

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>
4	38		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Colson to Leonard RE: the failure of "First Monday" to capitalize on a speech given by RN involving the Soviets. 1 pg.
4	38	6/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Harper RE: the Democratic platform. 1 pg.
4	38	6/20/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Dick Howard RE: Billy Graham's efforts to organize RN's supporters. 1 pg.
4	38	6/16/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	Copy of a memo from Colson to Haldeman RE: general campaign strategies on a plethora of issues. Handwritten notes on original added by unknown. 5 pgs.

MEMORANDUM FOR: FRANK LEONARD  
FROM: CHUCK COLSON  
SUBJECT: First Monday

I have just read First Monday and what is otherwise a brilliant job is marred terribly in my mind by your failure to do what we agreed upon -- that is, include a more prominent play of the President's speech about Tanya to the Soviet people. While substantively it may not have been as important as his speech to the Congress, it had a much greater emotional impact and I think an enormous political effect. I cannot conceive for the life of me why you saw fit not to do what you had agreed to do. This is the second time this has happened and we simply cannot have it.

I expect from you immediately an explanation of how this happened. I hope that you did not make a unilateral decision but I would like to know who decided to countermand the instructions from here which were clear and precise.

cc: Van Shumway

June 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ED HARPER

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

Do I correctly assume that you are doing an analysis of the Democratic Platform both as to cost and political impact? It would seem to me if we analyse the Democratic Platform, it will give rise to thoughts for our own where we want to draw a contrast or alternatively where we want to duck an issue.

I noted with very special interest George Meany's comments yesterday and he raised what is with labor a very key point, i. e. the export of jobs. If you read Meany's remarks in full, you will see that what he is saying is the Democratic Party should be more concerned with American capital going abroad resulting in exports of jobs than in such things as abortion, women's lib, etc. In this area, I think we could do some very, very effective demagoguing if we could write a plank that hits this issue head on. It would not only ring bells with Meany, but would give Don Rodgers, our labor man, something to really sell across the country. The labor people don't understand the issue of "export of jobs" has become something of a code word with labor, but that language alone would be useful. Could you explore this and let me know what the prospects are because there is an opportunity for real political exploitation here.

June 20, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: DICK HOWARD

FROM: CHARLES COLSON

I want a report on what we have done in connection with Billy Graham's Explo. I am appalled that we only had an "observer" present. Based on what Billy Graham told the President, these were our people. They want to go out and campaign for us and we should exploit this as fully as possible. This can be an enormous campaign resource. I think last week or the week before I made a notation in the News Summary to Howard Cohen telling him to be sure that our people were involved with this. I can't believe with Rietz' operation going the way it is, that we didn't get very deeply involved with this. It probably is not too late to do so; we should have had our operatives there circulating through the crowd.

I want to be absolutely certain that this is followed through on. Assign it to Cohen and be sure that I get follow through reports.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN  
FROM: CHARLES COLSON *CC*  
SUBJECT: Your Memo of June 12.

In response to your memo of June 12 regarding the campaign strategy, I think you already have my thinking on most of the points you have asked about. You probably have an ~~an~~ ad nauseam in some areas like aid to parochial schools.

Without asking you to go back and look at all my old memos I have written, I am enclosing for your quick perusal my memo of May 17 on "Issue Management". There is nothing issue-wise that I feel any different about nor to my knowledge have we made much progress since May 17. Just ticking through the items in that memo:

1. We have made a little start on the tax issue.
2. We have done nothing separating ourselves from the bureaucracy or attacking the bureaucracy.
3. On busing, we have got to do much better and have an opportunity to begin when the President blasts the higher education bill while signing it.
4. The inflation/food price issue I talked about yesterday. I feel it is coming on us very hard and very fast and I believe we should be prepared with the necessary contingency plan. *Disks!*
5. Welfare. The President has indicated that he likes the idea of implementing the Talmadge Amendments with a lot of fan-fare which is basically what I had proposed in this memo, but there will be a lot of bloodshed because the faint hearts will fight this to the death.

6. No Fault. This one happily we have done and in fact without much involvement of any of the President's time. We got a good bit of mileage out of it and for once our mechanism produced something.
7. Catholic Schools. Maybe we are coming to grips with this. I will believe it when it happens.
8. Social Security. In my memo of May 17, I said we are "treading water". I said it again yesterday. We are.

In response to the other questions that you raised in your June 12 memo I don't think it is necessary for the President to be travelling between the Conventions. Indeed, I would rather see him remain here while the Congress is here. Perhaps he could do one or two highly visible domestic events; for example, call in the food chain retailers and lay them out in lavender. Perhaps we will have an opportunity for a highly visible veto, but I think we can use that period of time also to rail against the Congress for its inability to deal with major national problems.

I still don't feel that the Jaycees or Rotary type appearances are good. I believe there is more to gain by keeping the President on the pedestal he is on, a little bit aloof and non-political, dealing with the great issues of our time. I disagree strongly with Hallett's point about a foreign trip. There is no way that we can top the last two and it would be transparently political. In short, let's keep the President tending to his knitting. But the most important point in my mind is that he be prepared to move in swiftly, firmly and very decisively to capitalize on any domestic issues that can either be turned into an asset or as to which we can block a negative. Food prices and busing are two that are in this category. If the Congress won't act on the moratorium as apparently they are not, let's take every opportunity between the Conventions to bang them hard. Let's be prepared to do something very dramatic on the food price front. We may have to go way beyond jawboning or attacking the food chains. We may have to have an Executive Order ready to issue to nail this very hard.

I very much like the idea of the President being in California for the first two weeks of July. In fact, there would be nothing wrong with him being there the first three weeks in July. We have no problem with the public thinking that the President spends all of his time relaxing. To the contrary, I think there was even a ripple of concern in the country that he was pushing himself too hard during the Soviet trip.

In any political campaign the most critical strategy call is momentum and timing. July is a month for us to be locking up all of our positions on the issues, exploiting constituency groups, having the President come forward strong and hard on critical domestic issues, but at the same time letting him get some rest, do some thinking and not be moving at a very rapid pace.

I think you know exactly what I believe the opposition strategy will be. They will hit us on the following issues:

1. We are in bed with big business and don't give a damn about the little guy. Off of this they play ITT, a \$10 million secret slush fund, vetoing of Social Security, etc.
2. Ineffectiveness on the domestic front, the President doesn't care about domestic issues and we have no domestic program.
3. The economy is in trouble, prices are rising, people are out of work.

As to these, I have no concern except over point one. That goes to the trust-confidence-credibility factor which maybe one of the most important things that the public uses to measure candidates. Here we have some real work to do.

You said yesterday that everyone was saying that we should worry about complacency. Obviously that is so, but in my mind it is a very serious problem. It is infectious organizationally, it does have an impact on voter turnout, but the worst thing it does is to permit people to throw away their votes. By this I mean the Democrats who might otherwise be frightened to have McGovern in the White House feel they can go to the polls and still cast a straight Democratic ticket because there is no chance of him being elected. This phenomenon was very evident in the Goldwater campaign. Many of my Republican friends said, "I can cast a vote for Goldwater because I know he can't be elected but if I thought my vote made a difference, I would be scared to vote for him!" That is also why Goldwater did better than the polls showed he would do. In my opinion, we have to contrive adverse polls if necessary to let the American people know this is a real test and we have to cleverly find a way to scare hell out of them at the prospect of a McGovern Presidency.

One thing we must do is to store up a whole slue of goodies that we can come out with in September and October. I have been mentioning this in every memo I have written during the past year and have yet to see any evidence that we are doing this. Shipyard contracts, parks to the people, Executive Orders, etc. etc. With a little imagination a program for this is not hard to develop. It does not need the involvement of the President unless we want him to but it gives a steady flow of government activities that have a positive impact on the people. I would like to see us have at least one a day in September and October.

You also know my thoughts on the campaign issue. Assuming it is McGovern and that our strength remains as it is or even close to what it is today, we need a real hatchet operation going on McGovern full time, but far removed from the President. Democrats for Nixon could carry the load. The President himself should go on doing those things which as President put him before the American people, visibly dealing with issues that are of concern to the American people. In short, we want to slide into the campaign period by just doing more of the kind of things that we have been doing. I agree with Hallett that we should only have a few partisan rally type appearances in October.

Lou Harris made a very interesting point this week suggesting that the President meet the domestic issue head on, saying in effect that we have not made as much progress on the domestic front as we would like (this kind of humility would help our credibility enormously), that the President had to deal in the first four years with the most pressing problem which confronted this nation, the search for peace and the strength of America's position in the world, etc. He would then say that he is happy to let the American people judge his Administration on his record in foreign affairs, ending Vietnam, SALT, China, etc. Now that we have made such enormous progress in the foreign field, which programs will continue (SALT continuation, etc.) that we are going to turn this energy, imagination, drive, etc. to solving the nation's most critical domestic problems, making government more responsive, lowering the cost of government, straightening out welfare, etc. etc. It is an interesting point because it is disarming and readily acknowledges we have not done everything in the domestic field that we want to. It suggests that the President's enormous skill in foreign affairs, which is well and firmly established in the public's mind, is transferable to handling the domestic issue and it somewhat co-opts the enemy's attack line. It also holds out the promise of things to be done because as Harris points out, people are much less concerned with what has happened in the last four years than what they think will happen to them over the next four years. Hence they are more concerned, even in the

case of an incumbent, with what he hopes to do during the next term than what he did do in the first term. This also keeps us from being put on the defensive.

One other point worth mentioning; Dick Scammon believes the public mood is just right for the kind of speech that Prime Minister McMillan gave in 1959 in the closing days of his campaign which according to Scammon ~~was~~ one which moved the British people and according to Scammon was one of the most brilliant political speeches ever. I haven't reviewed it although I have asked for it. The thrust of it was, interestingly enough, somewhat similar to Harris' point. In effect, "I have shown you what I can do, put your faith in me. Here are the things we need now to do together and you can trust me to do them." It was calming, soothing, low-key. It inspired trust and it suggested that the strong points that McMillan had demonstrated could be used to solve the problems of the British people, which he, McMillan, readily identified -- as I say, somewhat similar to the Harris point.