

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
Contested Materials Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
47	41	9/12/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: attack stragegy. 10 pgs.
47	41	9/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Statement for D.C. Blacks Visiting Shriver Family Home. 4 pgs.
47	41	9/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Statement (author unk) for Frank Fitzsimmons. 7 pgs.
47	41	9/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Fact Sheet RE: 'Another Look at George McGovern's Foreign Policy.' 2 pgs.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
47	41		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Draft (author unk) of Fact Sheet RE: another look at McGovern's Foreign Policy. 2 pgs.
47	41	9/5/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Colson RE: 'guy from Bethlehem Steel.' 2 pgs.

NUMBER	TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 1]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: attack strategy, with attached draft copy	9/12/72	C (mix)
N-2 [Doc 2]	Report	Statement for D.C. Block, visit, Shriver Family Home, with attached draft copy	9/9/72	C (mix)
N-3 [Doc 3]	Report	Statement for Frank Fitzsimmons, with 2 draft copies attached	9/7/72	C (mix)
N-4 [Doc 4]	Report	Fact Sheet: Another Look at George McGovern's Foreign Policy.	9/6/72	C (mix)
N-5 [Doc 173]	Report	<sup>Draft</sup> Copy of N-4	[9/6/72]	C (mix)
N-6 [Doc 5]	Memo	Khachigian to Failer, re: McGovern's defense expenditures & job market, with attached draft copy	9/5/72	C (mix)
N-7 [Doc 6]	Memo	Khachigian to Colson, re: guest from Bethlehem Steel, with attached draft copy	9/5/72	C (mix)
N-8 [Doc 7]	Letter	To members of McGovern Foreign Affairs Advisory Committee, with copy & draft copy	9/5/72	C (mix)
N-9 [Doc 8]	Memo	Khachigian to Colson, re: Shriver American First, with draft copy & attachments	9/1/72	C (mix)
[Doc 9]		Memo, Colson to Buchan, re: Shriver & America First, 8/25/72		

FILE GROUP TITLE

**KEN KHACHIGIAN**

America First, 8/25/72

BOX NUMBER

7

FOLDER TITLE

September [1972] [20/22]

RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
- B. National security classified information.
- C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
- D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
- F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: Kenneth L. Khachigian

Box Number: 7

Folder: September [1972] [2 of 2]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	
1	Return	Private/Political
2	Return	Private/Political
3	Return	Private/Political
4	Return	Private/Political
5	Retain	Open
6	Return	Private/Political
7	Retain	Open
8	Retain	Open
9	Retain	Open
173	Return	Private/Political

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 12, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR:           PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
FROM:                       KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN  
SUBJECT:                   ATTACK STRATEGY

If we seem to be flailing about while George McGovern appears to score political points against us, it's true. While we shouldn't overestimate the amount of political bulls-eyes McGovern has scored in the past 10 days, we should consider just what we need to do in the next eight weeks to prevent him from scoring too many more.

The first problem is that we are generally on the counterattack against issues which McGovern raises first, and he has raised those issues because they are his issues. There are two approaches here: (1) There are some things we have to answer -- I think by and large, the Butz response on the grain deal has been o.k. We can't let McGovern get away with totally irresponsible charges and to put McGovern into a spitting contest with Butz is o.k. by me. That gets him off other issues. (2) However, there are some issues we just don't need to answer, and we shouldn't. We should never counterattack unless we can turn the counterattack into an offensive plus for us.

TIMING

We are presently spreading ourselves too thin. We have shoved out statements over the last few days like they were going out of style. On occasion, we get in the way of our own stories. This is bad precedent and should be stopped. We need to focus on big issues or big stories. One story per day is sufficient.

Our sense of timing goes right along with spreading ourselves too thin. For example, the Chayes thing has gotten us nowhere in 8 days. One of the most remarkable stories to come down, and we can't do anything with it. Here is also where the problem of doing too much comes in. We moved on the Chayes story, and then the next day we picked up with something else -- losing the urgency of the Chayes story and thus losing the story. I am not sure we can resurrect it.

### SPOKESMEN

While McGovern is making news every day because he is on the road, we have, in the last week or so, tried to counterattack using low-level spokesmen. This is not to criticize Dole, MacGregor and some of the Cabinet types; it is a simple matter of who gets news space in the media. Some do and some don't. Dole is spread so thin he is not likely to make national news very often. MacGregor can make national news, but they seem to call press conferences only to harp on the Watergate thing.

Fundamentally, the problem with our attack is a problem of using newsmakers to make news on some of our best and biggest issues.

For example, while we have been piddling around with a number of things, we aren't moving out such lines as the quote on J. Edgar Hoover's death. We are not moving out his irresponsible and smear rhetoric. We aren't moving out some of the more egregious examples of how McGovern is flim-flamming the voters and the Democratic party. There are no limits on these.

Thus, we need, in the next three weeks and before, to have our national spokesmen, every three or four days, move with a new major speech knocking hell out of McGovern, and just as he begins to get one charge answered, we come at him again with another charge. Connally, Laird, Rockefeller, Reagan, Rogers and the Veep are those who come to mind. We should use Rogers and Laird sparingly but they should be used -- so what if partisanship is charged? It was charged three weeks ago and we jumped like hell in the polls. It is a meaningless charge in political Washington. The only reason they should be used sparingly on a national level is to maintain their newsworthiness.

## ISSUES

The issues we use are wrapped right into everything else I have mentioned above. Now, it is my understanding that 1701 wants to focus on four big issues. That's a lot of nonsense. There are probably about 50 issues in this campaign. For the President there are only about three or four issues, but for surrogates and attack spokesmen, there are dozens of issues. McGovern's record is rife with the wreckage of wild and irresponsible statements. Why should we limit ourselves on what we want to tie around his neck? Sure, we can focus on some gut issues the purpose of which is to coincide with voter attitudes. But we have another purpose as well: to engender the general opinion that this guy is a far-out, out-of-the-mainstream candidate whose elevation to the Presidency would be at worst a disaster and at best an embarrassment. We can do this without being strident.

If we don't start on some of these issues as soon as possible, we are going to be out of time and open to the charge of last-minute desperation tactics. For example, I have been urging for six weeks that a major figure in the Republican ranks has got to pick a good forum and lay out, point by point, the McGovern rhetoric, the appeal to fear, the smear tactics, the divisiveness, etc. I would guess that within ten days, McGovern will be touring the country saying he is going to heal the nation while Nixon divides. He is just dying to set the stage for another tricky-Dick campaign. It seems to me that we need to beat him to the punch, and one way of doing it is to move out the McGovern rhetoric.

One other thing we need to start doing in the same vein. As of now, we write something up, such as, "McGovern's not credible," and expect people to swallow it. What needs to be done is to launch this issue with a major speech, given all the P.R. support of 1701, laying out in agonizing detail just why McGovern isn't credible. Then we can follow up in the next four to five days with all kinds of short statements. We have to lay the foundation for an issue before we can make any headway with it.

This is why I emphasize the need to move out issues with big name speakers and a lot of fanfare. Then it becomes easy to have the other spokesmen just keep hammering away after the stage has been set.

Frankly, I feel my time is wasted producing so-called "talking points" which have about as much impact as a raindrop in a sandstorm. We should direct our efforts and direct them wisely. As of now we are using the blunderbuss in preference to the rifle shot, and it doesn't seem to be working.

#### PLANNING FOR THE NEXT EIGHT WEEKS

First of all, if we are to follow Eisenhower's advice, let's not even listen to anybody who puts out a set plan which is to be followed for one week and then the next. Let's use our political senses to see how the winds are going and then engage in planning. We should not get locked into anything. Things will change as time goes and we want to keep our own strategy updated according to changing events.

Nevertheless, we still want to be able to control the political events as much as possible. That is why we should begin thinking about who is going to say what for the next few days and when we are going to unleash some of our big guns. Remember, when RN gets on the stump in four weeks, everything else will be submerged, so if we want to make certain points now that we don't think RN can make later, we have to get started.

These are just some general thoughts. I can provide specifics along some of these lines if necessary. Why don't we get together to talk out some of this stuff before we submit a final memo for decision by higher-ups.



9/12/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: <sup>(ATTACK)</sup>~~ATTACK~~ STRATEGY

If we seem to be ~~we~~ flailing about while George McGovern ~~is~~ appears to score political points against us, it's true. ~~While~~ While we shouldn't overestimate the amount of political bulls-eyes McGovern has scored ~~in~~ in the past 10 days, we should consider just what we need to do in the next eight weeks *to prevent him from scoring too many more.*

The first problem is that we are generally on the counterattack against issues which McGovern raises first, and ~~because~~ he has raised those issues because they are his issues. There are two approaches here: (1) There are some things we have to answer -- I think by and large, the Butz response on the grain deal has been o.k. We can't let McGovern get away with totally irresponsible charges and to put McGovern into a spitting contest with Butz is o.k. by me. That gets him off other issues. (2) However, there are some ~~other~~ issues we just don't need to answer, and we shouldn't. We should never counterattack unless we can turn the counterattack into an offensive plus for us.

## TIMING

We are presently ~~is~~ spreading ourselves too ~~thin~~ thin. We have shoved out statements over the last few days like they

were going out of style. On occasion, we get in the ~~way~~ way of our own stories. This is bad precedent and ~~should~~ should be stopped. We need to focus on big issues or big stories. ~~One story per day is sufficient.~~ *One story per day is sufficient.*

Our sense of timing goes right along with spreading ourselves too thin. <sup>(S)</sup> For example, the Chayes thing has gotten us nowhere in 8 days. One of the most remarkable stories to come down, and we can't do anything with it. Here is also ~~where~~ where the problem of doing too much comes in. We moved on the Chayes story, and then the next day we picked up with ~~something~~ something else -- ~~losing~~ losing the urgency of the Chayes story and thus losing the story. I am not sure we can resurrect <sup>(sp?)</sup> it.

#### ~~THE~~ SPOKESMEN

While McGovern is making news every day because he is on the ~~road~~ road, we have, in the last ~~week~~ week or so, ~~we~~ tried to counterattack <sup>the</sup> using low-level ~~spokesmen~~ spokesmen. This is not to ~~criticize~~ criticize Dole, MacGregor <sup>(S)</sup> and some of the Cabinet types; it is ~~is~~ a simple matter of who gets news space in ~~the~~ the media. Some do and some ~~don't~~ don't. Dole is ~~spread~~ spread so thin, he is not likely to make national news, <sup>(very often.)</sup> MacGregor can make national news, but they seem to call press conferences only to <sup>harpoon</sup> resurrect ~~(sp?)~~ the Watergate thing.

~~XXXX~~

Fundamentally, the problem with our attack is a problem of using ~~the~~ newsmakers to make news on some of our best and biggest ~~a~~ issues.

For example, while we have been ~~the~~ piddling around with a number of things, we are't moving out such lines as the quote on ~~J.~~ J. Edgar Hoover's ~~the~~ death. We are <sup>not</sup> moving out his ~~the~~ irresponsible and smear rhetoric. We are't ~~the~~ moving out ~~the~~ some of the more egregious examples of ~~the~~ how McGovern is flim-flamming the voters and the Democratic party. *There are no limits on these.* ~~I could ~~the~~ draw up 10 different speeches with 10 different ~~the~~ themes -- each of which move out the line we want moved out instead of the line McGovern is determining.~~

Thus, we need, in ~~the~~ the next <sup>X</sup> three weeks and before to have our national spokesmen ~~the~~, every three or four days, move with ~~a~~ a new major speech knocking hell out of ~~the~~ McGovern, and just as he begins to get one charge answered, we come at ~~him~~ him ~~again~~ again with another charge. Connally, Laird, Rockefeller, Reagan, Rogers and the Veep are those who come to mind. We should use Rogers and Laird sparingly but they should be used -- so what if partisanship is charged? it was charged three weeks ago and we ~~the~~ jumped like hell in the ~~the~~ polls. It is a meaningless charge in political Washington. The only reason they should be used sparingly ~~is~~

on a national level is to maintain their newsworthiness.

### ISSUES

The issues we use are wrapped right <sup>into</sup> ~~up with~~ everything else I have mentioned above. Now, it is my understanding that 1701 wants to focus on four big issues. That's a lot of nonsense. There are ~~probably~~ probably about 50 issues in this campaign. For the President there are only about ~~■~~ three or four issues, but for surrogates and ~~■~~ attack spokesmen, there are dozens of issues. McGovern's record is rife with the ~~■~~ wreckage of wild and irresponsible statements. Why should we limit ourselves on what we want to tie around his ~~■~~ neck? Sure, we can focus on some gut issues ~~which which~~ the purpose of which is to coincide with voters' attitudes. But we have ~~■~~ another purpose as well: to engender the ~~■~~ general opinion that ~~■~~ this guy is a far-out, out-of-the-mainstream candidate whose elevation to the Presidency would be <sup>t</sup> at worst a disaster and at best an ~~■~~ embarrassment (sp?). *We can do this without being stupid.*

If we don't start on ~~■~~ some of these issues as soon ~~■~~ as possible, we are going to be out of time and open to the charge of last-minute desperation <sup>s</sup> tactics. For example, I have been ~~■~~ urging for six weeks that a major figure in the Republican ranks <sup>k</sup> has ~~■~~ got to pick a ~~■~~ good forum and lay ~~■~~ out, point by point, the McGovern rhetoric, the appeal to fear, the smear tactics, the divisiveness, etc.

I would guess <sup>within</sup> that ~~in~~ ~~about~~ ten days, McGovern ~~will~~ will be touring the country saying ~~he~~ he is going to heal the nation while Nixon divides. He is just dying to set the stage for another ~~tricky-Dick~~ tricky-Dick campaign. It seems ~~to~~ <sup>S</sup> to me that we need to beat ~~him~~ him to the punch, and one ~~way~~ way of doing it is to move out the McGovern rhetoric.

One ~~other~~ other thing we need to start doing in the same vein. As of ~~now~~ <sup>now</sup>, we write something up, such as, ~~"McGovern's~~ "McGovern's ~~not~~ not credible," and expect people to swallow it. What needs to be done is to launch ~~an~~ <sup>this</sup> issue ~~with~~ with a major speech, given all the P.R. support of 1701, laying out in ~~an~~ agonizing detail just why McGovern isn't credible. Then we can follow up in the next four to five days with all ~~the~~ ~~kind~~ kinds of short statements. We have to lay the foundation for an issue before we can make any headway with it.

This ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> is why I emphasize ~~the~~ the need to move out ~~issues~~ issues with ~~big~~ big name speakers and ~~a~~ <sup>a</sup> lot of fanfare. Then it becomes easy to have the other spokesmen just keep hammering away after the stage has been set.

Frankly, I feel my time is wasted producing so-called "talking points" which have about as much impact as a ~~teardrop~~ <sup>rain</sup> teardrop in a sandstorm. We ~~should~~ should direct our efforts and direct ~~them~~ <sup>(sp?)</sup> them ~~wisely~~ wisely. As of now we are ~~using~~ using the blunderbuss in preference ~~to~~ <sup>over</sup> to the rifle shot, and it ~~doesn't~~ doesn't seem to be working.

PLANNING FOR THE NEXT EIGHT WEEKS

First of all, if we are to follow Eisenhower's advice, let's not even ~~listen~~ listen to anybody who puts out a set plan which is to be followed for one week and then the next. Let's use our political senses to see how the ~~winds~~ winds are going and then engage in planning. We should not get locked into anything. Things ~~will~~ will change as time goes and we want to keep our ~~own~~ own strategy updated according to changing events.

Nevertheless, we still want to be able to control the political events as much as possible. That is why we ~~should~~ should begin thinking about who is going to say what for the next few days and when we are going to unleash some of our big guns. ~~Remember~~ Remember, when RN gets on the ~~trail~~ <sup>stump</sup> in four weeks, everything else will be submerged, so if we want to make certain points now that we don't think RN can make later, we ~~have~~ have to get started.

These are just some general thoughts. I can provide specifics along some of these lines if necessary. Why don't we get together to talk out ~~some~~ some of this stuff before we submit a final memo for ~~your~~ decision by higher-ups.

September 9, 1972

STATEMENT FOR D. C. BLACKS VISITING SHRIVER FAMILY HOME

We came here to visit the Shriver family home today to take a first hand look at Sargent Shriver's commitment to racial equality. What we have discovered should be of great interest to black people across this country.

It turns out that Mr. Shriver comes from a family of slaveholders in Maryland whose success in America came from the forced labor of black slaves. We first read about this in the Washington Post, but we had to see it to believe it. The Post said of Mr. Shriver's ancestors: "It was a life of luxury, for the Shrivvers, if not American aristocrats, were country gentlemen and ladies."

One of the things here we saw at the Shriver home was the kitchen, and in that kitchen are a series of bells that were used to summon the slaves and indentured servants. Also of great interest on our sightseeing trip was one of the mementos on the walls. There is a handbill printed in 1809 by David Shriver which offered the sum of \$30 for the return of a runaway slave.

What concerns us most is the fact that Mr. Shriver is apparently proud of his slaveholding ancestry. Mr. Shriver visited the deep South on August 23 and speaking in Louisiana, Sargent Shriver boasted

that of eight forebears of military age during the Civil War, six had served on Dixie's side and two had stayed home. And here are Mr. Shriver's own words: "but none of them fought on the other side (meaning the North)."

Now, we just put two and two together. Shriver goes to the South and brags about his ancestors who fought against freedom for blacks and then we come here to his family home and find that there is ample evidence of his slaveholding past. And today, of course, Mr. Shriver himself lives an aristocratic life, and we only wonder whether he is proud that his wealth today was the direct product of the sweat and toil of slaves against whose freedom he proudly notes his family fought against.



9/9/72

STATEMENT FOR D.C. BLACKS VISITING SHRIVER FAMILY HOME

We came here to visit the Shriver family home today to take a first hand look at Sargent Shriver's commitment to racial equality. What we have discovered should be of great interest to Black people across this country.

It turns out that Mr. Shriver comes from a family of slaveholders in Maryland whose success in America came from the forced labor <sup>of</sup> black slaves. We first read about this in the Washington Post, but we had to see it to believe it. The Post said of Mr. Shriver's ancestors: "It was a life of ~~luxury~~ luxury, for the Shriver<sup>s</sup>, ~~if~~ if not American aristocrats, were country ~~gentlemen~~ gentlemen and ladies."

One of the things here we saw at the Shriver home was ~~the~~ kitchen, and in that kitchen are a series of bells that were used to summon the slaves and indentured servants. Also of great interest on our sightseeing trip was one of the mementos on the walls. There is a ~~handbill~~ handbill printed in ~~1809~~ 1809 by David Shriver which offered the sum of \$30 for the return of a runaway slave.

What concerns us most is the fact that Mr. Shriver is apparently proud of his slaveholding ancestry. Mr. Shriver visited the deep South on ~~August~~ August 23 and speaking in Louisiana, Sargent Shriver boasted that of eight forebears of military age ~~of~~ during the Civil ~~War~~ War, six had served on Dixie's side and two had stayed home.

And here are Mr. Shriver's own words: "but none of them fought on the other side (meaning the North)."

Now, we just put ~~two~~ two and two together. Shriver goes to the South and brags about his ancestors who fought against freedom for blacks and ~~then~~ then we come here to his family home and find that there is ample evidence of his slaveholding ~~past~~ past. And today, of course, Mr. Shriver himself lives ~~an~~ an aristocratic life, and we only wonder whether he ~~is~~ is proud that his wealth today was the direct ~~product~~ product of the sweat and toil of slaves against ~~whose~~ whose freedom he proudly ~~notes~~ notes his family ~~to~~ fought ~~again~~ against.

September 7, 1972

STATEMENT FOR FRANK FITZSIMMONS

Senator George McGovern said this week that "any laboring man or woman who supports President Nixon ought to have his head examined." Being a laboring man this greatly concerned me. I want to announce today that I just got back from a visit to my doctor who examined my head, and told me the only thing I have is McGovernitis. For the layman, that translates into a fear of higher taxes and social chaos.

If I may be serious for a moment, Senator McGovern's statement about the working-man required about as much gall as could be mustered. The real working people of this country are going to resent such silly statements about "having their head examined." What kind of talk is that? According to a Harris Poll, President Nixon is receiving 49% of the labor support to McGovern's 40%. Senator McGovern apparently thinks he knows more about the working-man than the worker himself.

But let's really look at whose head needs examining. Senator McGovern voted against the SST in Congress. He voted to put tens of thousands of people out of work -- people now unemployed because of the way McGovern voted.

McGovern voted to put all the Lockheed workers out of a job, and he was barely defeated.

McGovern wanted to throw thousands of aerospace workers out on the streets when he voted against NASA appropriations year after year -- a minimum of 16 times. Referring to the very important space shuttle effort McGovern said: "I wouldn't manufacture foolish projects like the shuttle." He obviously meant to put thousands of more Americans on the unemployment rolls.

Not only has he constantly voted the straight unemployment ticket, George McGovern has proposed a number of silly welfare schemes and government boondoggles which would raise the budget by a minimum of \$99.4 billion. This would raise the taxes of the average American by at least 50%. A vote for George McGovern is a vote for higher taxes.

Today, George McGovern is public enemy number one of the American working man. He votes to put us out of work. He proposes to make America a second-class military power and put hundreds of thousands of Americans on the unemployment lines as a result. To top it off, he dreams up hare-brained proposals that make Santa Claus look like a miser and virtually assures higher and higher taxes for every American to pay for them.

The American working-man doesn't need his head examined, Mr. McGovern; all he needs is for you to get off his back.

STATEMENT FOR ~~FRANK~~ FITZGERALDS

Senator George McGovern said this week that "any laboring man or woman who supports President Nixon ought to have his ~~xxx~~ head examined." Now, ~~this startled me somewhat,~~ and being a laboring man <sup>this</sup> ~~is~~ greatly concerned me. ~~I~~ I want to announce today that I just got back from a visit to <sup>my doctor</sup> ~~a psychiatrist~~ ~~who~~ ~~was~~ ~~examined~~ my head, and ~~my doctor~~ told me the only thing I have is McGovernitis. For the layman, that is translated into a fear of higher taxes and social chaos.

If I may be serious for a moment, Senator McGovern's statement about the working-man <sup>required about as much gall as could be mustered.</sup> ~~was absolutely shocking.~~

~~The~~ The real working people of this country are going to resent such <sup>silly</sup> statements about "having their head examined." What kind of talk is that? <sup>according to a Harris Poll</sup> President Nixon is ~~getting~~ <sup>receiving</sup> 49% of the labor <sup>support</sup> ~~vote~~ to McGovern's 40%. ~~xx~~ Senator McGovern apparently thinks he knows ~~more~~ ~~about~~ the working-man ~~than~~ than the worker himself.

But let's ~~not~~ really look at whose head needs examining. Senator McGovern voted against the SST ~~bill~~ bill in Congress. He voted to put tens of thousands of people out of ~~work~~ work -- people who are now unemployed because of the way McGovern voted. McGovern ~~has~~ voted to put all the Lockheed workers out of ~~a~~ a job, and he was barely defeated.

McGovern wanted to throw thousands of ~~a~~ aerospace workers

out in the streets when he voted against NASA appropriations  
*a minimum of 16 times.* Referring to the  
 year after year ~~XXXXXXXXXX/XXX~~ very important space shuttle  
 effort McGovern said: "I wouldd't manufacture foolish projects  
 like the shuttle." He ~~XXXXX~~ obviously meantx to ~~h~~ put ~~xxx~~  
 thousands of more Americans on the unemployment ~~xxxxxx xxxix~~  
 rolls.

Not only has he constantly voted ~~x~~ the straight ~~x~~ unem-  
 ployment ticket, George McGovern has put up a ~~xx~~ number  
 of foolish welfare schemes and government ~~xxxxx~~ boondoggles  
~~xxxx~~ which would raise the budget by a ~~xxxx~~ minimum of \$99.4  
 billion. This would raise the taxes of every American by

at least 50%. *Vote for Gerge McGovern and I guarantee  
 higher taxes.*

Just who does Senator McGovern think he's kidding? Today,  
 he is public enemy number one to the working man. He ~~xx~~  
 votes to put us out of work. He proposes to make America  
 a second-class military power and put hundreds of thousands  
 of other Americans ~~xxxx~~ in the ~~x~~ unemployment lines) *as a result.* To  
 top it off, he whips out a bunch of ~~xxxx~~ hare-brained  
 proposals which make Santa ~~xx~~ Claus look like a piker  
 and virtually ~~xxxxxx xxxxx~~ assur<sup>es</sup> higher and higher taxes  
 for every American.

The American working-man doesn't need his head  
 examined, Mr. McGovern; all he needs from you is some  
 responsible political action so you quit voting men out of  
 their jobs and ~~xxx~~ proposing the welfare state ~~xxxx~~ for everyone/~~xxx~~  
 else.

STATEMENT FOR FRANK FITZSIMMONS

Senator George McGovern said this week that "any laboring man or woman who supports President Nixon ought to have his head examined." ~~Now,~~ *Being* a laboring man this greatly concerned me. I want to announce today that I just got back from a visit to my doctor who examined my head, and told me the only thing I have is McGovernitis. For the layman, that ~~is translated~~ *Translated* into a fear of higher taxes and social chaos.

If I may be serious for a moment, Senator McGovern's statement about the working-man required about as much gall as could be mustered. The real working ~~people~~ of this country are going to resent such silly statements about "having their head examined." What kind of talk is that? According to a Harris Poll, President Nixon is receiving 49% of the labor support to McGovern's 40%. Senator McGovern apparently thinks he knows more about the working-man than the worker himself.

But let's really look at whose head needs examining. Senator McGovern voted against the SST ~~bill~~ in Congress. He voted to put tens of thousands of people out of work -- people ~~there~~ now unemployed because of the way McGovern voted.

McGovern voted to put all the Lockheed workers out of a job, and he was barely defeated.

McGovern wanted to throw thousands of aerospace workers out <sup>of</sup> the streets when he voted against NASA appropriations year after year <sup>a</sup> minimum of 16 times. Referring to the very important space shuttle effort McGovern said: "I wouldn't manufacture foolish projects like the shuttle." He obviously meant to put thousands of more Americans on the unemployment rolls.

Not only has he constantly voted the straight unemployment ticket, George McGovern has <sup>proposed</sup> ~~put~~ a number of <sup>city</sup> ~~social~~ welfare schemes and government boondoggles which would raise the budget by a minimum of \$99.4 billion. This would raise the taxes of <sup>the average</sup> ~~every~~ American by at least 50%. <sup>A</sup>  Vote for George McGovern ~~is a vote for higher~~ <sup>is a vote for higher</sup> ~~taxes~~ <sup>taxes</sup>

~~Just who does Senator McGovern think he's kidding?~~ Today, <sup>George McGovern</sup> ~~he~~ is public enemy number one <sup>of</sup> ~~to~~ the <sup>American</sup> working man. He votes to put us out of work. He proposes to make America a second-class military power and put hundreds of thousands of ~~other~~ Americans <sup>in</sup> the unemployment lines as a result. To top it off, he <sup>dreams up</sup> ~~whips out~~ ~~such~~ <sup>that</sup> hare-brained proposals which make Santa Claus look like a <sup>pie</sup> ~~pie~~ and virtually assures higher and higher taxes for every American,   
 To pay for them.



The American working-man doesn't need his head examined,  
Mr. McGovern; all he needs <sup>is for</sup> ~~from~~ you is <sup>To get off his back.</sup> ~~some responsible political~~  
~~action so you quit voting men out of their jobs and proposing the~~  
~~welfare state for everyone else.~~

FACT SHEET  
Another Look at George McGovern's Foreign Policy

Interview with Abram Chayes:

Q. You say you would cut off all military aid to Saigon as soon as the McGovern Administration takes over. But what if the North Vietnamese also insist that the United States cease all economic aid to the South Vietnamese regime before the prisoners are returned?

A. Well, we'll cut that, too, then. We're not interested in keeping any presence there at all.

Q. What if Hanoi then insists that we must dump Lon Nol in Cambodia and Souvanna Phouma in Laos -- releasing, say, 100 American prisoners to sugarcoat the pill?

A. I don't think Hanoi will want Communist regimes in Cambodia and Laos, at least not right away. But if it does, then we'll have to dump Lon Nol and Souvanna Phouma, too.

Q. And what happens if Hanoi says we must dismantle all bases in Thailand before they will release the rest of the prisoners of war?

A. We can live with that, too. After all, Thailand is already making deals with Peking.

Q. Are you saying that if he is elected, McGovern would be prepared to abandon not only all of Indochina but the other nations of Southeast Asia as well?

A. We don't belong there.

-- Newsweek, September 11, 1972

The above exchange took place between a Newsweek correspondent in France and the newly appointed chairman of the McGovern foreign affairs advisory panel, Prof. Abram L. Chayes.

Prof. Chayes is the latest McGovern emissary, joining the ranks of McGovernites Ramsey Clark, Jane Fonda, and Pierre Salinger, to travel abroad with the message that a McGovern administration would sacrifice American interests and American allies around the world and reward Communist ambitions. Newsweek pointed out that Chayes' appointment suggested the likelihood of his emergence as the "Henry Kissinger" of a McGovern administration.

Professor Chayes was directly involved in the making of foreign policy during the Kennedy years when the Vietnam adventure was launched. In order to ingratiate himself with Senator McGovern he has now renounced that role.

Professor Chayes' services on behalf of the McGovern candidacy have not been restricted to undercutting delicate peace negotiations by promising North Vietnam everything it asks, and then some. He has also falsely identified a number of distinguished American academics as supporters of the McGovern foreign policy when, in fact, they strongly oppose McGovern and his policies.

Among those whose names were falsely used to perpetrate this fraud are Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University, Prof. Ben Halperin of Brandeis University, Prof. Marie Syrkin of Brandeis University, Prof. Gil Carl Alroy of Hunter College, and Prof. Michael Curtis of Rutgers University. Prof. Chayes was aided in perpetrating the fraud by a millionaire Harvard professor devoted to radical-left causes, Martin Peretz.

FACT SHEET  
Another Look at George McGovern's Foreign Policy

~~FACT SHEET~~

Interview with Abram Chayes:

Q. You say you would cut off all military aid to Saigon as soon as the McGovern Administration takes over. But what if the North Vietnamese also insist that the United States cease all economic aid to the South Vietnamese regime before the prisoners are returned?

A. Well, we'll cut that, too, then. We're not interested in keeping any presence there at all.

Q. What if Hanoi then insists that we must dump Lon Nol in Cambodia and Souvanna Phouma in Laos - releasing, say, 100 American prisoners to sugarcoat the pill?

A. I don't think Hanoi will want Communist regimes in Cambodia and Laos, at least not right away. But if it does, then we'll have to dump Lon Nol and Souvanna Phouma, too.

Q. And what happens if Hanoi says we must dismantle all bases in Thailand before they will release the rest of the prisoners of war?

A. We can live with that, too. After all, Thailand is already making deals with Peking.

Q. Are you saying that if he is elected, McGovern would be prepared to abandon not only all of Indochina but the other nations of Southeast Asia as well?

A. We don't belong there.

-- NEWSWEEK, September 11, 1972

The above exchange took place between a Newsweek correspondent in France and the newly appointed chairman of the McGovern foreign affairs advisory panel, Prof. Abram L. Chayes.

Prof. Chayes is the latest McGovern emissary, joining the ranks of McGovernites Ramsey Clark, Jane Fonda, and Pierre Salinger, to travel abroad with the message that a McGovern

administration would sacrifice American interests and American allies around the world ~~and~~ reward Communist ambitions.

Newsweek pointed out that Chayes' appointment suggested the likelihood of his emergence as the "Henry Kissinger" of a McGovern administration.

Professor Chayes was directly involved in the making of foreign policy during the Kennedy years when the Viet-Nam adventure was launched. In order to ingratiate himself with Senator McGovern he has now renounced that role.

Professor Chayes' services on behalf of the McGovern candidacy have not been restricted to ~~tempering with the delicate peace negotiations now progressing in the service of peace.~~ <sup>undercutting</sup> by promising North Vietnam everything it asks, and then some. He has also falsely identified a number of distinguished American academics as supporters of the McGovern foreign policy when, in fact, they strongly oppose McGovern and his policies.

Among those <sup>whose were falsely</sup> names used to perpetrate this ~~type~~ fraud are Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University, Prof. Ben Halperin of Brandeis University, Prof. Marie Syrkin of Brandeis University, Prof. Gil Carl Alroy of Hunter College, and Prof. Michael Curtis of Rutgers University. ←

Prof. Chayes was aided in perpetrating ~~this~~ <sup>the</sup> fraud by a millionaire Harvard professor devoted to radical-left <sup>causes</sup> ~~causes~~, Martin Peretz.

When did he do this?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHUCK COLSON

FROM:

KEN KHACHIGIAN 

The attached seems to be right down your alley. This guy from Bethlehem Steel can do nothing but help us, as surely all his complaints are with McGovern's wild statistics. Can't we have Henry Cashen plug in with him and make sure he gets ample material with which he can attack McGovern.

Since he is setting up his own truth squads, our effort would be minimal. We ought to give him as much support as we can -- he'll be doing our work for us.

Attachment

9/2/72

MEMORANDUM FOR CHUCK COLSON

FROM: KEN KHACHEGIAN

The attached seems to be right down your alley. This guy from ~~Beth~~ Bethlehem Steel can do nothing but help us, as surely all his complaints are with McGovern's wild statistics. Can't we have Henry Cashen plug ~~in~~ in with him and ~~make~~ make sure he gets ample material with which ~~he~~ he can attack Mc<sup>o</sup>vern?

Since he is setting up his own truth squads, our effort would be minimal. We ought to give him as much support as we can -- ~~he~~ he'll be doing our work for us.