our national dignity than the learning of our youth and the skills of our citizenry. No soldier bears a more sobering responsibility than a teacher. And in the schoolroom itself—all the schoolrooms of this state and this nation—may well be decided the fate and the future of Freedom.

“In meeting the challenge of this truth, no neat formula for action can suffice. Yet a few essential principles can be defined to inspire and direct our action. Among them are these four:

“One: We must act with awareness that the problems of education we face, even in purely statistical terms, are not static but continuing and growing. Enrollment in New York State’s elementary and secondary schools (today at some three and two-tenths million) will soar by another million by 1970. And in the even more critical area of higher education, enrollment will have almost doubled by that date. Thus the thinking and planning of today must be adequate in scope and imagination to meet and master the problems of tomorrow.

“Two: We must accept the fact—quite inescapable—that the cost of meeting the educational challenge will steadily rise. As a free people, to whose democratic processes education is indispensable, we might be expected to spend upon education a greater part of our national income than a totalitarian system. Yet today the percentage of the national income spent by the United States on education is less than half that spent by the Soviet Union. The teachers, the training, the schools required by our youth—and our future—will cost money and sacrifice. We should not be surprised: the tools to strengthen and save democracy, in peace, as in war, have never been found on sale in any bargain basement.

“Three: We must, in shaping the substance of our education, demand appropriate emphasis on both the so-called academic and the so-called practical subjects. For, in this full

and free society, we need scholars no less than scientists, students who contemplate the mysteries of the arts no less than those penetrating the mysteries of the atom. We need workers at the lathe no less than attorneys at law; carpenters no less than chemists. And we must never forget that there need be no conflict between the way in which an individual earns a living and his capacity for learning and enjoyment of our mighty cultural heritage.

“Four: We must, perhaps above all else, never forget that education is essentially a human, not a mechanical, process. Bigger plants, grander programs, larger appropriations—not any or all of these combined can assure a ‘good’ education. What is ‘good’ in an education has to be put there by a human being. And the selection and the training and the respect and the encouragement of teachers of stature and of skill; this is the essence of any answer to the challenge to our education system.

“Man over matter: this sums up much of our credo as a people. It indicates the essential truth about education: it is the man who matters, the man teaching and the man taught. And we shall have addressed ourselves to the critical problem when we have assured to our teachers the skills they need in their tasks, and the honor and respect and reward due them in their communities. . . .

“No specific formula for action matters so much as the priceless essentials: full awareness of the problems before us, the resolve to meet them vigorously, and an abiding knowledge of the crucial values at stake.

“Out of such awareness should evolve a long-range plan, based upon fundamental understanding of the magnitude of the problem we face. This can only be achieved if we are willing to assemble the best talents, knowledge, and intellects to define the goals and chart the ways to reach them.

“Nonetheless, I wish to make some specific statements of intent and policy.

“One: We shall strive, not spasmodically but consistently,

to assure to our schools and to our teachers both the resources and the recognition that they need and deserve.

“Two: We shall undertake what has been too long delayed—recognition of the major role that must be played by the state in financial aid, as educational needs fast outrun the resources which communities derive from the local property tax.

“Three: We must adhere to the principle of equalization in the granting of state aid so that less privileged localities are not left to their limited resources but are enabled to match the equipment, facilities, and competence of school systems in more prosperous areas.

“Four: We shall regard the increased aid by the State, enacted by the 1958 Legislature for one year, as the initial stage in a *continuing* program.

“Five: We shall expand state technical assistance to local school districts in such areas as community planning, standardized architectural plans, technicalities of issuing school bonds, test procedures, and program evaluations. Such planned and skilled assistance can not only strengthen local school systems but also must be designed to significantly lower costs of building and operating schools.

“Six: We must attack an array of problems in the field of higher education to assure the opportunity of a good college education to every qualified student seeking it. We must seek every proper means of encouraging our private colleges and universities, which have for generations served the cause of higher education in our state. We need to assure the capacity of the State University, and we need more community colleges to meet expanding future needs. We need to study and, wherever possible, remove the causes for so many of the most qualified high school students failing to continue their education at the university level. We must expand assistance, by scholarships and loans, so that as many may go forward as possible.

“Seven: We should, for the sake of orderly administration and planning, in local and State budgeting, begin to separate

strictly education costs from costs of non-curriculum services. This will make more clear and coherent the nature of local school programs, make less obscure and confusing the use of school taxes, assure more precise planning for the future and assist localities in budgeting their school costs.

“Eight: We shall institute specific procedures for the regular and continuing review of minimum salaries, pensions, and all other aspects of the financial security of our teachers. Such a review, conducted by an appropriate state agency making public its findings at some such regular interval as every two years, can and will assure the summoning of public attention—and state action—to the needs of the teaching profession.

“By such elementals as these, grand designs can be made real. Every child can have within his reach that which his talent and ambition can achieve.

“We live in a time when no less can suffice. . . . In education we dare not lag. For the price can be incalculable—to be paid by future generations.

“As a nation, we must, in example and in execution, in spirit and in striving, lead all other nations that know and cherish freedom.”

On the basis of his performance in office, Rockefeller wasn't indulging in platform rhetoric when he said, “In education we dare not lag.” As Governor, he took immediate action to meet the educational challenge in his state. Within four months of his election he made a statewide telecast to report on what had been accomplished during his Administration's first legislative session. Among other matters, he discussed what had been done to further his school program:

“There is no problem of greater concern to all of us than equal opportunity for the best possible education of our children. . . . We must prepare for the [coming] expansion in school enrollment and at the same time increase our efforts to achieve the highest standards of education for every boy and

girl in the state. . . . Much remains to be done by your state government. But in addition to all of the state aid to school districts provided in accordance with the existing formulas, many new steps were taken during the recent legislative session. Let's take a look at some of them.

"Here are copies of the bills themselves just as they came from the printer. This first one, *Aid to School Construction*, helps those school districts in financial trouble that in the past had only been able to borrow for school construction at a very high rate of interest, rates which they can't afford.

"Next, here is a bill for State University construction. More than thirty-four million dollars was voted for construction of new buildings for the various community colleges and other units of the State University, to meet the tremendously increased demand for college education.

"Now here is one to do with scholarships. Funds are provided to increase the number of state scholarships from 25,000 to 27,000.

"In the next bill, for the first time in the state's history, aid is provided in the amount of \$2,700,000 for higher education in New York City.

"In addition, bills were passed to provide more state assistance for groups of children who need and deserve special attention and care to assure them their chance in life. They provide special aid for delinquent children, special aid for physically and mentally handicapped children, and special aid for non-English speaking children.

"Another bill enacted provides for experimental mental programs for the early detection of potential problem children and the development of programs to help them get straightened out.

"Thus you can see that significant steps have been taken in the all-important field of education. Education is not only basic to the development and self-realization of every child, but in the last analysis, education is basic to the concept of freedom and the very survival of the free world itself."

In addition to the bills he sent to the Legislature, Rockefeller assigned three new projects to the state's Education Department. It was asked to devise ways and means of expanding its program of technical assistance to school districts. A study of school construction costs was launched. And the department was instructed to set up a system for reviewing, on a continuing basis, the salaries, pensions, and other aspects of the financial position of the state's teachers.

As we undertake the gigantic task of restoring the physical plant of our educational system to good working order we must also be constantly on guard to see that the basic nature of the system remains unchanged, Rockefeller says. Our schools must continue to insure the survival of free inquiry, as in the past. In an era of increasingly dehumanized technology, he feels it is particularly important that our school system preserve as its principal goal the strengthening of the opportunities for free men to develop their *individual* capacities.

Shortly after Sputnik I was launched, Nelson addressed the eighty-seventh graduating class of the State University of New York College of Teachers. He told the class:

“America is in a ferment today over its educational system, in part because of some rather spectacular Soviet achievements. Let us not confuse the educational objectives of the Russians, however, with our own. Their purpose is to develop an educational elite to subserve the State, as instruments of the Soviet drive for world dominion. The purpose of education in a free nation is to provide equality of opportunity. Beyond that, its goal should be the perfecting of the human spirit and the pursuit of excellence. And always, it should stir the minds of free men to inquiry and open discussion. America does not want intellectual robots coming off an education assembly line.”

## 8 . . . On Civil Rights

When Rockefeller became Governor, New York State already had on its books one of the most effective sets of civil rights laws in the nation, as well as the agencies to enforce them. Even so, one of his first acts was to strengthen both the state Commission against Discrimination and the Civil Rights Bureau in the Attorney General's office, by increasing their budgets and enlarging their personnel.

His position on the civil rights issue is uncompromising. Whenever the question is raised, he says, bluntly, "I want full freedom and opportunity for all persons, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in every phase of life."

Considering his heritage, it would be surprising if Rockefeller felt any differently. Almost a century ago, his great

grandmother, Eliza, was an active member of the pre-Civil War underground railroad. At the turn of the century, when higher education for either Negroes or women was practically unthought of, his grandfather founded Spelman College, for Negro women. And during the early 1900's, both his grandfather and his father, through their General Education Board, were underwriting coeducational colleges for Negroes and, at the same time, pouring millions into schools for Southern whites because they thought that, otherwise, the South would actively resent their contributions to the advancement of the Negro.

Rockefeller's concern for the rights of minorities reaches so deeply into his marrow that he is unable to think of them in terms of "civil" prerogatives, involving only social, economic, and political matters. To his mind, "civil" rights is a misnomer; they are, instead, moral rights. He made this clear in an address to the New York State Baptist Missionary Convention, in October, 1958:

"I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to meet with you in your annual convention and to share in this reaffirmation of our common faith. . . .

"Regardless of race, creed, or religion, we all stand before one God. Our relationship to him transcends all other relationships, and the tragedy of human life is that we often place human relationships, both individual and social, ahead of this one enduring and truly spiritual relationship. . . .

"Now, let me comment briefly on some of the specific tenets of my faith. I have a duty, on a man-to-man basis, to tell you the truth as to where I stand on certain issues.

"I believe that the state has a moral responsibility to help the needy, wherever and whenever the need exists.

"I subscribe with my whole heart to a program of full civil rights for all Americans of every race and creed. That includes the right to good housing, to good education, and to equal opportunity in jobs. I believe no man should be dis-



criminated against because of his color or creed, and that every man should have the chance to go as far as his capacities and ambition will enable him to go.

"I am proud of the contributions that my family and I have given to Negro education and to such great Negro organizations as the Urban League and the N.A.A.C.P.

"It was through this great church, the Baptist Church, that my grandfather first became interested in Negro education, and it was at a time when there was not a single high school for Negroes south of the Mason-Dixon Line. He and my father gave generously of themselves, their time and thought, in improving opportunities for Negroes in education, in jobs, in every way they could. My brothers and I have continued that tradition, for it was instilled into us in our home.

"I carry with me always the memory of a letter my mother wrote to us when we were young men. She wrote about the evils of race hatred and race prejudice, and pointed out the terrible injustice of it. And she pleaded with us always to give the other fellow a fair chance and a square deal. This was the atmosphere in which I grew up, and it was not academic, I assure you. I have sought all my life to make it a practicing faith. I have insisted in all my business endeavors that Negroes have equal opportunity for jobs and it is one of the great satisfactions of my life that a number of them are moving steadily up the economic escalator in the organizations where I have some control.

"It has been especially shocking to me to be charged with using philanthropy to buy votes. It is almost a hundred years ago that my great-grandparents made of their home in Cleveland a station on the underground railroad to assist fleeing Negro slaves. They did it because they believed with all their hearts in man's right to freedom and to brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. It is that spirit which moved my grandfather and my father in their philanthropies. Any other kind of giving would be anathema to them, and it would be anathema to me.

"The guides that I have had in philanthropies are those

laid down by my forebears: will they advance human welfare, and will they further international, interfaith, and interracial understanding?

“In seeking a mandate from the people of our state to serve them as Governor, I have only one purpose: that is, to serve my fellow men on a broader scale than is possible to any individual. It is my transcendent hope that I can help to unify all our people, upstate and downstate, and bring to fuller fruition the great hope and dream that brought the Pilgrims to these shores and that has made our country a beacon of hope through the centuries for all the people of the world.”

While Rockefeller regards civil rights as a moral and spiritual issue, basically, he has a realistic appreciation of the need to attack the problem in practical terms. He accepts the fact that tolerance cannot be legislated. But he knows that we can, and believes that we should, legislate against intolerance. We unhesitatingly legislate against other forms of immorality and, as he told the 1959 Governor's Conference on Civil Rights, he sees no reason why we should not legislate against the immorality of discrimination:

“The governors of the states represented here have the privilege of leadership in the struggle for the realization of equal opportunity and full dignity for all of our citizens. With that leadership goes great responsibility.

“Equality of opportunity which will allow every individual to develop his talents to the fullest and to make his maximum contribution for the good of all must be our objective. Discrimination and bigotry, if allowed to persist, will not only inhibit our economic development but imperil our position as a nation in the basic struggle for the minds of men. Racial bias and religious intolerance in America may be explained by social scientists, but cannot be excused. Our greatest national assets are the spirit and abilities of all the men, women, and children who comprise these United States.

“We in New York are proud that our state government en-

acted the first law against discrimination in employment. Other states represented here followed soon after. Significant progress has been made in the elimination and prevention of discrimination. This is true in every state where such laws have been enacted.

“Habit dies hard and the history of discrimination left its imprint on the practices of management and labor. But it has now been demonstrated beyond any doubt that there need be no obstacle, no barrier, in American industry to deprive persons of employment opportunity, on any level for which they have the capacity and the ambition. Americans of every creed, color, race, and national origin, we know, can, and will work together.

“And there is real hope for further progress. Constantly increasing numbers of citizens are anxious to rid their communities of the weakening and divisive influences of discrimination and prejudice, to move forward not only in the field of employment but in education, housing, and in public accommodations. We who must lead in our respective states have new and compelling opportunities for that leadership.

“Our experience has shown the importance of the law in the elimination of discrimination. That the law represents the will of our communities is strikingly indicated in the relatively small number of cases of non-compliance that must be referred to the courts for adjudication. There must be laws, federal as well as state, which give expression to the conscience of America and support it with the sanction of constituted authority. . . .

“The concept of equality of opportunity for education, implemented by decisions of our highest court, is being bitterly resisted in some parts of the nation. This is a matter of concern to all of us here. We are a part of this struggle as are all our citizens. Though in a sense we may be said to be in the vanguard, we ourselves still have a long way to go.

“If we fail to move forward toward elimination of discrimination within our own state borders, we too shall fail in our responsibility to the nation. We know there are dark

corners of bias and bigotry in our midst which law, education, and persuasion can and must dispel. Our goal must be full equality of opportunity for all, and this is not beyond our reach.”

The fact that the civil rights struggle has now outgrown our state borders to become a telling international issue—mirroring for all the world to see as it does the degree of our fidelity to the democratic human values we profess—is a matter of particular concern to Rockefeller. We are engaged in a contest, he feels, whose gigantic economic, military, and political dimensions are overshadowed by the competition for the soul of mankind itself. And while the world may be eyeing our scientific and material progress, it is watching even more intently to see if we truly observe in practice the principles of freedom of which we so proudly boast. If for no other reason, then, we should redouble our efforts to eliminate discrimination. We can prove ourselves in the eyes of the world only by our behavior, never by our rhetoric, Nelson says. And the times call for an improvement in our behavior.

In an address to the Order of the Eastern Star, in May, 1958, he said:

“We must insure the extension of civil rights to all Americans. A large segment of our population is outside the mainstream of the nation as a whole, because of discrimination.

“Our country cannot afford this stigma, neither economically or morally.

“The economic waste from failure to make full use of our manpower cripples our productive capacity at a time when we should be making every effort to use it to the fullest.

“The moral erosion is far worse. The conscience of America will never rest easy, and beyond that, our leadership of the forces of freedom will never be fully convincing until we have rooted out discrimination and made full civil rights and equal opportunity for all men a reality in our country.

“We have made substantial progress toward that goal. But

the time has now come, in my judgment, to accelerate our efforts, through a comprehensive program, at every level of our national life, that will highlight the areas where civil rights are not fully realized, and to formulate a constructive program.

“The Supreme Court has spoken, insofar as education is concerned. The law should be respected and enforced, in a prompt and orderly way.

“There are other areas, however, economic, social, political, where civil rights are also denied.

“A positive program is urgently needed. I should like to see it start in localities, with local conferences that would inventory areas of progress and pinpoint areas where local corrective measures are needed.

“From the localities, the program should move to the state level, with statewide conferences, to determine the extent to which full participation in American life is denied to minorities by virtue of state action or inaction. At that level, needed state programs of action and legislation could be formulated.

“Finally, out of these state conferences, should come a national conference, where, as a nation, we could reaffirm our faith in the worth of the individual and his right to full opportunity for self-realization and participation in our national life.

“Such a program, beginning at the grassroots, and finding full expression in a national consensus, would demonstrate to the world, far better than words, that freedom is still the best hope of earth, and that it is for all men, everywhere.”

In an effort to give succinct expression to his total feelings about the problem of human rights in the world today, whether civil or moral, Nelson once remarked, “I can never forget the words of a certain Jewish rabbi, who said, ‘God give us the courage to love.’ That’s it. Never before has the world so desperately needed this courage—the courage to love.”

## 9 . . . On Housing

Rockefeller began taking an active interest in housing in 1947, when Wallace Harrison—a well-known architect who has been an associate in many of the Rockefeller family's business and charitable projects—developed a new method for building poured-concrete houses at high speed and low cost. (With the aid of modern, mobile equipment that eliminates much of the ordinary work of construction, a five-room Harrison house can be erected in about eight hours.) Nelson was enthusiastic about the warm-climate possibilities of the Harrison house and immediately set up a housing corporation, as part of IBEC, to build the houses in critical areas in South America. Later, he helped sponsor a project to build thousands of the houses in Puerto Rico, a project financed in part with

money invested by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Still later, he cooperated with David Dubinsky, of the ILGWU, and Jacob Potofsky, head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, in building similar houses in Israel.

Rockefeller contends that good, low-cost shelter is basic to human progress, on the grounds that substandard housing conditions and housing shortages impede social advance. Without a decent home to serve as the center of an integrated family life it is almost impossible, he feels, for the average person to achieve economic, spiritual, cultural, or intellectual fulfillment.

Consequently, he views with alarm the immense and still unmet housing crisis that has arisen in the United States in recent years. And as Governor of a state where the problem is particularly acute, he has probably given more personal attention to housing than any other single issue confronting his Administration.

With over ten million substandard dwelling units in the country, housing is now a matter of major concern at all levels of government. And because the cost of rehabilitating or replacing them would run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, the question of how best to finance the nation's housing needs has become one of the most controversial political issues of the day. This gives Nelson's views on the matter a special pertinency. He outlined them in a lengthy statement issued during his gubernatorial campaign, in which he said:

"Housing policy is a matter of critical concern to all citizens. . . .

"The basic problem in housing today is the yawning gap between supply and demand. It has been estimated that in 1958 some 85,000 New York families need homes which are not available, and that some 700,000 are living in substandard housing. These families are almost entirely in the low-income and middle-income categories. It is toward these groups that we must shape our major housing policies and programs.

"The housing problem of today is also inextricably bound

up in the problem of our burgeoning metropolitan areas and the fate of the central part of our cities. The post-World War II flight to the suburbs has not always been one made by choice. Thousands of our middle-income families—particularly younger ones—who might have preferred city living, have been forced to the suburbs by the lack of available apartments within the cities at rents they could afford. They have been compelled to place thousands of man-hours of commuter time between the husband's place of work and the home.

"Meanwhile, the cities are suffering a host of crushing conditions which sap their vigor. These consist primarily of a slow deterioration in the physical structures and a failure to keep pace with changing circumstances. Slums have spread like dry rot through many city areas, causing such serious consequences as:

"Substandard dwelling conditions and overcrowding for many families.

"An adverse effect on these families, and an increasing rate of breakdown in family life, with accompanying increases in crime and juvenile delinquency.

"A decline or leveling off of the tax base within the city, creating acute financial problems for city officials.

"Increased costs of fire and police protection and health and welfare services.

"These conditions are sometimes referred to as 'urban blight.'

"In addition, building costs have skyrocketed in the last decade and will probably continue to climb, adding increasing pressures on apartment rentals. Yet studies show that the personal income of New York City families, for example, is such that over seventy-five per cent of them cannot afford rentals of as much as \$100 per month.

"Another fundamental problem is the small part that private enterprise is presently able to take in the construction of urban middle-income housing. Everything possible should be done to encourage private enterprise in this area.

"Still another problem is the deteriorating condition of



some of our public housing today. This situation threatens to discredit a program which fills an essential need in our total housing picture.

“Finally, there is the persistent problem of inadequate overall planning. The need remains for a comprehensive and imaginative approach to housing problems, permitting a rational use of the combined total of community resources, through urban planning. . . .

“As Governor, I would promote a strong housing policy based on the following principles:

“It is a state responsibility to help assure that the people of the state have access to adequate housing at costs they can reasonably afford.

“Rehabilitation must be a major weapon of housing policy; new construction cannot meet the full need.

“The state should never displace either local initiative or private enterprise in the field of housing. A cornerstone of our housing policy should be encouragement and incentive both to localities and to private enterprise.

“Large amounts of private capital must be put to work in the production of middle-income housing.

“Public housing programs are not an end in themselves, but are essential to meet the needs of our lowest income families.

“On the basis of these principles, I have evolved a nine-point housing program [and] I am convinced that the balanced program I am presenting would make a major impact on our housing conditions.

“1. Leadership in urban planning. It is crucial that we go about the business of urban planning in a more intensive and comprehensive way. While planning is essentially a local function and the state should not violate the principle of home rule in this area, our municipalities should be given as much assistance as possible from the state level. . . .

“Good urban planning should take into consideration the importance of balanced neighborhoods. It is highly desirable that housing for a single income level should not be concen-

trated in particular areas or segregated from housing for other income groups. Careful selection of sites for public housing is a key factor in achieving diversification. Furthermore, there should be more opportunities for people to live closer to where they work.

"2. Acceleration of urban renewal programs. The progress of municipal urban renewal programs has been altogether too slow. I believe that the state can do much to accelerate these programs.

"This can be achieved, first, by increased technical assistance and advice from the state in connection with the complex problems of surveying and planning, coordination of governmental programs, tenant relocation, and the like. The second avenue of state assistance is financial. . . . I strongly support [permitting] the state to lend money to municipalities to help pay the non-federal portion of urban renewal costs. . . .

"I propose, further, that truly middle-income housing should be an integral part of the planning of any new construction on cleared urban renewal sites.

"3. Increased private sponsorship of middle-income housing. While private builders have continued to produce dwellings designed to accommodate families with above average incomes, moderately priced homes and apartments with moderate rentals are rapidly disappearing from the market. The dilemma of the middle-income families is critical.

"Private builders, without some public aid, cannot produce accommodations which these families can afford. However, a minimum of public aid will enable private enterprise to do the job.

"The [state's] Limited Profit Housing Program permits private sponsors to borrow on mortgage up to ninety per cent of the capital required for middle-income projects, at low interest rates. I would seek to strengthen and improve this program, to give it even greater effectiveness.

"4. Channeling of private capital into middle-income housing. The full need for more housing at modest rentals is

measured in billions of dollars rather than in millions. The state cannot assume a debt burden of the magnitude necessary to meet our housing deficit through direct state loans to project sponsors.

“The only answer is to devise a realistic way of channeling additional *private* capital into middle-income housing. This should be preceded by a careful analysis of the reasons more private capital has not been invested to date.

“The capital resources are ample. I am convinced that, with proper incentives, a large amount of private capital would be invested in such housing.

“There are various avenues which should be explored to promote this flow of private capital. One approach would be state guaranties of private mortgage loans. . . . To explore this and other possible approaches, I would seek the advice of financial and housing experts and present a practical program to the Legislature. A way of putting private capital to work for middle-income housing must be found.

“5. Encouragement for construction of more middle-income non-profit cooperative housing. Home ownership is a fundamental urge of most Americans. The desire to own or share in the ownership of a dwelling has been and should continue to be encouraged by governmental policy. . . .

“In an urban area, where apartment dwelling is essential, home ownership can be achieved only through joint ownership of the building, commonly called ‘cooperative’ ownership. The housing cooperative offers numerous advantages to the tenant-owners, including the security of home ownership, greater stability in occupancy, lower maintenance costs, and certain income tax advantages. This type of ownership has become increasingly popular in recent years. Among the sponsors of successful cooperative projects have been unions, guilds, fraternal organizations and other non-profit groups. When so sponsored on a non-profit basis, cooperative ownership offers the additional advantages of lower initial costs, with correspondingly lower down payments and carrying charges per room.

"I propose that the state government undertake more active measures in promoting non-profit cooperative housing designed for the middle-income family, with a reasonable down payment and modest carrying charges. I suggest three methods of achieving this:

"A. A basic step would be the channeling of private capital into the construction of such housing, through the methods discussed in my fourth proposal.

"B. I propose the creation of a special unit within the state Division of Housing devoted solely to the promotion of non-profit cooperative housing. The preliminary planning and organizational steps, the legal and financial technicalities, the maximum utilization of available government aids—these are all matters as to which the technical assistance of skilled experts can be of incalculable value to a sponsoring group.

"C. I propose the consideration of legislation authorizing a state revolving fund for advances to non-profit sponsoring groups during the preliminary stages to cover such costs as land acquisition and project planning. The amount required for such a fund would be small in relation to the substantial effect it could have.

"6. Continued support for public housing. It has been estimated that at least 800,000 families in New York have incomes which are insufficient to meet their basic needs in terms of food, clothing, and medical treatment. We must face the fact that some form of subsidized public housing is essential for these families, since private enterprise obviously cannot meet this need. Public housing, if properly administered, can be a continuing asset, without the kind of deterioration that has characterized a small percentage of projects.

"Public housing need not create economic segregation. Middle-income housing can and should be built on sites cleared of slums. The result will be better and more balanced neighborhoods. Where state funds are used for public housing, I shall assure that such planning is carried out.

"7. More housing for older persons. A major focus of

housing policy in the next decade must be the older individual and the older couple. They need accommodations of which the design, location, and operating costs are adapted to their specific situation. But these accommodations should be integrated with the community and not wholly removed from persons of other age groups. Special attention must be given to proximity to health facilities. . . . I now propose that the state Division of Housing develop an extensive program within a central unit to provide technical assistance to all communities, sponsoring groups, lenders, and builders interested in housing for older persons. This unit should serve as a clearinghouse of information as to planning, design, and costs for such housing.

"8. Prevention of slums, rehabilitation. As stated earlier, there are more than 700,000 substandard dwelling units in New York State. It would be as impossible as it is unnecessary to replace them all with new construction. Sound housing policy, therefore, requires an increasing emphasis on rehabilitative techniques which serve the double purpose of improving existing substandard housing and preventing deterioration of good housing in the neighborhood.

"I pledge an intensive effort to devise and promote, through all the available resources of the state, programs of both slum prevention and rehabilitation of run-down neighborhoods. These programs should not be restricted to areas covered by an urban renewal plan. . . .

"9. Continuation of rent control. Where continued housing shortages persist, and as long as they persist, the continuation of rent control is imperative. I pledge my support for continuation of rent control, and for vigorous and fair administration of the Law. I shall also propose amendments to close any and all loopholes that have been found to exist in the present law.

"The program I have presented is not all-inclusive. There are many more measures which can and should be taken. For example, every encouragement should be given to the construction industry, which helps to provide so many jobs in this state. We should help the construction industry in reducing

the costs of building good housing and in cutting the red tape so often involved in dealing with governmental agencies.

“Our overall housing needs are great and pressing. . . . I would, as Governor, do everything in my power to provide the opportunity for a good home at reasonable cost for every individual and family in this State, irrespective of race, creed, color, or ancestry.”

The uncommon stress placed on middle-income housing in Rockefeller's program reflects his feeling that while much has been done to provide public low-cost housing, too little has been done to meet the needs of the middle-income group of our population, with the result that they are being pushed out of the cities by a lack of housing within their means. One of his first acts as Governor was to appoint a “Task Force on Middle-Income Housing” to study this particular problem.

He was not content, however, to let the matter rest with his task force. He himself held a series of meetings with the representatives of savings banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and other institutions with large sums available for investment, to persuade them that since government could not possibly assume debts of the magnitude necessary to meet our total housing deficit, it was up to them to use their investment funds to finance middle-income housing.

Through a combination of his own efforts and the work of his task force a feasible plan for enticing private funds into public works was developed. And when Rockefeller made his first televised report on housing to the people of his state, the emphasis was again on middle-income housing and what he has called “a truly revolutionary program” for building it:

“One of the fields of major concern to this administration is the protection of the home—adequate housing at reasonable rents.

“I made a series of recommendations to the Legislature

for immediate and positive action. In solving the housing problem, three basic factors are involved. All three were dealt with in this session of the Legislature. First, rent control; second, slum clearance; and third, middle-income housing.

“Let’s start with rent control. As I promised, rent control laws were strengthened and extended for a two-year period to protect hundreds of thousands of families in our cities from exploitation. . . . But rent control is not an end in itself. The true end is adequate housing.

“The Legislature also took steps which have to do with the places in which we live. They tackled the problem of state participation and leadership in urban renewal and slum clearance. The action taken in this session permits the state, for the first time, to give active leadership in solving the housing problem in cooperation with the municipalities throughout the state—and to help them bear their share of the cost of federally aided urban renewal projects.

“Now let’s turn to the third phase of the program. It relates to the problem of middle-income housing. . . . If you live in New York, or Binghamton, or Syracuse, and are trying to find a place to live in a price range from seventeen dollars to thirty dollars per month per room, you know exactly what I am talking about.

“It is increasingly difficult for office workers and factory workers to find suitable housing in our metropolitan centers. The middle-income group is excluded from subsidized governmental low-cost housing because it earns too much to qualify, and yet it can’t afford the high rentals in the only private housing being built in our cities today. Except for the outstanding efforts in cooperative housing undertaken by some of our unions and fraternal organizations, very little has been done in this field. Middle-income families are becoming the forgotten people in housing.

“So, to facilitate and encourage participation by private capital and of cooperative groups in the middle-income housing field, the Legislature authorized a truly unusual program. Here is how it will work. . . .

“First, it provides for the establishment of a limited profit housing mortgage corporation. This corporation will bring together money from savings banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies with the money from the state bond issue. The private groups will supply \$200 million of private funds, and this will be augmented by the \$100 million of public funds already authorized by the voters. This combined \$300 million will make possible the construction of 21,000 new housing units in the \$17 to \$30 per room range. The Legislature authorized the state to service these mortgage loans in order to reduce the administrative costs.

“Secondly, the program contemplates the continuation by the municipalities of temporary tax relief as a further encouragement of middle-income housing projects.

“Thirdly, the new legislation provides for the use of the state’s new urban renewal program to help in lowering the cost of land for middle-income housing projects.

“Fourthly, the program calls for the organization in the cities throughout the state of local citizens’ committees to provide the local middle-income housing project leadership.

“Fifth, the new legislation affords the rights of private or cooperative sponsors of these middle-income housing projects to pay off the mortgage after 15 years and buy full ownership of the project. Not only will this release the State’s funds involved, but the project would immediately begin to pay the full local real estate taxes.

“These projects will be self-liquidating. Thus we have a formula that will bring together public and private funds in a common effort, that will result in projects that pay for themselves, that will cost the taxpayers little or nothing and that should produce 21,000 new homes for middle-income families.

“It provides a pattern for the future which may have major significance in solving one of our most urgent city problems.”

Another element of the housing picture to which the Governor gave his attention was the matter of discrimination.



Prior to his administration, New York had been the first state in the nation to outlaw bias in public housing. But as he made clear in a message to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, delivered only a month after his inauguration, Rockefeller was in some doubt that all had been done that could be done, and he was hoping to find ways to improve his state's housing laws:

"It is a privilege to be able to welcome the Commission on Civil Rights to New York for this public hearing on housing.

"When we speak of housing we are talking about the American home, and the home is the heart of any good society. So your subject is vital to the life of this nation. . . .

"In the North, employment and housing are the cutting edges of the problem of discrimination. The denial of jobs or of homes because of color, race, religion, or national origin is a tragedy not only for the individuals involved but for our whole society.

"In 1945, New York State became the first state to outlaw discrimination in employment. In recent years New York State has also pioneered the outlawing of discrimination in public housing and in public-assisted private housing. Last April, an ordinance went into effect in New York City prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or leasing of multiple-dwelling private housing accommodations. We have an official State Commission Against Discrimination and a Civil Rights Bureau in the Attorney General's office to carry out these state laws, and New York City has its own educational and enforcement agency, the Commission on Inter-group Relations, for its far-reaching new law. . . .

"There are of course complex questions involved here, and all the answers will not be found in New York, for our situation necessarily differs in some respects from that of other regions. But our laws and agencies may be models from which you and other areas may learn something. . . . I understand that in this hearing you will be considering the effectiveness

of these laws and agencies of ours dealing with discrimination in housing. We welcome this inquiry and hope to learn from whatever shortcomings you find here. We know that we have much to learn, much to improve.”

At the very moment his message was being delivered to the Commission, a bill to prohibit discrimination for race, color, religion, or national origin in multiple-dwelling *private* housing (to complement the law against bias in *public* housing already enacted) was pending before the New York State Legislature. In view of his expressed desire to improve and strengthen his state's housing laws, many were startled and dismayed when Rockefeller let the bill die in committee. When he said he wanted to see first how the recently enacted New York City law on anti-discrimination in private housing was working, there was still considerable headshaking.

Then, in July, 1959, in a speech to the fiftieth anniversary convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he announced that he would recommend to the 1960 Legislature a statewide law against bias in multiple-dwelling private housing. “The New York City law in this field has worked well,” he said, “and the state should now adopt its principles. . . . I believe every American should be able to live where his heart desires and his means permit.”

New York, which became in 1950 the first state to prohibit discrimination in public housing will, it appears, in 1960 join Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Oregon, and become the fifth state to extend the ban to private housing.

## 10...On Organized Crime

Rockefeller was quick to strengthen the machinery of law enforcement in New York. And it was the crime syndicate itself that persuaded him to “move with alacrity,” as he told the state Legislature. By its own arrogance and violence just prior to his election, organized crime shocked and angered him and goaded him into making something of a crusade out of what otherwise might have been only the standard overhaul any new administration gives its police agencies.

In a televised campaign speech in October, 1958, he discussed the gang actions that had angered him:

“Organized crime is in business in our state. You’ve seen the proof: newspaperman Victor Riesel, who bravely spoke

up against crime, blinded by acid thrown in his face while walking in the street; gambler Frank Costello, fired at and wounded in the public streets, right in the doorway of his apartment; Albert Anastasia, the boss man of Murder, Inc., assassinated by gangsters as he sat in a midtown Manhattan barber chair.

“And, with Anastasia dead, it was necessary for organized crime to get together to make a new split-up of territory. Less than three weeks later, sixty-five underworld leaders converged on a little upstate community called Apalachin, for a formal business meeting. These overlords of crime came in expensive cars from twelve states, from Cuba, from upstate and downstate. They came from the old Capone mob, from Detroit’s Purple Gang, from Murder, Inc., from the Dragna Gang on the West Coast, from gambling and vice empires in Florida, Cleveland, New Orleans, and elsewhere. It was the largest convention of hoodlums in history. The ‘host’ at this meeting had been twice arrested for murder. The ‘guests’ had a total record of 153 arrests and 74 convictions for crimes ranging from rape to murder, and from narcotics peddling to extortion.

“No single district attorney can possibly cope with organized crime on this scale. Criminals like these don’t do business on a county scale alone, and district attorneys can’t cross county lines to chase them. Only one state-wide officer has the power to appear before a grand jury in every county and investigate this kind of gangsterism—the Attorney General.

“Unfortunately, [gangsters] find this a good climate in which to do business. And don’t forget, when waterfront racketeers and shakedown experts drive New York’s great sea-port trade to other ports, they hurt everybody in the state. They cut down job opportunities all over the state. They take money out of everybody’s pocket. Racketeers are victimizing thousands of people each year in cities all over New York. Organized crime is selling dope to teenagers. In our state today, organized peddlers of pornographic pictures prey upon children in hundreds of localities—and count yearly profits in

the millions of dollars. All over our state today, decent people—men as well as women—now think twice before they walk alone at night in the public parks and even on their own sidewalks, for fear of being mugged or attacked. . . .

“These gangsters are organized. They mean business. And the only way to lick them is to organize and mobilize the forces of decency and go out and fight them—which I intend to do.”

At the conclusion of his Administration’s first legislative session, six months later, he returned to television to report to his constituents on his progress in his battle against crime. In his remarks, incidentally, he failed to mention that the law creating a Municipal Police Training Council was the first of its kind, and that through it New York became the first state to establish uniform training standards for its police:

“Let me begin by discussing the action taken at the last session of the Legislature which will make possible the stepping up of the war on organized crime. I have said many times how deeply shocked I was—and I know you were—by the appalling spectacle of the Apalachin convention, when the masters of national crime made a mockery of law enforcement in our state. The heads of gangland descended on a quiet little country town and dared to hold a convention which told the world that our state was the home of a nationwide crime syndicate.

“Organized crime nowadays no longer operates just as a racketeering or illicit business. It is with us in the guise of legitimate business, controlled by illegal means—ill-gained money, illicit power and shrewd violation of our laws.

“These gangland chiefs, who gathered together so boldly at Apalachin, pass as respectable citizens. They live lives of luxury and ease and they do it by the subtle corruption of our communities—our children, our business, our whole society.

“In March I sent a message to the Legislature which proposed measures to give the state more effective weapons

to intensify the fight on crime and criminals. I am glad to report to you that all my recommendations were adopted into law. They begin with the foundation of our law enforcement system—with the training of our law enforcement officers.

“There are over 40,000 local police officers in the state. We rely on these men for the basic protection of our lives and property. Their training is of first importance, and so one of the new laws just passed creates a new Municipal Police Training Council made up of state and local law enforcement officials. The state will set minimum standards for basic police training worked out by this Council. They will have to be met by everyone seeking permanent appointment to a local police force.

“Second, under these new laws it will be a crime for a person served by a subpoena by the state Crime Commission to refuse to appear for questioning without reasonable cause.

“Third, it will now be a felony, rather than a misdemeanor, to conspire to commit serious crimes such as murder, kidnapping, arson, and extortion. This is aimed at reaching top-level operators of organized crime.

“Fourth, the law now makes it a more serious crime, with heavier penalties, to bribe a labor representative.

“Fifth, any contractor who refuses to answer a grand jury’s questions about his contract with the state or a locality will, in the future, be barred from any further public contracts for five years.

“In addition, the Criminal Intelligence unit of the state police was strengthened by doubling the number of its men. This is the state’s ‘Little F.B.I.’ as you know. And an improved method of reporting on crime has been introduced to promote better law enforcement.

“Finally, the new laws allow more time to enforcement agencies to prosecute tax evaders. This is an important means of detecting and catching criminals.

“In other words, these new measures give us more effective weapons with which to fight organized crime.”

In the special message on crime he sent the state Legislature, the message inspiring the new laws he describes, Rockefeller also spoke of an underlying problem in law enforcement that defies legislation; the problem of achieving full coordination among all of the units of government involved, whether local, state, or national.

"All too often," he said, "there is an inadequate exchange of vital information, a lack of coordination on major policy and strategy, and a failure fully to utilize manpower and resources on specific problems in specific areas.

"To help overcome these obstacles to improved law enforcement, I am asking the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, the Attorney General of the State, the Temporary State Commission of Investigation, local district attorneys, the Police Commissioner of New York City, the State Police, and sheriffs and local police officials to designate representatives to join with me in periodic meetings to advise on the coordination of our law enforcement efforts. The purpose of this working group would be to help identify areas in which cooperation among the various units of government can be increased and to make specific recommendations for improvement."

Rockefeller's plan for bringing together enforcement officials from all levels of government to work out methods of improving police efficiency was highly unusual and, possibly, unique, according to the conferees who attended the group's first meeting in July, 1959. The agenda of that meeting included such topics as:

How can large, well-staffed, and well-equipped district attorneys' offices be of greater assistance to smaller offices?

How can criminal information be more effectively collected, disseminated, and utilized?

How can the collection and correlation of criminal statistics be improved?

How can state agencies be of greater assistance in the narcotics problem?

How can the office of governor's counsel be more effective in developing specific legislation relating to law-enforcement problems?

No solutions to any of the questions were reached in this first, general meeting. But subcommittees were set up to pursue individual questions at future working sessions, and Rockefeller was optimistic. He felt something worthwhile would grow out of his plan. "The division of responsibility among national, state, and local authorities," he said, "can be made to function effectively only if we have this kind of close harmony among all of the officials concerned with the administration of justice."



## 11...On National Security and Defense

In 1952–53, when Rockefeller was Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Reorganization, he also served in a secondary capacity as head of the Committee's Commission to Study the Organization of the Department of Defense. The Commission eventually submitted a Defense Department reorganization plan to Congress. A few of its recommendations were put into practice, most were ignored.

When Rockefeller returned to private life in 1956, he had an uneasy feeling that much still remained to be done to put our military house in order. And when he initiated the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's Special Studies Project, the first study embarked on was, significantly, a survey of our defense establish-

ment. As Chairman of the Project's overall panel of experts, he was himself deeply involved in one of the most searching studies ever made of our national defense structure.

Seven months before the now famous Rockefeller report on the problem of U.S. Defense was published, Nelson gave the public a sampling of its contents. In May, 1957, he spoke at the annual meeting of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. His topic was economy in government. And the section of his speech devoted to a discussion of the costly, wasteful, and inefficient set up of the Defense Department was actually a brief summary of the forthcoming *Report*. He said:

"A major area of increase [in the Federal budget] has been in our national security program. High and sustained expenditures for national security are most difficult to accept. It is hard for us as a people to become accustomed to prolonged international tensions and to the constant danger of some overt threat to peace. Our tradition is to rally to a national emergency with an all-out effort and then to revert to a normal peaceful existence.

"Unfortunately, this has now become impossible. The Communist effort to subvert and overthrow the democratic system is unrelenting. . . . The danger to our national security is all the greater because the Soviets combine an implacably hostile ideology with an increasingly high order of technical skill. They have mastered the revolutionary advances in science and in some fields which may threaten our very survival, such as that of intercontinental missiles, they may even be ahead of us.

"To relax our vigilance is to court disaster. But the cost of national security comes high primarily because of the technological revolution through which we are living. In the past, a weapons system would be good for a generation at least. But many of today's weapons become obsolescent almost as soon as they reach combat units.

"We must therefore bear the cost of weapons for two mil-

itary programs concurrently. One is based on existing weapons to protect ourselves against current dangers. The other is for weapons in production and being developed for defense three to ten years ahead. To weaken either program would invite aggression either now or in the near future. And the lead in the technological race once lost is almost impossible to regain.

“To cut military and defense expenditures before we have assured ourselves of success in the fields of weapons technology and overall defense would be suicidal. In fact, to take care of realistic minimum needs in these areas will involve larger, not smaller appropriations—much as we deplore the necessity. But we can be deeply grateful that our vigorous and growing economy gives us the capacity to do so.

“This is not to say that economies in the field of national security are not possible. . . . A promising area for long-range economies is that of reorganizations in our military establishment. The current assignment of roles and missions was established when technology was much more elementary than now. It was based essentially on means of transportation: the Army was responsible for everything that moved on land, the Navy was responsible for the oceans, and the Air Force for control of the skies.

“But the extraordinary complexity and destructiveness of modern weapons and the increasing range of delivery capability are tending to make this traditional division of functions meaningless. It is difficult to know whether a ballistic missile should go to the Air Force because it flies through the air, or to the Army because it is fired like an artillery projectile, or to the Navy, which has the flexibility of movable bases. As a result, each new technological invention—and they succeed each other at an unbelievable rate—leads to an endless wrangle about which service should control it. Therefore, too, each service is usually pressing the development of new weapons in all categories without sufficient regard for the program of other services, because the service which gets there first hopes to

control the weapon and the budgetary allocation that goes with its production and use.

“Now, some competition in weapons development is vital, since superior quality of weapons is basic to our survival. However, much of the present competition is unnecessary and costly both in terms of duplication and of our total national security. With the scarcity of top-flight scientists, why should three groups be working on the same problem of developing guided missiles in all their stages? The basic problem is a lack of overall strategic plans and clearly defined and designated roles for the three services to carry out the plans.

“A solution to this problem of duplication is made difficult by the organization for developing our strategic plans. The recommendations for the assignment of roles and missions comes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of a Chairman and the Chiefs of the Army, Air Force, and Navy. Thus, the Joint Chiefs reflect the same differences which produced the interservice disputes in the first place. Chiefs of services, responsible for the morale of their organization, are asked to adjudicate disputes and to develop doctrine which may involve the very existence of their service. Interservice rivalry and wasteful duplication are inherent in the current assignment of missions and in the organization of the Defense Department.

“A system must be set up where clear decisions can be made from an overall national point of view. Possible solutions to the problem might be to have either a military staff for the Defense Department separate from the three service staffs, and reporting directly to the Secretary and the President, or to give the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff much greater power and a staff independent of the three services. Today, the Secretary of Defense has inadequate control over expenditures because he has no way of determining an overall strategic plan and of assigning an integrated program of roles and missions to the three services, except on the basis of the rec-

ommendations which the three services give him through the Joint Chiefs. And the Joint Chiefs, however hard each one of them may try as an individual, do not stand above the interservice rivalry; on the contrary, Defense Department organization makes them an expression of it.

“This is a major problem area and it must be faced realistically. . . . There must be a reorganization in the Defense Department staff setup which will permit overall strategic planning and determination of weapons use, roles, and missions for the three services exclusively on a national interest basis.”

The study from which Rockefeller had drawn the substance of his comments was equally blunt and much more detailed in its analysis of the weaknesses of the Defense Department. Consequently, when the Rockefeller report on the problems of U.S. Defense was published in January, 1958, it made headlines from coast to coast. In the midst of the public debate attending its release, Nelson was asked to appear before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate’s Committee on Armed Services. The Subcommittee’s Chairman, Lyndon Johnson, said he was eager to have Nelson “discuss with us the recommendations of his group and the reasons why those recommendations have been made.”

In a prepared statement, Rockefeller told the Committee:

“The Rockefeller Brothers Fund’s Special Studies Project was organized to explore the problems and opportunities with which the United States will be faced in the next ten to fifteen years. . . . We organized a bipartisan panel of thirty members representing a cross-section of American life. We then set up subpanels to concentrate on special areas.

“The first study to be issued was the one on the military aspects of our national security. . . . This report was prepared by a subpanel of twenty members and reviewed at various stages by the overall panel, which also went over the final

draft in full committee. Thus, the conclusions represent a consensus of the thinking of some fifty people who strongly urge the implementation of its recommendations.

"I should like to give the highlights of this consensus. It represents the collective judgment and deep convictions of this group of citizens who feel that it is essential that major steps be taken now to insure survival.

"In the words of the report: 'Power alone will not supply an answer to the challenge of the future. It does offer the prospect that there will be a future.'

"Our goal is a world under law; our aspiration is an international community from which the threat of war has been removed. But we will not realize these aims unless we are prepared to make the effort required to survive.

"It is our judgment that all is not well with present United States security policies and operations. The overall United States strategic concept lags behind developments in technology and in the world political situation. In major respects, defense organization is unrelated to critically important military missions.

"The roles and missions assigned to the individual military services have become competitive, rather than complementary, because they are out of accord with both weapons technology and the principal military threats to our national safety.

"The present organization and responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs of Staff preclude the development of a comprehensive and coherent strategic doctrine for the United States.

"The Secretary of Defense is so burdened with the negative task of trying to arbitrate and control interservice disputes that he cannot play his full part in the initiation and development of high military policy.

"Systems of budgets, appropriations, and financial management are out of gear with the rapidly accelerating flow of military developments.

"The United States system of alliances must be adapted to the constantly changing strategic requirements.

"The United States is rapidly losing its lead in the race of military technology.

"With respect to civil defense, the main feature to note is that it is long overdue. It does not make sense for the free world to engage in a major military effort without at the same time protecting its most important resource: its civilian population.

"We believe that the security of the United States transcends normal budgetary considerations and that the national economy can afford the necessary measures.

"We believe that the United States lag in missiles and space machines, however worrisome, is a symptom and not a cause. It reflects our national complacency over the past dozen years. It is vitally important to the United States to calculate its security requirements on an integrated and long-range basis, and set about correcting all deficiencies.

"This report concludes that we can afford what has to be done to assure our security; and indeed that we cannot afford less. . . .

"Ever since World War II, the United States has suffered from a tendency to underestimate the military technology of the U.S.S.R. In the military field the technical capability of the U.S.S.R. is increasing at a pace obviously faster than that of the United States. If not reversed, this trend alone will place the free world in dire jeopardy. Unless present trends are reversed, the world balance of power will shift in favor of the Soviet Bloc. If that should happen, we are not likely to be given another chance to remedy our failings. However, it is emphatically not too late if we are prepared to make the required big effort now and in the years ahead.

"The growing complexity of modern technology, the foreseeable rise in the cost of maintaining weapons systems, and the interdependence of foreign policy and military capability make it clear that our future security, which is to say our

survival as a nation, will require a far more efficient system for military planning and military decisions.

“Starting immediately, defense expenditures must be increased substantially over the next few years. Testimony indicates that current deficiencies in our strategic posture require additional expenditures each year of approximately three billion for the next several years.

“This does not include necessary increased appropriations for mutual assistance and for civil defense. Because we must maintain our present forces as we go into production on new weapons, such as missiles, the cost of military programs will continue to rise until at least 1965.

“The price of survival then is not low. This panel is convinced, however, that increases in defense expenditures are essential and fully justified, provided that the greater expenditure is coupled with increased efficiency. We can afford to survive. . . .

“The basic problem of American strategy is the ability to make effective choices. This will depend on the courage and sense of purpose of our leadership, the effectiveness of the organization of our Government, and on the spirit of our people.

“When the security of the United States and of the free world is at stake, costs cannot be the basic consideration. The cold war cannot be won and a ‘hot’ war cannot be avoided without a major effort. This is clearly not a time for complacency; it is just as clearly not time for hysteria.

“What is required throughout the country is an attitude of sustained and informed determination.”

After Rockefeller finished reading his prepared statement, the Committee questioned him for three hours on the Report’s specific suggestions for reorganizing the Defense Department. The Committee was particularly interested in the five recommendations which bore on unification, as they came closest to the heart of the matter. These urged:



That the military departments (Army, Navy, and Air Force) be removed from the channels of operational command, and that their responsibility be restricted to providing support for recruitment, training, research, procurement, and supply.

That all operational military forces be organized into unified commands to perform the missions called for by our strategic requirements.

That the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who would be the heads of their services, be named Principal Military Advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the President.

That the staff of the Joint Chiefs should not serve as "ambassadors" from the services but be organized on a unified basis and placed under control of the chairman.

That all officers above the rank of brigadier general or equivalent receive their promotions from the Department of Defense and become officers not of a service but of the armed forces of the United States. ("It is vital that we develop a group of top officers who throughout their careers have been encouraged to transcend the thinking of any one service.")

Near the end of Rockefeller's interrogation, Senator Francis Case called his attention to Section 202, Subparagraph (c) of the National Security Act of 1947, which reads, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the combat functions assigned to the military services . . . shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated." Did he think that portion of the law needed amendment, the Senator asked? He did. Did he regard its amendment as basic to the problem they were discussing? "Absolutely basic," Nelson replied.

When Rockefeller had finished testifying, Senator Johnson said, with what proved to be premature optimism, "We think you have made a substantial contribution in informing our country, and we think an informed country will be an aroused country, and that under our processes we can now get effective action."

Action did seem in the making. In mid-1958, President

Eisenhower announced his intention to reorganize the Defense Department, and, although his plan did not mention the Rockefeller report by name, it could hardly have been pure coincidence that it incorporated most of the Report's recommendations.

Then action ground to a halt. The Pentagon is not an easily breached fortress, and the President's plan hardly made a dent in its legally buttressed walls. As a result, the situation remains relatively unchanged. In mid-1959, the Mahon Committee of the House of Representatives complained that interservice strife was still damaging the defense program, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were still not providing "adequate leadership and advice." Senator Clair Engle, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, raised his voice in protest in August, 1959. He made a speech advocating the abolishment of the existing structure of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and proposed, instead, that the services be reorganized on the basis of roles and missions. And in September, the House Committee on Government Operations joined the ranks of Congressional grumblers and called for a merger of the Army and Air Force, on the same old grounds that, "Until the Air Force and Army join hands in a single service effort, the costs of defense will mount ever higher, duplication and waste will grow, and the nation will be exposed to the vitiating effects of interservice rivalries and wars for many years to come."

These indications that Congress is growing anxious and restive are fortunate for the country, Rockefeller feels, for in the past Congress has usually resisted attempts to legislate military unification. And Nelson is convinced that only laws will work, and that all unification plans, as such, are futile. "Only Congress can correct our military organization," he said in a 1957 speech. "And until it does, there will continue to be competition and duplication and confusion between the three military services that will cost increasing billions in unnecessary defense expenditures and which could conceivably be catastrophic in case of emergency."

## 12...“And in conclusion...”

*[From the telecast speech with which Rockefeller brought to a close his campaign for the Governorship of New York State, November 3, 1958.]*

“I would add only one more thought. We live in a moment in history that urgently demands the best we can give.

“The tremendous revolution set in motion by science has sped the pace of industrial and social change. The speed of these changes is breathtaking. The problems they bring must be understood, and the great new forces of this age of science must be controlled and guided as they emerge and made into positive forces for good, not forces rampaging out of control.

“These are the problems facing all the world’s people.

“But to solve them we first have to resolve a basic conflict that goes far deeper than any of those between military, economic, or diplomatic forces. It is a conflict between those on the one hand who believe in the freedom of opportunity for the individual everywhere to develop his own capacities to the fullest—spiritual, intellectual, and intuitive—and those on the other hand who believe in the individual as a cog in a machine, so disciplined and so conditioned that he loses all power of independent thought and even the capacity for religious experience.

“This country is today the hope of those throughout the world who cherish freedom and peace.

“We must rededicate ourselves to strengthening the vitality of freedom and the equality of opportunity for all of our people.

“I hope to serve this principle. I hope to work with you toward the fulfillment of the great promise of America—the promise that Thomas Wolfe put in these words: ‘To every man, regardless of his birth, his chance, his shining, golden opportunity. To every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This, seeker, is the promise of America.’”



## **III...PROGNOSIS**



## Prognosis

A governor of New York has been the presidential candidate of one or the other major parties in 13 of the 23 elections since the Civil War. Governor Rockefeller may well become the state's fourteenth candidate for the office.

It is true that as this is being written the Governor says he has no present presidential ambitions and is interested only in his gubernatorial role. This is the classic political position, the standard statement issued by presidential candidates who feel the time is not yet ripe for them to declare themselves. An escape clause is always included in such pronouncements. In the Rockefeller statement the word "present" provides such an obvious avenue of escape that it amuses even the Governor. A reporter asked him this past summer why he always said it



was his "present intention" to serve his full four-year term as governor. Rockefeller grinned and said, "It's just because I'm honest."

Although he remains non-committal in the classic tradition, there is little doubt that he will seek the nomination at the G.O.P. National Convention in July *if* the political omens and portents of the day offer him the slightest encouragement. Two foreseeable developments could bring the Rockefeller boom to an abrupt halt. Nelson is a political realist and would certainly bow to the inevitable if Vice-President Nixon succeeded to the presidency as the result of the total disability or death of President Eisenhower, or if the President gave Mr. Nixon his personal endorsement. But if the situation remains competitive and it is possible for Rockefeller to run without directly opposing the President or the party's will, most politicians are convinced he will make a strong bid for the nomination.

Those who favor his candidacy regard him as the only Republican in sight who stands a chance of defeating the Democrats' nominee, whoever he may be. They believe that as long as the G.O.P. remains numerically inferior to the Democratic party and continues to bear the conservative label, its *only* hope of winning a presidential campaign is to put forward as a candidate a man of such broad appeal that he can detach voters from the Democrats, the liberal coalition, the independents, and the country's multiple minority groups. Rockefeller supporters feel that he has shown, dramatically and convincingly, that his appeal transcends party lines. With Nixon as a candidate, they argue, the party could only be sure of the support of the old-line Republicans, the ward vote, and a few special interest groups.

The Rockefeller presidential boom at the moment draws its chief inspiration from his spectacular 1958 victory over Harriman. His more objective supporters feel that, in addition, he must establish an outstanding record as an administrator, executive and party leader before he can risk showing

an avowed interest in obtaining the nomination. And they are sure he will have finished building such a record by the time the January–March, 1960, session of the New York State Legislature comes to a close.

They base their assurance on his accomplishments during his first nine months in office. In terms of his campaign pledges, in his first session with the Legislature he put through all of his major programs except two. The exceptions were a program to increase health insurance coverage and a measure to make pension rights transferable, both still in the planning stage.

When he entered office he was faced with the inevitable results of spending without taxing and his first act was to put through an unpopular tax increase program; evidence of his orthodox Republican belief in a balanced budget and a pay-as-you-go fiscal policy. He showed concern for private enterprise by enacting legislation that gave tax relief to railroads and encouraged the private development of atomic energy within the state. In the social welfare area he was less orthodox. He continued rent controls and set up a novel state-private-enterprise partnership corporation for financing middle-income housing. He increased state aid in education, strengthened New York's civil rights and law enforcement agencies, and broadened its public health program. The unemployment insurance law was revised in order to widen its coverage, and higher benefits were written into other forms of social insurance. And in putting through the first state law ever enacted to safeguard union funds, Rockefeller anticipated similar federal action by a full six months.

He handled the first suggestion of scandal in his administration firmly and adroitly. George P. Monaghan, the state Harness Racing Commissioner inherited by the Governor, was charged with accepting free meals, drinks and other even more expensive favors from the harness tracks under his supervision. The state law did not give Rockefeller authority to fire him, and the Commissioner refused to resign. The Governor's answer

was to call a special one-day session of the Legislature to pass a bill which legislated the Commissioner out of office. At the same time, Rockefeller issued an executive order barring all state officials from accepting even so much as a pass to a prize fight, although previous administrations had allowed public officials to accept such minor favors as a matter of course.

In assessing the early months of his administration the *New York Times* said, "Mr. Rockefeller's political popularity still suffers from the effects of his tax program. But he is widely regarded as a man of decision and political courage, sincerely devoted to the cause of good government and maintaining the dignity of the individual."

If the Governor can continue to add to his administrative stature in the months immediately preceding the Republican National Convention in July, his supporters think he will have a good chance of scoring an upset victory over Nixon. They know the Vice-President has a firm grip on the G.O.P.'s party organization and can count on the support of most of the county leaders. But they also know that Robert Taft had full control of the "Old Guard" in 1952—and lost the nomination to President Eisenhower. They realize, too, that Nixon has been working for the nomination for years, while Rockefeller will have only a few months in which to campaign openly on the national level—and they bolster their hopes by pointing out that when Willkie won the nomination in 1940 he not only beat the party machine but did it in a brief six months.

Rockefeller *did* score an upset victory over Averell Harriman. The question now is: Can he repeat this feat on a national level? And if he does repeat, what then? What kind of President would he make?

If the future can be forecast on the basis of past performance—always a large *if*—it's a safe guess that a Rockefeller administration in Washington would be characterized by social liberalism and economic conservatism. And it would have determined, possibly even stubborn leadership. Nelson

is by temperament a forceful executive, rather than a mediator, and once he arrives at a decision he demands action. To arrive at his decisions, he would rely heavily on staff-studies and roundtable conferences of experts called in to find solutions to his administration's problems. And as a Governor, at least, he has shown an inclination to seek advice from specialists in terms of their experience, rather than their party affiliation.

His administration would probably be younger than the present one. Rockefeller may *be* a grandfather but he doesn't think like one. And while he respects our venerable elder statesmen, he has shown a marked preference for the counsel of younger men of proven ability and talent. It would presumably be an administration that would take the people into its confidence, too; Nelson's candor has sometimes been as refreshing to newspapermen as it has been horrifying to professional politicians of the public-be-damned school. And it should be an administration equipped with and prepared to test fresh ideas. Nelson has a far-ranging, uninhibited mind—in New York, for example, he is at work one day on a plan to make possible the transfer of pension benefits when workers change jobs, next on a plan to enlarge the chain-of-succession to the governorship so that the state will not be deprived of leadership in the event of an enemy thermo-nuclear attack—and he tries to surround himself with imaginative advisers.

As to the policies he would follow should he become President, there is no need for guesswork. He has clearly outlined his political principles and beliefs in the preceding pages of this book, leaving us in no doubt about where he stands on the major issues of the day.

In describing his policies, he has inevitably painted his own political image. Some will applaud the picture, others frown on it. In either case, it remains the portrait Nelson Rockefeller has himself chosen for public display.















