

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>
5	51	11/18/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Ehrlichman to RN RE: The election and the near future. 6 pgs.
5	51	8/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Walker to Ehrlichman RE: Committee to Re-elect and RNC relationship. 1 pg.
5	51	8/11/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Hullin to Ehrlichman RE: Impressions of Committee to Re-elect (1701). 2 pgs.
5	51	2/23/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Ehrlichman to Mitchell RE: Committee for the re-election and White House Staff. 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>
5	51	11/6/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Ehrlichman to Haldeman RE: Re-election Campaign. 9 pgs.

**DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]**

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N1 [Doc 13]	memo	Ronald H. Walker to Ehrlichman	2-23-72	C(Nixon)
N2 [Doc 14]	memo	Jesi Hullen to Ehrlichman	2-11-72	C(Nixon)
N3 [Doc 15]	memo	Ehrlichman to President	11-18-72	C(Nixon)
N4 [Doc 16]	memo	Ehrlichman to Mitchell (3 copies)	2-23-72	C(Nixon)
N5 [Doc 17]	memo	Ehrlichman to Haldeeman	11-6-72	C(Nixon)

FILE GROUP TITLE

Ehrlichman

BOX NUMBER

16

FOLDER TITLE

1401 [Committee for the Re-election of the President]

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- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.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:** John D. Ehrlichman

**Box Number:** 16

**Folder:** 1701 [Committee for the Re-Election of the President]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
13	Return Private/Political
14	Return Private/Political
15	Return Private/Political
16	Return Private/Political
17	Return Private/Political

November 18, 1970

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT**

**FROM JOHN EHRLICHMAN**

**RE THE ELECTION AND THE NEAR FUTURE**

**I. Analysis of the President's election efforts**

**We have a ball which must be played from where it lies. Or, rather, from where the media has made it appear to be.**

**The weekend TV and press and last week's newsmagazines establish a common theme: The Vice President's efforts were fruitless and, in fact, turned off many undecided voters.**

**The President discovered from polls that Republicans were in danger of serious defeat and decided to campaign all-out. The Senate victories were the President's. Lack of further victory was, say the media, because the line adopted by the Republicans was negative, founded on fear, divisive, etc.**

**Many contrasts between your Phoenix speech and Muskie's rebuttal are being featured.**

**The comparison puts you on the political path and Muskie on statesman street.**

**The net result: A gain in the Senate for two years and a short-run p.r. loss for the Administration. The concerned media criticism probably won't be very sustained. The election is not the public's favorite subject at this point.**

## **II. Posture the President should maintain**

### **A. November and December 1970**

During the next 60 days everyting possible should be done to re-establish the public attitude toward the President and counter the media's negative barrage.

We should pre-empt the statesman's high road image from Muskie, et al.

For instance, such devices as a Thanksgiving service at the White House, a visit to West Point for a Saturday parade, a visit with HHH and wife to welcome them back (builds him, shows magnanimity, appeals to the independent), a TV special on a state visit, allowing film of the whole thing, the schedule should be constructed to hit this theme.

A press conference is past due, will permit you to occupy the high ground on questions of interest and has maximum visibility. You can dispel the false media image, direct to the people

The image being developed for the Democrats as being "resurgent" should be demolished. For example, they owe \$9 million. We should cause them to be sued by dozens of creditors. Byrd should be encouraged indirectly to oppose EMK for Whip.

### **B. Year 1971 Tactics**

#### **1. Fireside chats**

1972 will be a political year. 1971 is, therefore, the most credible time for a series of talks, low key, on issues of the day. The expressed purpose will be to help people understand better the Nation's defense requirements, the problems of the economy, tax and budget problems, etc.

There is, I feel, a strong national demand for this kind of "leadership" by the President. A poll on this question might be a good idea.

**2. Speeches on the issues**

Accept invitations providing a forum for speeches which are actually position papers on central domestic issues.

**3. Take government to the people**

Hold Cabinet or Council meetings around the country but permit them to be televised live. This will require some extraordinary preparation but should pay real dividends.

**4. The National Parks tour**

1971 is the right year for this.

**5. An image of probity, open-mindedness, interest in people and their individual problems (e.g., we are concerned about the man and his family who are out of work vs. "the problem of unemployment"), the foreign policy and defense expert, the statesman, the family man, the man who has brought down crime in the District of Columbia; interpreter of the issues, expert in management of government.**

But, primarily, **The President** in all aspects. Never the individual, the party leader or any other narrow role. Never an action, an event or a comment that is non-Presidential. Yet, at the same time, Presidential by presumption, indirection and inference, never by self-serving statement or action.

To be avoided are first-party references to the power of the Presidency. These are widely misinterpreted as self-serving, regardless of content.

**III. Relationship to the Media**

It should be merely correct. Continue to never let them use you; never let them create a useful issue needlessly.

Force their coverage to be favorable by careful planning.

Be subtle in rewarding friends and cutting enemies among the press. Be Presidential about it, never petty or partisan.

Do press conferences about once a month. It's your very best platform. It's highly Presidential.

#### **IV. Use of the Vice President and Cabinet**

**The Vice President is "used merchandise" just now and needs a few victories in agreeable areas. Some might be:**

**Veterans' health care  
Reading  
Water pollution  
Mexican-Americans and Indians  
Customs and immigration procedures  
Labor  
Relations with Canada  
National Parks  
Better use of Federal land  
Signs along highways  
Cancer/Heart research**

**He tells me his strong suit is politics, not the issues. I strongly disagree. If he sticks to the merely partisan he will quickly lose all credibility and will end up with a narrow, vocal following of small influence.**

**The Cabinet should continue to be treated as "the family" and as a speaker's bureau.**

**As said above, a televised Cabinet meeting or two, out of town, where an issue is thoroughly discussed live and in color would be effective and would focus on Presidential leadership.**

#### **V. Relationship with Congress**

**Presidential, Constitutional, as non-political as is possible.**

**Your effective power over Congress is your ability to unleash public opinion. You have this power because you are everyone's President, and for only that reason.**

**Thus, to be effective, you must build that particular capacity.**

**You should "go to the people" as frequently as there are key Congressional issues on which you must act.**

Generally, either sign or veto (not let a bill become law without signature).

Consider the use of a sign-board tally of Congressional over-spending.

Entertain Congressional families rather than just the Members. It precludes much business talk and makes a most lasting favorable impression on the Congressman.

Organize task forces of the younger Congressmen to give them intensive schooling on some key issues:

- taxation
- revenue sharing
- wage and price controls
- environment

so they can speak, write and fight for our position in these areas.

George Shultz and I will give you a schedule of our dinners we are going to have with Senators and Representatives this Fall. You might pick an early one to drop-by (here in the West Wing). This word will get around and give them greater significance without your actually being at any others.

SUMMARY

For the entire two years (November 1970 - November 1972), you must always be the President, never a politician, never a candidate, never anything else.

It is the high ground, and we must never let anyone else get close to it.

All of your instincts and predispositions will impel you to become a candidate or, at least, a manager of the campaign. I think that would be dangerous, indeed fatal. It would move you from a position of strength and broad appeal to one of relative weakness.

When Nixon organizations in the states are formed and are discovered by the press you should never comment on them or have personal contact with them. Others may do the political things but you are President of everyone -- especially the non-political, non-partisan citizen (who is more inclined to vote for a man than a party or political organization).

Only at the 11th hour in 1972 will you move to partisan campaigning and then as President, asking for a personal mandate in re-election.

\* \* \* \*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

ADMINISTRATIVELY  
CONFIDENTIAL

August 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN  
FROM: RONALD H. WALKER *ed*

Per your request, we have tried to pull together as much as possible an overall feeling for the relationship between the Committee for the Re-election (1701) and the Republican National Committee.

The RNC feels that 1701 is running the President's campaign in toto and that the RNC's role is strictly one of running the various State campaigns.

Our relationship between the RNC and 1701 recently centered in Miami and here are some general comments:

1. We found remarkably little friction between 1701 and the RNC. There were problems but these were for the most part personality problems instead of institutional problems. For example, Dick Herman, a strong-headed individual, gave all of us problems but Bill Timmons managed the situation very well.
2. There was an effort made by the White House staff to include 1701 and the RNC in all planning sessions. This reduced friction. A strong effort was made to let the RNC front all committees.
3. The RNC working-level people generally faced each problem in Miami with apathy and a lack of can-do spirit. There was no initiative -- and no follow-through. It was very noticeable that the RNC ranks lacked young aggressive, action-oriented men. They had no nitty-gritty workers.

cc: Mr. Haldeman  
Mr. Chapin

August 11, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR      JOHN EHR LICHMAN  
FROM                    SUZI HULLIN  
SUBJECT                IMPRESSIONS OF 1701 OPERATION

I.    Physical Aspects

A.    Third Floor

1.    Security seemed a little casual. Constant flow of people moving in and out. A "sign-in" book that wasn't enforced.
2.    Small cramped reception area. Stark.
3.    People who can be seen by the public should be dressed in a more business-like manner.

B.    Fourth Floor

1.    More impressive and business-like.
2.    Not the "zoo" of the third floor

II.   Ann Dore

- A.    I was very impressed with her poise, her ability to get to the point and her concept of the program.
- B.    I wasn't certain of her control of her part of the press area (total press staff about 25 people).
- C.    She was most impressed with her call from John Ehrlichman. "If I didn't have an opening for you, I would have made one."

### III. Bart Porter

- A. I was not as impressed with Bart.
- B. He's enthusiastic about his work, but he didn't listen to me. I had the feeling he was waiting to pounce on any moment of silence or any pause to continue his stream of conversation.

### IV. Overall impressions

- A. The fourth floor seemed much more orderly and business-like.
- B. The third floor was a "zoo", in Kathy O'Melia's words or "just unbelievable" - Ann Dore.
- C. There was no communication between the two floors on this project; i. e., Bart and Jeb had written a proposal for Clark Thursday morning (without consulting Ann Dore) -- "very neat": 12 teams of 3 each making 6 trips hitting 72 cities.
  - 1. Appointee talks about her job
  - 2. Cabinet wife about her husband
  - 3. White House wife about personal relationship with the President

When I said that Ann and I had discussed a different program - more low key and not teamwork per se, I was told that this proposal (Bart) was already in rough draft.

- D. I could not define the structure of the organization. The media group and the scheduling group both work on different facets of the same project, but how well they coordinate, communicate and assume final responsibility or "sign off", I couldn't determine.
- E. My interview with Ann was enjoyable and informative, a feeling for the job. My interview with Bart was a little frustrating. I didn't feel I was communicating and he took me into Jeb's office where there were two men meeting with Jeb to repeat my declining the position. It was awkward, not to mention a little embarrassing.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 23, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR

Honorable John Mitchell  
Attorney General  
Department of Justice

I continue to see evidence that the Committee for the Re-election staff and the White House staff are meshing very badly on matters of substantive policy and how to use it politically.

As I said the other day, to those who have been long in this vineyard, it's as if, suddenly for the first time, what the Administration favors, opposes, advocates and stands for is to receive some political wisdom.

It is important that all Jeb's people know and understand what policy is, why it is as it is, where our strengths and weaknesses are and, for what it is worth, what our three years of experience has taught us about presenting this material -- to veterans, the aged, youth, minorities, etc.

They should bear in mind that our people really do know something about this problem of presenting policy positions --

- the issue
- past performance
- proposals
- pay-out for the voter.

We have recently seen some CFTROTP (how's that for an acronym?) copy on issues. To be very generous about it, it was very terrible.

Committee staff can't seem to stay away from calling everyone in the government (plus Pete Rozelle) to ask for information on substantive programs and policy. Departments, agencies, OMB, my staff all are

Page Two

getting calls from new people, just on the scene, determined to reinvent the wheels which long ago have been thoroughly invented.

Moreover, they tactlessly seek to exploit "non-political" efforts in the clumsiest kind of way. The call to Rozelle (about which Jeb knows) is a classic example.

May I ask that all of the Committee people be thoroughly indoctrinated and instructed as to --

1. The existing policies and programs, and their rationale (both substantive and political).
2. How to make contact with government and non-government people for information or help on these subjects.
3. What resources are already available to them, and how to use them.

I am still uncertain as to the role Fred Malek will play. Will it be limited to coordinating activities related to cultivating political interest groups, or will his role be a broader one? How his efforts relate to Jeb's? Perhaps you would be good enough to send me a copy of his job description so we know where he fits.

John D. Ehrlichman

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

February 23, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR

Honorable John Mitchell  
Attorney General  
Department of Justice

I continue to see evidence that the Committee for the Re-election staff and the White House staff are meshing very badly on matters of substantive policy and how to use it politically.

As I said the other day, to those who have been long in this vineyard, it's as if, suddenly for the first time, what the Administration favors, opposes, advocates and stands for is to receive some political wisdom.

It is important that all Jeb's people know and understand what policy is, why it is as it is, where our strengths and weaknesses are and, for what it is worth, what our three years of experience has taught us about presenting this material -- to veterans, the aged, youth, minorities, etc.

They should bear in mind that our people really do know something about this problem of presenting policy positions --

- the issue
- past performance
- proposals
- pay-out for the voter.

We have recently seen some CFTRTP (how's that for an acronym?) copy on issues. To be very generous about it, it was very terrible.

Committee staff can't seem to stay away from calling everyone in the government (plus Pete Rozelle) to ask for information on substantive programs and policy. Departments, agencies, OMB, my staff all are

Page Two

getting calls from new people, just on the scene, determined to reinvent the wheels which long ago have been thoroughly invented.

Moreover, they tactlessly seek to exploit "non-political" efforts in the clumsiest kind of way. The call to Rozelle (about which Jeb knows) is a classic example.

May I ask that all of the Committee people be thoroughly indoctrinated and instructed as to --

1. The existing policies and programs, and their rationale (both substantive and political).
2. How to make contact with government and non-government people for information or help on these subjects.
3. What resources are already available to them, and how to use them.

I am still uncertain as to the role Fred Malek will play. Will it be limited to coordinating activities related to cultivating political interest groups, or will his role be a broader one? How his efforts relate to Jeb's? Perhaps you would be good enough to send me a copy of his job description so we know where he fits.

John D. Ehrlichman

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 23, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR

Honorable John Mitchell  
Attorney General  
Department of Justice

I continue to see evidence that the Committee for the Re-election staff and the White House staff are meshing very badly on matters of substantive policy and how to use it politically.

As I said the other day, to those who have been long in this vineyard, it's as if, suddenly for the first time, what the Administration favors, opposes, advocates and stands for is to receive some political wisdom.

It is important that all Jeb's people know and understand what policy is, why it is as it is, where our strengths and weaknesses are and, for what it is worth, what our three years of experience has taught us about presenting this material -- to veterans, the aged, youth, minorities, etc.

They should bear in mind that our people really do know something about this problem of presenting policy positions --

- the issue
- past performance
- proposals
- pay-out for the voter.

We have recently seen some CFTROTP (how's that for an acronym?) copy on issues. To be very generous about it, it was very terrible.

Committee staff can't seem to stay away from calling everyone in the government (plus Pete Rozelle) to ask for information on substantive programs and policy. Departments, agencies, OMB, my staff all are

Page Two

getting calls from new people, just on the scene, determined to reinvent the wheels which long ago have been thoroughly invented.

Moreover, they tactlessly seek to exploit "non-political" efforts in the clumsiest kind of way. The call to Rozelle (about which Jeb knows) is a classic example.

May I ask that all of the Committee people be thoroughly indoctrinated and instructed as to --

1. The existing policies and programs, and their rationale (both substantive and political).
2. How to make contact with government and non-government people for information or help on these subjects.
3. What resources are already available to them, and how to use them.

I am still uncertain as to the role Fred Malek will play. Will it be limited to coordinating activities related to cultivating political interest groups, or will his role be a broader one? How his efforts relate to Jeb's? Perhaps you would be good enough to send me a copy of his job description so we know where he fits.

John D. Ehrlichman

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 6, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR

BOB HALDEMAN

RE: REELECTION CAMPAIGN

The tone or theme:

In spite of all the talk about this being an age of one-term Presidents, I believe it is very hard for the American people to turn out a sitting President. Therefore, obviously, the tone or theme of the campaign must be keyed to the fact that the President is the President, that he has done a professional and competent job, that he has made significant accomplishments and that there is, therefore, no reason to change.

I think people tend to vote against a candidate perhaps more frequently than they vote for him; and certainly a Presidential race always weighs a candidate against his opponent. An incumbent President has an obvious advantage and President Nixon has a very clear advantage in view of his international initiatives on the question of "compared to what?".

At the same time, the President is the national father figure, the exemplar, the leader, and the nation's champion against other nations. This is what the American people believe a President is and they want him to act out these parts. They want him to evidence compassion for the poor, even though individually they may say and do things showing callous disregard for the poor. It is alright for Mr. Voter to be indifferent to the poor but it is not alright, in his eyes and mine, for his President to be indifferent to the poor. In fact, I suspect he gets a certain amount of psychic relieve from the knowledge that his President is being concerned about the less fortunate even at the time that he himself is not.

I think it is indispensable for the President to act out these roles in the course of the next year, with feeling and sincerity, to fulfill these expectations. To the extent that he does not we will find vague discontents and negative reactions expressed as "the President has no compassion, he doesn't care, he is cold and indifferent, he has no thought for the little people, he only cares about big business, etc."

Since this is role-acting, let's approach it as such. The President has a natural antipathy for doing the phony, the unnatural and the not-felt. But we are now not talking about making him comfortable in what he is doing; we are talking about getting him reelected and, in looking at that project coldly, there are some things that are going to have to be done to do the job properly that he may not totally like. But I am sure he and we would like the alternative even less. Because I think the alternative is to give exposure to an Achilles heel to which the President may be attacked mercilessly and effectively with unknown results.

And like a tennis game, as long as you can return the ball without mistake every time it doesn't really matter how hard you hit it. You keep playing for the other fellow's mistake. We occupy the high ground now since the President is the incumbent and all he has to do is go on being the incumbent. The other fellow has to figure out how to take the high ground. Therefore, we should avoid giving him handholds, avoid making mistakes, avoid acting rashly or without calculation or contemplation (e.g., the re-run of the Phoenix speech) and close as many of the doors as possible through which the enemy might enter.

In short, I would like to see the President put in situations which would act out his compassion, his fairness, his true concern for his inferiors, his leadership, etc. It does almost no good at all for those of us who know him well to tell about these things. One acting-out session will be worth ten thousand interviews with White House staffers or members of the Cabinet.

The President's part in the campaign

We had a good session with the Cabinet yesterday in the President's absence, and we told them all the things that they had to do in order to get the President reelected. But I suspect you know, and I strongly feel, that in the last analysis it isn't going to make much difference what the Cabinet says or does. The President himself is going to have to do much more than he is inclined to do, much more than he would want to do and probably much more than his responsibilities in fact permit him safely to do. But nevertheless I think he will have to do them.

Television and Radio

I know there is a concern that the President is over-exposing himself on television. And yet the singular criticism which I hear as I go around the country talking the issues to people is that the President is not talking to them about the issues. The Cabinet is talking to them, the staff is talking to them, Bob Dole is talking to them but they want the President to talk to them. They want fireside chats. Over and over again I receive the suggestion that the President sit down and talk to the country about the issues of the time on a periodic basis, so that they may count regularly on hearing from him not just at times of crisis but under circumstances that will permit them to pull their chairs up to the television and listen to him explain to them about the problems of our aged, health problems, the problems of our youth and our cities in terms which they can understand and react to.

We have discussed the fireside chat format in the past and I gather that the ten o'clock meeting or the five o'clock meeting or the Saturday morning group or somebody doesn't think it's a very good idea. All I know is that there is considerable consumer demand out there in the field for this kind of thing.

As a variation on this, let me suggest that we think about this hunger or market demand in terms of regions. As Ed Harper pointed out to us in his analysis, the issue of support to parochial schools is a hot issue in limited areas. The issue of the problems of the aged is almost completely confined to 8 or 9 states. The farm problem is obviously localized. Perhaps there is a regional approach to this fireside chat idea that would prevent the President from becoming over-exposed nationwide and would avoid whatever disadvantages are inherent in such over-exposure.

Something like this would have to be started before campaigning begins in earnest and I know the equal time problem exists, but I also know there is a very strong pull for this among people who are thinking about the Presidency and about the nation's problems.

#### Personal Appearances

Aside from the fact that it prevents the press from writing that the President is ducking the people, I don't know that there's a great deal of advantage in personal appearances during the campaign. We've always been very big for rallies, crowd shots, motorcades and balloons but I really seriously question whether they are in any way important for an incumbent President. It may be that we need some bandwagon psychology but I wouldn't think so. There are obvious tolerance maximums in terms of the use of television, but I think those limitations are perhaps limitations on campaigning generally then, since I think the idea of the President getting out and whistle stopping or stumping the nation is doubtful.

#### New Hampshire

I think I would stay completely away from New Hampshire under the circumstances. McCloskey may do better than anyone thinks at this time simply because he is effective up close and can be expected to make substantial inroads in the meager population of that state by an intensive hand-shaking and coffee hour campaign. I would think it's safer simply to take the position that New Hampshire has little or no significance in terms of the Republican nomination. It happens to be the first primary but somebody had to be first and it doesn't stand for anything. We might even play up McCloskey's obvious advantage in being able to devote unlimited time to hand-shaking in New Hampshire while the President is busy saving the world. McCloskey's absentee record might be emphasized and our chairman up there might make the point that it's more important for the President to be hard at work in the White House than up in New Hampshire trying to tilt for delegates with some unknown Congressman. If we write it off now, we don't have to apologize for any results later, assuming we can bring it off.

### Trips into the Country

I would subscribe to John Whitaker's proposal for more issue-oriented trips and fewer rallies. I don't think I would go quite as far as he in degree but I think he has the right idea. He forgets to make the point that most of these issues are regional in character and we can pretty well localize our attack on an issue with some intelligent analysis. But he is certainly right that trips should be taken to discuss problems.

### Running as an out

I think John Connally is right that the President has to run as an out, against the status quo, rather than as a defender of the status quo. There are simply too many unfulfilled proposals, too many unsolved problems, too many unsatisfied needs and wants as demonstrated by the Harris poll. People don't like the way the country is going and the only way to respond to that discontent is to run against the conditions which they identify. You have to advocate change under such circumstances, rather than to run on a platform of accomplishment.

If it's skillfully done, the President can attack his Senator opponent on the ground that he, the member of Congress, is the defender of the status quo since the Congress wouldn't change things even though the President wanted them to. The Senator perpetuated pollution, he perpetuated poverty, he perpetuated the conditions in the cities which might have been solved by revenue sharing, etc.

### The Catholic Vote

We are operating under a set of assumptions about the Catholic vote that I suspect are totally invalid. You have seen Roy Morey's preliminary analysis and Pat Buchanan's seat-of-the-pants emotional response. I took the position with Buchanan that Morey had made the prima facie case and it was up to Buchanan to sustain his burden of proof and I am afraid Pat has not done so. He has told us with great fervor what he, Buchanan, believes but he has no answers for the statistics and polls which indicate the contrary. Because a strongly pro-Catholic position on some issues costs us votes (as shown by the polls) in the border states and the South, and we are relying on those areas as part of our base of support, we had better be very sure of the validity of our assumptions on this subject before we go much farther.

## The Environment

A somewhat kindred subject is that of the electoral effect of the environmental issue. There is an instinctive distrust of this issue by the President. Yet the polls tell us very clearly that it is a highly important issue and everything that we can develop on an objective basis tells us over and over again that it is motivating and significant. If I read the Harris poll correctly (and it would seem inescapable to me on the basis of this poll) people don't want "balance" between the environment and the economy. We know that balance is right, makes good sense from the standpoint of the future of the country, has to be an important consideration in the things we do around here, but it will turn off the environmentally oriented voter. And here we are talking about broadening our base. It's the young, the women, the middle bracket wage earner who is concerned about pollution in overwhelming numbers.

Now, whether we like it or not, and whether the President agrees emotionally with the evidence or not, I think we have to be realistic about this issue and begin to act more politically about it.

On both these points, what I wish to argue is that we are making emotional responses to these two issues. Rather, we have to be cold, calculating and thoroughly political in our analysis of the issues and how to treat them.

## Labor

I'm of two minds on this issue and I don't quite know what to suggest. We need to know a lot more about the situation than we do. We would like to think that we can make inroads into the labor vote; we would like to think we can even pick up some labor leaders at the margin who will help us. But we are under heavy attack by our friends at the moment for being soft on labor, for having sold out to labor on Phase II, for having tolerated wage increases and strikes to the serious damage of business and the nation and, in effect, for being "dupes" who have been taken into camp by labor, largely on a bluff.

In a minute I am going to mention credibility. We are telling people not to worry about the China trip and the Russia trip because the President is tough, he's able to handle them, he won't be taken in by them and they can't bluff him. It is being argued that our labor record makes these assertions incredible.

#### The President or the politician?

To be reelected the President must attract the support of people who are not party Republicans. The campaign must be inclusive rather than exclusive. It must bring to him people who are attracted by that extra ingredient rather than by the former Senator from California. In other words, everyone knows that the President is a consummate politician and frequently does things for political reasons. They often assign political reasons to things done for non-political reasons. There's a sort of rebuttable presumption that everything the President does is done for political reasons.

My thesis is that he will attract additional support if his campaign is essentially Presidential and not political. The closer we get to election day the harder it will be not to be political; not to say and do the purely political thing, to drop the Presidential mantle and wade into the fray at the level of the lowest common denominator. Yet I think that the strategy can be that of the front runner which was so successfully employed in the weeks just before the 1968 convention.

#### Credibility

In thinking about vulnerability, this has to be an avenue that we should be concerned about. McCloskey is already playing this tune in New Hampshire, to what effect I don't know. I think many people want to believe that their government officials are trying to pull a fast one, trying to slide one by them, trying to get away with something, etc.

I think each time Chuck Colson is caught at one of his escapades or the Defense Department is nailed on a North Vietnamese pipeline exhibit or we attempt to excuse some indefensible mistake by a subordinate we lose some people that we otherwise could have won. There's no doubt that we're going to be attacked as dishonest and incredible and I think we have to lean over backward to avoid creating grounds or even the appearance of grounds for these attacks.

I think the Bureau of Labor Statistics effort, while right, is going to cost us in the long run on this score. We're going to have the same trouble in punishing or firing those guilty of leaking. Suppression of the truth comes under the general heading of incredibility. This is a problem we're going to have to deal with on an almost daily basis, making the best judgment calls we can but always keeping in mind the overall problem.

Perhaps under this general heading comes the Justice Department and some of its activities lately.

#### The Law and Order Issue

The nationwide crime statistics for the last three years have not been very good. On the other hand, Washington, D. C.'s record has been excellent, given all the problems of this place. In truth, the difference is that we have poured an unbelievable amount of money into law enforcement in the District and it is governed by a dictatorship rather than an elected Mayor and City Council. We've been able to do a lot of things in the management of the city government that the electorate would never have stood for if they had had any say in it. And it's gotten results.

I'm not sure how this issue can be handled in the coming campaign. I suppose one approach would be to point with pride at the city we have responsibility for and say that big city Democrat Mayors could do the same thing if they were as good as we are. And we can say that we've been trying to send more money to the cities in the form of revenue sharing but the Congress wouldn't let us. But all in all it is not a good national record and we're going to be on the defensive in this area and we'd better start laying some plans right now for meeting the political onslaught. There is no sign that the statistics are going to get any better in the coming year.

Civil Rights

There is going to be a major political offensive against us in the civil rights area and we will have a separate report coming to the President within a couple of weeks as to the dimension of this problem and the directions that the attacks probably will take.

This memorandum started out to be general and ended up being specific on certain issues. Going back to the general, I think that the President should "declare peace" at the start of his campaign, say that the Vietnam war is at an end as he promised it would be, that the country is emerging into an era of peace and prosperity and that we have come through the dark night (please, not nightmare) with the President's firm hand on the helm. Many, many problems remain to be solved but now we're in a position to attack them with the same leadership, vision and courage that has been displayed in bringing us through the problems of war and recession.

To earn a generation of peace many international problems are yet to be tackled and it's a very bad time to be thinking about changing Administrations, particularly when such a good start has been made by the incumbent President.

We don't try and defend the domestic status quo; we urge that it be changed and we run against the failures of the Congress (the Democratic nominee almost surely coming from that body).

I apologize for the rambling nature of the memorandum but we'll try and organize this subject matter better for you in succeeding notes.

John D. Ehrlichman