

Stand On Major Issues

Heart of Campaign

Q. What do you consider the three key issues of this campaign?

BROWN: I don't believe that Mr. Nixon has raised an issue during the 13 months that he has been campaigning. My record is necessarily the biggest issue in the campaign, however, and I regard what we have done in public education, from the kindergarten through the graduate schools, and the master plan of higher education as the No. 1 accomplishment of our administration.

No. 2, the resolution of the water deadlock that had lasted for some 10 years between the North and South in the building of the California Water Plan.

No. 3, the advances we have made in conservation of human resources. I refer to the rehabilitation work that we have done with the mentally ill, the crippled, and the prisoners through conservation camps. Adding another factor within all of that, we have done all this with fiscal responsibility, and by that I mean with four balanced budgets.

NIXON: The three major issues are the cost of state government and the burden of taxes, the law enforcement and crime prevention, and economic growth in jobs. Those are the three major issues as I see them.

What About State's Job Opportunities?

Q. Is California's rate of job increase good enough, and, if not, what should be done to improve it?

NIXON: It is only half as good as it should be. Unemployment from September, 1959, to September, 1962, went up 44 per cent. During that same period our population went up only 11 per cent. The seasonal drop from August to September was less than usual in California, and at the present time the rate of investment in California is only at the rate of approximately \$2.5 billion a year. The rate of investment to provide one million new jobs over the next four years has got to be at \$5 billion a year. In other words, we have got to double the rate of investment if we are going to reduce unemployment and provide jobs for the new people coming into the state every day.

Another indication of the problem is that California in the last 19 months was ninth in the nation in new plants coming into this state, and that New York, our major competitor, over that same 19-month period, got three times as many new plants as did California.

Now, this torpedoes, it seems to me, some of the smog screen of statistics that have been put out by the State Economic Development Agency, which, incidentally, has not brought any new plants into the State of California, and which is simply using its facilities apparently to try to cover up a potentially dangerous situation. That is why I think we need a program for business investment which will put us in the big league in this field by getting more competent people competing with the development agencies of states like New York; and, second, along with that must go in Sacramento a different attitude toward business investment.

We have got to stop bureaucratic harassment of private enterprise in California, and there are instances that could be given of that. Above all, we have got to have new fiscal policies which will assure new business, that when they invest in California they aren't going to be sandbagged by higher taxes.

The Brown administration's program first embodied a billion dollar tax increase on the people of California over four years. That is the record of the past, and the prospects for the future are no different because the Democratic platform on which Brown is running calls for new spending programs which would total at least \$1.3 billion over four years, which means another whopping tax increase. California already is first in taxes in the United States. Our per capita tax burden, for example, is \$141 as compared with New York's \$129.

If we are going to get the new investment that we need, we simply have to get our financial house in order so that new business can come in here with confidence, and that their taxes will be competitive.

BROWN: California produced 238,000 new jobs last year. We will pass the state of New York as the greatest industrial state in wealth in the entire nation by the end of this year. We are getting 41 per cent of the space age contracts from the federal government and almost 25 per cent of all the defense business in the United States. We get this because we have the brains and the climate and the employees.

I think, in addition to that, that the Economic Development Agency should move on a great job of selling new industries into coming into this state, telling them that we will have six and a half million more customers here within 10 years, and that the potential for new business is as great.

Our unemployment rate is now below the national average, but I am not satisfied until every man that wants a job in our state gets a job.

Mounting Costs Of Education

Q. How do you propose to cope with the mounting costs of education in California?

BROWN: In California we are starting the trimester system in the universities and state colleges, which will make greatest use of the buildings and grounds and laboratories of the state institutions. We are moving ahead with educational television, and we are trying to find ways to make more efficient use of our elementary and high schools.

But California has a million more children in its public schools than the state of New York, with almost the same population, and I see no way that we can make significant savings in the education of our children. I regard this, however, as an investment, because the educational standards of our state are bringing to California the space age industries and the great scientific industries of the future.

I oppose any statewide ad valorem tax to assist education. I think that we will generate new revenues here in California by creating a good business climate. When business is making money, they are paying income taxes and employing people. When people are employed, they are buying things, and that is the answer to the additional revenues that are necessary to take care of our great public school system in our state.

NIXON: They are going to continue to go up. I will say that first.

Second, however, I believe that we have gone overboard in the field of buildings and in the field of grounds. I feel there are two areas where we can save. One is in the field of what I call frills on buildings. I think our building costs are way out of line.

I was in San Diego recently and saw a new junior high school in that perfect climate down there, and it was air-conditioned. The kids don't go to school in the summer in San Diego, and it doesn't need to be air-conditioned. The people of San Diego were outraged that the State Board insisted that it be air-conditioned. And that is at an immense cost, as we know.

Also, with regard to grounds, I think that in many instances many of our schools have taken up too much ground, and many administrators to whom I have spoken have agreed on this.

I believe that by cutting down on extravagant building costs — let's have adequate buildings, but not lavish ones — by making better use of space, that we can then concentrate more in the area that I think is essential, and that is teachers' salaries. My own view is that we have had too much of a tendency to put emphasis on buildings rather than on salaries, and I think that salaries need to be given more priority. I think costs per capita do not have to go up at the rate they have been going up in the past. That can come down, but the over-all cost has to come up, because more youngsters are coming into the schools all the time.

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT OPPONENT?

Q. How would you characterize your opponent?

NIXON: I would prefer not to conduct campaigns in personal terms. I prefer to characterize him in terms of his performance as a public official, and I think that as a public official that his major weakness has been an indecisiveness and a tendency not to assume responsibility and to make decisions himself, but to rely and depend on others and to pass the buck where great decisions, important decisions, have to be made. The Chessman case is the most striking example of this.

BROWN: He is very difficult to characterize because he has not in this campaign pursued any particular philosophy. He denounced the John Birch Society at the beginning of the campaign but has refused to repudiate the congressmen who are members and spokesmen for this society. He has injected Communism into the campaign by innuendo, charging the Democratic Party and myself with being soft on Communism.

His entire campaign has been one of telling us what he is going to do to people rather than what he is going to do for people. He stated that he is going to get the derelicts out of the state hospitals. He has stated that he is going to issue an executive order telling the constitutionally independent U.C. Board of Regents who could speak on the campuses. He has stated that he is going to fire public employees who have Civil Service status. He has stated that he is going to beat me to a pulp. He has stated that he favors gassing more people.

That is what I mean by saying he is telling us all the time what he is going to do to people, but what he is going to do for people, I don't know.

A LOOK AT RECORD

Q. How would you characterize the present administration of California?

BROWN: My own characterization of this administration was given in my inaugural address when I termed it responsible liberalism. We have been responsible with the people's money, but we have pursued policies of a liberal administration in dealing with the human beings and natural resources.

NIXON: I would characterize it as an administration that had faded on the record in making significant progress and adequate progress in handling major issues. It is an administration that has had at times brilliant public relations, but in areas of primary concern of the people of California the performance has fallen far short.

Positions Taken on Reds, Extremists

Q. Do you consider communism a menace in California, and, if so, what would you do to combat it?

NIXON: It is, and the latest developments internationally underline it. As J. Edgar Hoover said in Las Vegas, the Communists are stepping up their offensive all over the United States, and particularly among the youth of America.

Communism is not a menace in terms of the numbers of Communists, but numbers do not measure the size of the Communist threat within a country. Every Communist's power must be multiplied a thousandfold by the fact that he is directly controlled by and is an agent of a potential enemy of the United States, the International Communist conspiracy.

To control it, I believe that in addition to what we have at the Federal level, our Federal Anti-Subversive Activities Control Act of 1951—of which I was one of the authors, and which requires Communists to register as agents of a foreign government—in addition to vigorous enforcement of that at the state level we need a program of education, of legislation and investigation.

In the field of education I favor giving higher priority to a program which will see that every high school student at some time during his high school career has a course in the facts about communism in practice; not in theory, but in practice, using, for example, what happened in Cuba, the lies and deceptions that President Kennedy forcefully pointed out in his address (Monday), and the alternative that freedom offers.

I think these courses also should be made available at the adult level.

I do not mean that these courses should be dictated in content. There should be broad choice allowed to the school district so that the local school districts can determine which will be the most effective.

In addition to that program of education, I favor backing up agencies in the field of investigation. I believe that at the state level, we should back up our congressional investigating committees and our legislative investigating committees. That is why I say that we in California should deny forums in our state universities and colleges to any individuals who refuse to answer questions in an investigation of Communist activities on the ground of self-incrimination.

Beyond that, I favor the vigorous enforcement of and compliance with the state loyalty oath program. And I emphasize here that by the loyalty oath I mean a loyalty oath in which the individual says he is not a member of an organization. It is not enough simply to have an affirmative oath of loyalty. The loyalty oath in which an individual says, "I am not a member of an organization that seeks to overthrow the Government of the United States," is one that gives our enforcement officials the case they need to bring the Communists to justice.

BROWN: Communism is a menace any time, any place, anywhere, but I believe that the F.B.I.—and I gain this information from conversations with the F.B.I.—the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the State Senate Committee on Un-American Activities, plus the laws that have been on the statutes for many years, are adequate to deal with this situation. And I make this statement after serving eight years as attorney general.

I believe, however, that we must be constantly on the alert, because it is like a latent infection. It can get worse very quickly. We have initiated studies of Communism in our public schools and in our universities, and I favor an extension of that teaching, but I wouldn't want to deal only with the negative phases of Communism. I would want to deal with the greatness of our democratic institutions and its history, and we have firmed up through legislative enactments, pushed through at my request, the study of American history.

Q. Is the John Birch Society a menace to California, and, if so, what would you do to combat it?

BROWN: I think the John Birch Society is a menace to the entire United States. It is a secret organization. Their blue book states specifically that they do not believe in democracy. They have accused members of both parties of being Communist. They stated that Dwight Eisenhower was a conscious agent of the Communist Party. They have refused to let people see their membership list so that we can find out who actually belongs to the organization. They use some of the tactics of the Communists in achieving their objective.

I would attack it by frankly discussing it, but that is as far as I would want to go at the present time. I would defend with all the powers of my office their right to take any position they want as long as they do it within the laws of our state. I believe in free speech.

NIXON: I would say first that the John Birch Society, comparing it to the Communist Party, is like comparing a pygmy to a giant. The John Birch Society does not have any foreign ties and is not controlled by a foreign power, as is the Communist Party. Its numbers also, like the Communist Party, are small. I emphatically and categorically disagree with and condemn the totalitarian nature of the John Birch Society, the fact that its founder uses the tactics of any means to accomplish an end, and in my opinion the John Birch Society renders the greatest disservice in the very field it claims to want to serve. That is that it weakens the cause of fighting communism.



RICHARD M. NIXON—THE CHALLENGER

in this state, because by over-stating the case it raises a doubt about all anti-Communist activities.

For the reasons that I have mentioned, I oppose it. As I have stated, its threat is in no way comparable to the threat of the Communist Party.

I would combat it by leadership. I have tried to give leadership within my own party, and I have called upon office holders and candidates to repudiate the John Birch Society. I have not been successful completely in that respect, but I will continue to give that leadership. I think that is the most effective way to combat it.

I do not believe that in either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party that people who adhere to totalitarian principles can be effective members or leaders of either party, and this is characteristic of the John Birch Society. It is also characteristic of the Communist Party.

Q. Would you bar extremists, either of the left or the right, from official party activities? This doesn't mean party membership, but official activities within the party.

NIXON: You very appropriately said "party membership." You could not bar extremists, because anybody has a right to register as a Democrat or a Republican, and under the law nobody can question him and say, "Are you a member of a certain organization?" That would be a denial of the constitutional rights.

But when we are talking about party organizations and officials in party organizations, I, if I am elected Governor of this state, will continue to take the leadership in seeing that—not extremists, because by "extremists," it might take in native American radicals that are rather indigenous to this country — people who advocate and use totalitarian methods are barred from positions. And that would include the practicing members of the John Birch Society; it would also include certainly any who had Communist ties.

This is one place where I agree with Mr. Unruh, (Jesse Unruh, speaker of the State Assembly). I think Unruh was correct in supporting a resolution to bar members of the Communist Party and members of the John Birch Society from the Democratic Party organization. I think Governor Brown showed lack of leadership in failing to support that resolution and, in fact, thereby really opposing it and letting it die.

BROWN: Well, I would personally do everything within my power to see that extremists of either the left or the right do not hold any party office in any official organization of the Democratic Party, but I would do it by seeking to outvote them and getting the people to support a moderate position. But I believe in democracy, and I believe that an organization has the right to select whom they want. If I don't like it, I will get out of the organization.

Proposition 24

Q. Why do you oppose Proposition 24? Is your opposition basic or technical?

BROWN: My opposition is basic. I don't believe that any legislation should be passed that would permit any governmental agency to take away the rights of citizenship from any individual without permitting that person to have a fair hearing and to be represented by counsel. Proposition 24 provides for various agencies and a grand jury to meet in secret to deprive a person of his or her rights as a citizen.

I feel further that all of the good things in Proposition 24, and there are some, are already covered by statutes in this state, and I see no reason to freeze them into the State Constitution.

NIXON: Technical. Proposition 24 is aimed at curtailing the activities of the Communist party in California. I share that objective.

Proposition 24, in its Section 3, sets up a procedure which has, in my opinion, a fatal constitutional flaw.

I learned from having written the Mundt-Nixon Bill—I had a lot to do with writing it because I was the only lawyer on the Committee on Un-American Activities at that time—and that became the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1951—that the key section of any Communist control legislation is the section which sets up the procedure to determine who is a Communist and what is a Communist organization. It isn't as simple as people would like to say, such as, "Let's outlaw communism." The point is: Who is a Communist?

Now, Section 3 of Proposition 24 sets up a procedure for determining who are Communists, and that procedure is so loosely defined that I believe that the Communists, who will test this in court inevitably, will be successful in proving it to be unconstitutional, and that will set the fight against communism back. Because the procedure allows grand juries and even individuals down as low as constables to hold hearings and make determinations as to what organizations are Communist action groups.

In my view the Supreme Court of the United States, with its present makeup, would never uphold this bill with the kind of deficiencies that are in it.

Here is a well-intentioned bill, but with an unfortunately loosely drawn provision. So I believe that what substantive parts of this bill that we may feel are effective should be handled by legislation.



Governor Brown expounds on administration, keys to campaign in special Tribune interview session