

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	36	6/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: plan to 'nail McGovern to the wall on his welfare scheme.' 8 pgs.
47	36	6/20/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: Michael Harrington and Irving Howe. 2 pgs.
47	36	6/19/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: attacking McGovern. 5 pgs.
47	36	6/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Draft report from Khachigian RE: McGovern. 25 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	36	6/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: the "McGovern Market." 1 pg.
47	36	6/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Colson RE: material on the Wallace Convention. 2 pgs.
47	36	6/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: tarring McGovern terming him an 'extremist' and not a 'radical.' 3 pgs.

**DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]**

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 135]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Mc Govern & welfare, with attached draft copy	6/28/72	C (mit)
N-2 [Doc 136]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Michael Harrington & Dwight Howe	6/20/72	C (mit)
N-3 [Doc 209]	Memo	Draft copy of N-2, attached to N-2 case file	6/20/72	C (mit)
N-4 [Doc 137]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Mc Govern hatchet work, with attached draft copy	6/19/72	C (mit)
N-5 [Doc 138] [Doc 139] [Doc 210] [Doc 140]	Memo	Buchanan/Khachigian to Holdeman, re: Response to HRCI memo of June 12, 1972 <u>attachments:</u> 1) Memo, Khachigian to Holdeman re: Response to HRCI memo of 6/12/72, 6/16/72 2) memo draft of attachment #1, 6/16/72 3) memo, Holdeman to Buchanan, re: Buchanan memo of June 8th, 6/12/72	6/18/72	C (mit)
N-6 [Doc 141]	article	"Is He or Isn't He?" - Cover page, " & First you say you do..." with attached draft copy	6/13/72	C (mit)
N-7 [Doc 142]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: "Mc Govern market"	6/13/72	C (mit)

FILE GROUP TITLE

**KEN KHACHIGIAN**

BOX NUMBER

6

FOLDER TITLE

June [1972]

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.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

P. 2

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-8 [Doc 143]	Memo	Khachigian to Colson, re: Wallace Convention, with attached draft copy	6/13/72	C (copy)
N-9 [Doc 144]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: McGovern + three big issues, with attached draft copy		
N-10 [Doc 145]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: McGovern extremism, with attached draft copy	6/9/72	C (copy)
N-11 [Doc 146]	Memo	Buchanan to Cook, re: Defense Dept + McGovern, with attached draft copy	6/6/72	C (copy)

FILE GROUP TITLE: **KEN KHACHIGIAN**      BOX NUMBER: **6**

FOLDER TITLE: *June [1972]*

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:** 6

**Folder:** June [1972]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	
135	Return	Private/Political
136	Return	Private/Political
137	Return	Private/Political
138	Retain	Open
139	Retain	Open
140	Retain	Open
141	Return	Private/Political
142	Return	Private/Political
143	Return	Private/Political
144	Retain	Open
145	Return	Private/Political
146	Retain	Open
209	Return	Private/Political
210	Retain	Open

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

It was requested that we come up with a plan between now and the Democratic National Convention to nail McGovern to the wall on his welfare scheme. What follows is the outline of that plan -- specifics will come later.

The important point is that McGovern is going to change his plan right after the Democratic National Convention. We know he is planning it, and he has already laid the groundwork. Thus, our immediate strategy is to tar him every conceivable way on his \$1000 bonus so that his manner of rehabilitation is not in the least bit comfortable. Moreover, we should also predict that he is going to change his plan and that he will do so after the convention.

These points should be uppermost in the criticism of the McGovern proposal:

-- There is a \$1000 cash grant to every man, woman, and child in the country, regardless of need and with no work incentive at all.

-- This plan will expand the budget by \$210 billion.

-- This plan will put 210<sup>7</sup> billion people on "welfare."

-- This plan is an assault on the work ethic and removes from the American culture the idea that people should work for a living, not live on the largesse of the taxpayer.

-- This plan will cost exorbitant sums, will require a massive increase in taxes (or cause confiscatory taxation), will directly harm middle income people and will harm the families where man and wife are each holding jobs to help make ends meet.

-- Finally, it should be pointed out that McGovern himself does not know what his program would cost, has been totally irresponsible in trying to sell this to the public, and if this is any indication of a McGovern presidency, then God help us all.

Suggest that Javits be asked to be one of those on the warpath regarding the McGovern welfare giveaway. He did a good job during the Joint Economic Committee hearings, and he might be willing to do so again in a public forum. If he does, we should make our P. R. facilities available to him at 1701. Javits is also ranking minority member on Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Rockefeller would also be a good one to attack the plan. He could stick in his speech a classic line: "Ladies and gentlemen, Nelson Rockefeller appreciates the offer, but I don't think I need a \$1000 bill from George McGovern."

Richardson would be a credible source as HEW secretary, but it is thought that he would not receive very much press. Nevertheless, he should have our materials and be primed for response at press conferences. A hard-hitting speech insert should be prepared for him.

Governor Reagan, who is known for his opposition to welfare waste, would also be a good source. He should have the information with a Lyn Nofziger speech.

Ehrlichman is supposed to be out on the hustings next week, and he can be briefed to get out the line. All surrogates should have this information with appropriate suggested inserts provided for them.

Finally, the Veep should be asked to focus a major section of one of his speeches on ridiculing the McGovern plan. Emphasis on the wage-earner being taken to the cleaners to give \$1000 to every breathing person in the country.

Beginning Monday, the whole week must be orchestrated towards one goal, and that goal is to totally discredit the McGovern welfare plan. We should not have all our wad shot on one day -- it should dribble out each day with each spokesman making some news. If done correctly, by the end of the week, there will have been widespread coverage on the plan.

The following points are the ones we have to target in order to get the press to focus on them:

-- The plan means higher taxes for hard-pressed wage-earners.

-- It is a giveaway which will discourage work and create greater class conflict.

-- McGovern doesn't know how much it will cost and is being irresponsible in presenting it as he has.

-- In one of the greatest acts of political expediency in our history, McGovern is going to make a wholesale revision of his plan to trick the American people into thinking it is some panacea for their ills. He will do it after the Dem convention as a cynical gesture to get him out from under a subject that was over his head to begin with.

Our entire effort next week must be well-coordinated. There has got to be a press release handed out for every spokesman we have speaking on the subject. Efforts should be made to get on network television; radio actualities should be made available; the wire services should get copies of everything; columns should be planted.

Other points which can be made. People on Social Security would get less money than they are getting now because McGovern has not said what he would do with the present system. McGovern is going to do away with tax exemptions -- \$3,000 for a family of four -- without proving how this helps the taxpayer. People with higher incomes are going to suffer confiscatory taxation.

A fact sheet which extracts all the various versions of the McGovern welfare giveaway is now being prepared and should be ready by Friday. This will go out as a supplement for this outline, and will become the basis for our charges. The idea will be to show that the McGovern plan is so totally confused and misshapen that it will be the biggest fiscal and social disaster of any program that has ever come down the chutes. The plan, alternately, should be held up to derision and alarm. Without doing it explicitly, McGovern ought to be portrayed as a decent humane, nut.

6/28/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: EKN KHACHIGIAN

It was requested that we come up with a plan between now and the Democratic National Convention to nail McGovern to the wall on his welfare ~~scheme~~ <sup>scheme.</sup> What follows is the outline of that plan -- specifics will come later.

The important point is that McGovern is going to change his plan right after the Democratic National Convention. We know he is planning it, and he has already laid the groundwork ~~floating stories in the Post~~ and indicating on his Southern states ~~swing his intent to change it.~~ Thus, our immediate strategy is to tar him every conceivable way on his \$1000 bonus so that his manner of rehabilitation is not in the least bit comfortable. Moreover, we should also predict that he is going to change his plan and that he will do so after the convention.

These points should be uppermost in the criticism of the McGovern proposal:

-- There is a \$1000 cash grant to every man, woman, and child in the country, regardless of need and with no work incentive at all.

-- This plan will expand the budget by \$210 billion.

-- This plan will put 210 billion people on "welfare."

-- This plan is an assault on the ~~work~~ work ethic and removes from the American culture the idea that people should work for a living, not live ~~on~~ on the largesse of the taxpayer.

-- This plan will cost exorbitant sums, will require ~~the~~ a massive increase in taxes (or cause confiscatory taxation), will directly harm middle income people <sup>and</sup> will harm the families where man and wife are ~~each~~ each holding jobs to help make ends meet.

-- Finally, it should be ~~pointed~~ pointed out that McGovern himself does not ~~know~~ know what his program would cost, has been totally irresponsible in trying to ~~sell~~ sell this to the ~~public~~ public, and if ~~this~~ this is any indication of a McGovern presidency, then God help us all.

<sup>4</sup>  
Suggest that Javits be asked to be one of those on the warpath ~~regarding~~ regarding the McGovern welfare giveaway. He ~~did~~ did a good job during the ~~Joint Economic~~ Joint Economic Committee hearings, and he might be willing to do so again ~~in~~ in a public forum. If he does, we should make our P.R. facilities available to him at ~~1001~~ ~~1001~~ 1701. Javits is also ranking minority member on ~~Senate~~ <sup>the</sup> Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Rockefeller would also be a good one ~~to~~ <sup>to attack</sup> ~~and should~~  
~~take news on the issue.~~ <sup>the plan.</sup> He could stick in his speech a  
classic line: "Ladies and gentlemen, Nelson Rockefeller  
appreciates the offer, but I don't think I need a  
\$1000 bill from George McGovern."

Richardson would be a credible source as HEW secretary,  
but it ~~is~~ ~~thought~~ ~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~would~~ ~~not~~ ~~receive~~ ~~a~~ ~~great~~ ~~deal~~ ~~of~~ ~~press~~ ~~coverage~~  
<sup>very much press.</sup>  
~~largely~~ ~~because~~ ~~he~~ ~~is~~ ~~a~~ ~~somewhat~~ ~~bland~~ ~~figure.~~  
Nevertheless, he ~~should~~ have our materials and be  
primed for ~~a~~ response at ~~a~~ press conference ~~and~~ a hard-  
hitting speech insert <sup>should be prepared for him.</sup>

Governor Reagan, who is known for his opposition to  
welfare waste, would also be a good source. He should have  
the information with a Lyn Nofziger speech.

<sup>Ehr</sup>  
Alichman ~~is~~ ~~supposed~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~out~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~  
hustings next week, and he can be briefed to get out the  
line. All ~~surrogates~~ should have this information ~~with~~  
with appropriate suggested <sup>inserts</sup> ~~provided~~ for them.

Finally, the Veep should be asked to  
focus a major section of one of his  
speeches on ridiculing the McGovern  
plan. Emphasis on the wage-earner  
being taken to the cleaners to give  
\$1000 to every breathing person in the country.

Beginning Monday, the whole week must be orchestrated ~~to~~ towards one goal, and that goal is to ~~make~~ totally discredit the ~~McGovern~~ McGovern welfare plan. We should not have all our wad shot on one day -- it should ~~be~~ dribble out each day with each spokesman making some news. If done correctly, by the ~~the~~ end of the week, there ~~will~~ will have been widespread coverage on the plan.

The following points are the ~~the~~ ones we have to target in order to get the press to focus on them:

-- The plan means higher taxes for ~~hard-pressed~~ hard-pressed wage-earners.

-- It is a giveaway which will ~~encourage large families~~ *discourage work* and ~~discourage working~~ *and create greater class conflict*

-- McGovern ~~doesn't~~ doesn't know how much it will cost and is being irresponsible in presenting it as he has.

-- In one of the greatest acts of political expediency in our history, McGovern is going to make a wholesale revision of his plan to trick the American ~~people~~ people into thinking it is some panacea for their ills. He will do it after the Dem convention as a cynical gesture to get him out from ~~the~~ under a subject that was over his head to begin with.

Our entire effort next week must be well-coordinated. There has got to be a press release handed out for every spokesman we have speaking on the subject. Efforts should be made to get on ~~the~~ network television; radio actualities should

be ~~made~~ made available; *the wire services should get copies of everything; columns should be planted.*  
Other points which can be made. People on ~~the~~

Social Security would get less money than they are getting ~~now~~ now because McGovern has ~~not~~ not said what he would do with the present system. McGovern is going to do away with ~~the~~ tax ~~exemptions~~ exemptions -- \$3,000 for a family of four -- without ~~proving~~ proving how this helps the ~~taxpayer~~ taxpayer. People with higher ~~incomes~~ incomes are going to suffer confiscatory taxation.

A fact sheet which extracts all the various versions of the McGovern welfare giveaway is now being prepared and should be ready by Friday. This will go out as a supplement ~~for~~ <sup>this</sup> ~~outline~~ outline, and will become the basis for our charges. The idea will be to show that the McGovern plan is so totally confused and misshapen that it will be the biggest fiscal and social disaster of any program that has ~~ever~~ ever ~~come~~ come down the chutes. ~~the~~ The

*plan, alternately, should be held up to derision and alarm. Without ~~doing~~ doing it explicitly, McGovern ought to be portrayed as a decent, humane, nut.*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 20, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

You might not have seen this letter in the New York Times from the pre-eminent Socialist Michael Harrington and his fellow traveler Irving Howe. Though they make clear that McGovern is not a socialist, they go on to express great pleasure at "a significant extension of the welfare state." And, "That is where McGovern has taken a series of excellent, if sometimes not sufficiently precise, stands . . . ."

"That is why we, . . . support his candidacy."

Come this fall, it will be nice to send out the headlines -- "Socialist Leaders Endorse McGovern -- Believe his Plans for "Significant Extension" of Welfare State "Excellent." If McGovern is making the socialists happy, he must be doing something wrong.

6/20/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

You might not have seen this letter in the New York Times from the pre-eminent Socialist Michael Harrington and his fellow traveler Irving Howe. Though they make clear that McGovern is not a socialist, they go on to express great pleasure at "a significant extension of the welfare state." And, "That is where McGovern has taken a series of excellent, if sometimes not sufficiently precise, stands: . . ."

"That is why we, . . . support his candidacy."

Come this fall, it will be nice to send out the headlines -- "Socialist Leaders Endorse McGovern -- Believe his Plans For "Significant Extension" of Welfare State "Excellent." If McGovern is making the socialists happy, he must be doing something wrong.

P. Keep original of article for  
our files - drcG Ext. 4  
copy of memo attached on  
back - also check  
PJB file.  
K.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 19, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

McGovern knows damn good and well that we have enough material on him to sink a battleship. He also knows that we won't be afraid to use this information, and that it will damage him highly. Thus, his strategy will be, among other things, to obfuscate the issues around personality. To wit, he and his people will try to shrug off the attacks by yelling "smear," "hatchet job," "Tricky Dick" -- the works.

This has already been promised by Mankiewicz and the first evidence of it came over the weekend. After Herb Stein's low-keyed assault on the McGovern tax and welfare schemes, McGovern released a statement saying the following about the Stein appraisal:

"He called the attack 'the opening shot of this year's campaign against me,' and said: 'Nixon obviously realizes that this year's Presidential campaign is going to be waged primarily over the rampant unemployment, inflation, economic uncertainty and favoritism which now burden this country.'

"The attack, he said, 'tipped his (Nixon's) hand that he is going to try to cover up with the kind of political hatchet work which has characterized every campaign he has ever run.' " New York Times 6/19/72

This has been an enormously successful tool of the Democrats, and they will use it with gusto. I have some suggestions to counter it.

-- We have to start, very soon, using the very same tactic. I. e., we need to have our people accuse McGovern of doing hatchet work, accuse him of divisiveness, of polarization -- and we have the quotes to back it up. Our use of this should be relentless in order not to let McGovern get away with using it first. There is no reason why we shouldn't be the "hurt" party. It didn't do RN any damage in 1966.

-- As soon as things begin in earnest, any time McGovern makes national news with such accusations, we ought to be right on top of it and have Scott, Rockefeller, and others try to get on t.v. immediately refuting it -- backed up with some well-documented examples of McGovern demagoguery.

-- This whole business reinforces the necessity that our attacks be not at all strident, but simply factual. The only thing McGovern will be smeared with is hard fact.

-- Finally, let's hold in reserve to the very end of the campaign the possibility of a major speech by RN -- only if the election appears to be close and only if the smear argument seems to be catching. That speech would be a point by point refutation (Checkers style) of the McGovern argument -- one which catalogues the whole series of smears against the President (this is being compiled by Research, as you know). Let's not jump the gun on this one, but let's hold the idea in reserve if needed.

6/19/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

McGovern knows damn good and well that we have enough material on him to sink a battleship. He also knows that we won't be afraid to use this information, and that it will damage him highly. Thus, his strategy will be, among other things, to obfuscate the issues around personality. To wit, he and his people will try to shrug <sup>off</sup> the attacks by yelling "smear," "hatchet job," "Tricky Dick" -- the works.

This has already been promised by Mankiewicz and the first evidence of it came over the weekend. After Herb Stein's low-keyed assault on the McGovern tax and welfare schemes, McGovern released a statement saying the following about the Stein appraisal:

"He called the attack 'the opening shot of this year's campaign against me,' and said: 'Nixon obviously realizes that this year's Presidential campaign is going to be waged primarily over the rampant unemployment, inflation, economic uncertainty and favoritism which now burden this country.'

"The attack, he said, 'tipped his (Nixon's) hand that he is going to try to cover up with the kind of political hatchet work which has characterized every campaign he has ever run.'" *N.Y. Times 6/19/72*

*has been an*  
This ~~is~~ enormously successful tool of the Democrats,  
and they will use it with gusto. I have some suggestions  
to counter it:

using  
-- We have to start, very soon, the very same tactic. I.e.,  
we need to have our people accuse McGovern of doing hatchet  
work, accusing ~~him~~ <sup>e</sup> him of ~~that~~ divisiveness, of polarization --  
and we have the quotes to back it up. Our use of this  
should be relentless in order not to let McGovern get away  
with using it first. There is no reason why we shouldn't be  
the "hurt" party. It didn't do RN any damage in 1966.

-- As soon as things begin in earnest, any time McGovern  
~~is~~ makes ~~the~~ national news with such accusations, we ought  
to be right on top of it and have Scott, Rockefeller, and  
others try to get on t.v. immediately refuting it -- ~~we~~ backed  
up with some well-documented examples of ~~the~~ McGovern demagogy.

-- This whole business reinforces the necessity that  
our attacks be not at all strident, but simply factual. The  
only thing McGovern will be smeared with is ~~the~~  
hard fact.

-- Finally, let's hold in reserve to the very end of  
the campaign <sup>?</sup> the possibility of a major speech by RN -- only  
if the election appears to be close and only if the smear  
argument seems to be catching. That speech would be a point  
by point refutation (Checkers style) of the McGovern argument --

One which [REDACTED] catalogues the [REDACTED] whole series of smears against the President (this is being [REDACTED] compiled by Research, as you know). Let's not jump the gun on this one, but [REDACTED] let's hold the idea in reserve if needed.

"First you say you do, and then you don't;

Then you say you will, and then you won't. . . ."

From the lyrics of "Undecided"

IS HE OR ISN'T HE?

It is clear by now that many of the major media in America are going to give George McGovern a free ride in his quest for the Presidency of the United States. Not only will George McGovern race as rapidly as he can from the left to the middle, but a sympathetic press is already leading interference for him.

In one of the most candid appraisals ever made by a newspaperman, the respected political reporter Godfrey Sperling, Jr., said in the Christian Science Monitor:

"Reader beware. A love affair between a number of newsmen and George McGovern is bursting into full bloom and even though we are talking -- by and large -- about tough-minded, professional observers, this congenial relationship is bound to affect their copy.

"In fact, in this reporter's judgment, it already has."

Sperling's observation is documented by the thousands of words that are now being written about Senator McGovern to the effect that he is not so radical as he appears or that he is not really as extreme as he sounds.

In May, before the "McGovern Phenomonon" had struck responsive chords in the liberal establishment, the New York Times was raising storm warnings against McGovern's extreme economic proposals saying:

". . . too sudden and drastic a shift to income redistribution might actually intensify other problems such as unemployment and lagging productivity. The link between corporate profits, investments and jobs is vital.

"Similarly, his welfare proposals. . . would be extremely costly. . . .

". . . And Senator McGovern must be prepared to demonstrate how cutting the defense budget by \$32 billion in three years -- virtually 40 percent -- can be carried through without endangering national security."

Twenty-four hours after the final votes from California were tabulated, the Times was less certain about how it perceived McGovern's positions, referring to them merely as "hazy" and "controversial." Never mind that giving every man, woman, and child in the United States one thousand dollars is far from "hazy" and much worse than "controversial."

Finally, after realizing that Senator McGovern may be its only hope of sending the President into early retirement, three days later the Times was positively excited about letting McGovern slide away from his extremist positions toward what it referred to as the "vital center." Said the Times:

"It implies no surrender of principles for realistic leadership to recognize that compromise is at the heart of politics, especially in such a vast, heterogeneous society as the United States. If Senator McGovern is to become his party's nominee, and prove himself a viable candidate in the fall, his task is to show that he would be sensitive and responsive to the diverse elements in the national community in shaping the inevitable legislative compromises."

The Times had come full circle. The signal to George was essentially that it would "allow" him to move away from his extremist positions and not accuse him (as it with relish often does of President Nixon) of political expediency.

And if the New York Times be there, can the Washington Post be far behind? The Post allowed as though McGovern would be forgiven if his far-out defense, welfare and tax schemes underwent "reconsideration and rearrangement." Mr. McGovern "would be the first to concede that he should not be wedded to programs that do not squarely address the conditions they purport to." The Post further observed that those political commentators who criticized McGovern for "trimming and expediency" were just engaging in "gloating wisecrack remarks." Those are clear code words of warning that the press dare not hold the South Dakota Senator up to his own pious standards of honesty and candor.

Much of what the media has done in relation to George McGovern is subtle -- obviously avoiding overt expressions of their preference for the left-liberal line of McGovern. In Sperling's words "they are slow to give him the same kind of 'hard time' on his programs that they would give almost any other candidate." This subtlety is in full operation at Newsweek where McGovern's scrambling is referred to as "a practical politician's game of nuance and emphasis."

Newsweek also said of the Senator: "He is clearly ~~permissive~~ permissive on the issues of marijuana and abortion but has not come out for full legalization of either." But in fact McGovern has come out for the full legalization of both, but in both instances he has taken contrary positions after the fact without publicly acknowledging his more permissive statements (which have certainly not hurt him among radical campus and women's lib groups). McGovern may not now advocate legal pot and open abortion, but he sure did a few short months ago. The media's refusal to clearly delineate the candidate's thinking is more proof of their inclination to give him a helpful boost.

After the California primary, Newsweek devoted a front page story to Mr. McGovern one basic purpose of which was to knock down the idea that he is a radical. In the days when the McGovern juggernaut was only a gleam in the New Left's eye, Newsweek had this to say: "An open liberal-leftist since his days as a South Dakota history professor,

McGovern is perhaps the closest thing to an ideological radical in the U. S. Senate." Only two months later in a sympathetic assessment, Newsweek was saying that McGovern's campaign was "hardly the mark of a radical candidate."

In that same June 19, 1972 issue of Newsweek, the magazine suggested McGovern's far-out share-the-wealth welfare scheme was not very different -- except in dollar amounts -- from the President's welfare reform program. This nonsense was passed off as the truth. Yet Mr. McGovern's plan is to give everyone \$1000 with no questions asked and no work requirement -- \$4000 for a family of four. President Nixon's is \$2600 for a family of four -- and only to those families who have proved their need and only with stiff work requirements which encourage people to get off welfare, not stay on. Congressman Mills suggests that the McGovern proposal would cost nearly \$70 billion while the Family Assistance Plan would cost a mere fraction of that. Yet here is Newsweek trying to draw the comparison to make George McGovern look more like Richard Nixon and less like Karl Marx.

Newsweek also refers to McGovern in the most glowing terms as a man who came back from the war "nursing an idealistic sense of social injustice and the need for international reconciliation;" as a man who only "flirted" with the Communist-infiltrated Progressive Party of Henry Wallace (when McGovern was ~~an ardent supporter~~ actually an ardent supporter and attended its convention); as a man

whose values -- "candor integrity, hard work -- are old-fashioned and Biblical, a heritage from his Methodist-minister father." Why old George isn't a radical after all -- he only seems like one! What's more (and please understand the implicit comparison) his "rhetorical style is uninflamatory." Is this the same man who said: "I think the re-election of Richard Nixon in 1972 would be an open hunting right for this man to give in to all his impulses for a major war against the people of Indochina." Or the man who said: "Every Senator in this Chamber (the U. S. Senate) is partly responsible for sending 50,000 young Americans to an early grave. This Chamber reeks of blood." Or the man who said (in 1964): "I regard Mr. Goldwater as the most unstable radical and extremist ever to run for the Presidency in either political party." This is the same McGovern who boasts: "I have sought not to whip up emotions but to appeal to humanity and reason."

In what appears to be a contest, Time magazine has also done its share of covering up the stale extremist tracks of George McGovern. Time refers to the Senator's "sometime endorsement of the \$6,500 income guarantee for a family of four" which would cost \$72 billion and put 104 million people on welfare. Of course it is not a "sometime" endorsement -- it is a flat endorsement, and McGovern has twice endorsed this proposal while also introducing it in the Senate of the United States. But Time's effort is to make it appear to be a half-hearted embrace.

In the Christian Science Monitor, one of Mr. Sperling's colleagues writes a front page article which would have profited from Mr. Sperling's warnings. The author, Richard L. Strout, who is also the "TRB" of the left-wing New Republic, admits that Mr. McGovern's "economic proposals are perhaps as radical as any made by a leading contender for the presidency since William Jennings Bryan." But later he observes that "Mr. McGovern does not look like a radical. His simple, cool and almost dull delivery makes proposals that are essentially startling seem almost commonplace." Mr. Strout's observation is of course S.O.P. for what will come in the next few months; i. e., "this guy is just too nice a guy to turn the country upside down."

Other columnists and pundits are playing the same game. Tom Wicker of the New York Times is now telling Hubert Humphrey to get out of the race: "So the path of real statesmanship for Hubert Humphrey -- as well as for Edmund Muskie and Edward Kennedy, . . . may well be withdrawal from the race and a solid endorsement for Mr. McGovern." Wicker also points out that because Mr. McGovern "has shown himself nothing if not an astute politician" he can allay the fears of radicalism if his fellow Democrats can get behind him. We can hide anything behind unity, can't we Tom?

Joseph Kraft, who falls not far behind Tom Wicker in his obeisance to the liberal establishment line is also pounding the keys in order to assist McGovern cover up his extremist positions. On the day of the California primary, Kraft was saying: "He is calm, well-spoken and sure of himself. He does not evoke old themes or past glories or tired rhetoric. Right or wrong, he has specific programs to meet concrete difficulties."

Two days later, Kraft knew he might be speaking about the next Democratic party nominee for President, and so he set out to help him. After confessing that the Senator's tax proposals were "insufficiently sensitive to the delicate nature of confidence in the American economy" and that McGovern's approach to foreign policy and defense problems "seems to me to want a certain discrimination," he then delivered the saying grace:

"Still, these are details. The critical point is to get the United States moving in the right direction, and the right direction is not much in doubt."

". . . His tax proposals may not be perfect, but they will certainly set in motion a redistribution of income."

Thus, Kraft counsels, we need not worry about the minor "details" of what McGovern says. The direction is "right." Later, Kraft continued his counsel in another column, asking: ". . . by what right would they (McGovern's opponents). or any dark dark

horse, take the nomination away from Senator McGovern?" The nomination "cannot fairly be denied him by just a snapping of fingers." And as if to make sure McGovern won't be tarnished by a radical image, Kraft advises that his "rough edges" can be "planed away by a more centrist platform and running mate." Kraft has made clear that he is there to help McGovern rehabilitate himself.

McGovern gets help from other sources as well. The "love affair" of which Mr. Sperling speaks is more than apparent in the writings of a rhapsodic Mary McGrory, who suggests that George McGovern is "the master of a new Camelot." She feels that with McGovern "the government might become rational and human again, as it was in John Kennedy's day."

McGovern will continue to get these breaks from the members of the press because it is apparent that they agree with much of what he is saying. But knowing that his extremist positions will get him in trouble with an electorate which does not find itself comfortable with welfare giveaways, tax confiscation, and unconditional amnesty, these reporters are going to do what they can to engage in the biggest political cover-up in history. There will be little of the honest assessment which the Wall Street Journal gave to George McGovern's intentions to escape unpopular positions:

" . . . it really would be nice if we could be spared all that talk so dear to those devoted partisans -- all the stuff about how other politicians are slippery but Senator McGovern is consistent, about how all the rest are deceivers and only he is truthful. "

There is not much question that the media are going to do their best to help George McGovern hide those postures on the left-wing fringe of American politics. Few members of the opinion-making community will say anything to hurt the so-called "Prairie Populist. " Thus far, no major television network, with the ability the networks have to reach nightly into millions of homes, has laid bare the facts on McGovern's extremism. They would prefer, it seems, to save up all their investigative reporting for the Nixon Administration. As Sperling put it: ". . . McGovern has pretty much been given a 'free ride' from the press" on his radical proposals and that there is a "new political reality: George McGovern has become the new 'sweetheart' of the liberals. "

Concluding this rare and honest appraisal, Sperling writes:

"But, as of now, I would say that many of those newsmen who accompany McGovern along the campaign trail have already let their bias show through -- not so much by what they have written about McGovern but by what they have not written about him and his programs. Their omissions tell a great deal. "

This bias will continue in all likelihood with McGovern getting a fresh break to get him over each crisis. And finally, most sadly, we may have in 1972 the same unfortunate situation of 1960 where reporters wore their emotions on their sleeves and did little to hide their preference for one candidate over another. Theodore White recorded this phenomenon in his book, "The Making of the President -- 1960:"

"By the last weeks of the campaign, those forty or fifty national correspondents who had followed Kennedy since the beginning of his electoral exertions into the November days had become more than a press corps -- they had become his friends, and, some of them, his most devoted admirers. When the bus or the plane rolled or flew through the night, they sang songs of their own composition about Mr. Nixon and the Republicans in chorus with the Kennedy staff and felt that they, too, were marching like soldiers of the Lord to the New Frontier."

"First you say you do, and then you don't;

Then you say you will, and then you won't. . . ."

From the lyrics of "Undecided"

IS HE OR ISN'T HE?

It is clear by now that <sup>many</sup> ~~a goodly portion~~ of the major media in America <sup>are</sup> going to give George McGovern a free ride in his quest for the Presidency of the United States. Not only will George McGovern race ~~as~~ rapidly as he can from the left to the middle, but a sympathetic press is already leading interference for him ~~though few will admit it.~~

In one of the most candid appraisals ever made by ~~a~~ a newspaperman, the respected political ~~reporter~~ <sup>reporter</sup>, Godfrey Sperling Jr., said in the Christian Science Monitor:

"Reader beware. A love affair between a number of newsmen and George McGovern is bursting into full bloom and even though we are talking -- by and large -- about tough-minded, professional observers, this congenial relationship is bound to affect their copy."

"In fact, in this reporter's judgment, it already has."

Sperling's observation is documented by the thousands of words that are now being written about Senator McGovern to the effect ~~is~~ that he is not so radical as he appears or that he is not really <sup>as</sup> ~~an~~ extremist <sup>as he sounds.</sup>

In May, before the "McGovern Phenomonon" had struck responsive chords in the liberal establishment, the New York Times was raising storm warnings against McGovern's extreme economic proposals saying:

". . . too sudden and drastic a shift to income redistribution might actually intensify other problems such as unemployment and lagging productivity. The link between corporate profits, investments and jobs is vital.

"Similarly, his welfare proposals. . . would be extremely costly. . . .

". . . And Senator McGovern must be prepared to demonstrate how cutting the defense budget by \$32 billion in three years -- virtually 40 percent-- can be carried through without endangering national security."

Twenty-four hours after the final votes from California were tabulated, the Times was less certain about how <sup>it</sup> perceived McGovern's positions, referring to them merely as "hazy" and "controversial." Never mind that giving every man, woman, and child in the United States one thousand dollars is far from "hazy" and much worse than "controversial."

Finally, after realizing that Senator McGovern may

be its only hope of sending the President into early  
three days later  
retirement, /the Times was positively excited about letting  
McGovern slide away from his extremist positions toward  
what <sup>it</sup> referred to as the "vital center." Said the  
Times:

"It implies no surrender of principles for  
realistic leadership to recognize that compromise  
is at the heart of politics, especially in such a  
vast, heterogeneous society as the United States. If  
Senator McGovern is to become his party's nominee,  
and prove himself a viable candidate in the fall, his task  
is to show that he would be sensitive and responsive  
to the diverse elements in the national community in  
shaping the inevitable legislative compromises."

The Times had come full circle. The signal to George  
was essentially that <sup>it</sup> would "allow" him to move away  
from his extremist positions and not accuse him (as <sup>it</sup>  
with relish often do<sup>s</sup> of President Nixon) of political  
expediency.

And if the ~~Times~~ New York Times be there, can the  
Washington Post be far behind? The Post allowed as though  
McGovern would be forgiven if his far-out defense,  
welfare and tax schemes underwent "reconsideration and  
rearrangement." Mr. McGovern ~~would~~ "would be the  
first to concede that he should not be wedded to programs

that do not squarely address the conditions they purport to." The Post <sup>(further observed)</sup> that those political commentators who criticized McGovern for "trimming and expediency" were just engaging in "gloating wisecracking remarks." Those are clear code words of warning that the press dare not hold the South Dakota Senator up to his own pious standards of honesty and candor.

Much of what the media has done in relation to George McGovern is subtle -- obviously avoiding overt expressions of their preference for the left-liberal line of McGovern. In Sperling's words "they are slow to give him the same kind of 'hard time' on his programs that they would give almost any other candidate." This subtlety <sup>(C.P.)</sup> is in full operation at Newsweek where McGovern's scrambling is referred to as "a practical politician's game of nuance and emphasis."

Newsweek also said of the Senator: "He is clearly permissive on the issues of marijuana and abortion but has not come out for full legalization of either." But in fact McGovern has come out for the full legalization of both, but in both instances he has taken contrary positions after the fact without publicly acknowledging his more permissive statements (which have certainly not hurt him among radical campus and women's lib groups). McGovern may not now advocate legal pot and <sup>open</sup> abortion, but he sure did

a few short months ago. The media's refusal to clearly delineate the candidate's thinking is more ~~off~~ ~~off~~ proof of ~~the~~ their inclination to give him a helpful boost.

After the California primary, Newsweek devoted a front page story to Mr. McGovern one ~~purpose~~ <sup>basic</sup> purpose of which ~~was~~ was to knock down the idea that he ~~was~~ is a radical. In the days when the McGovern juggernaut was only a gleam in the New Left's eye, Newsweek had this to say: ~~McGovern~~ "An open liberal-leftist since his days as a South Dakota history professor, McGovern is perhaps the closest thing to an ideological radical in the U.S. Senate." Only two months later in a sympathetic assessment, Newsweek was saying that McGovern's campaign was "hardly the mark of a radical candidate."

In that same June 19, 1972 issue of Newsweek, the magazine suggested McGovern's far-out share-the-wealth welfare scheme was not very different -- except in dollar amounts -- from the President's welfare reform program. This nonsense was passed off as the truth. Yet Mr. McGovern's plan is to give everyone \$1000 with no questions asked and no work requirement -- \$4000 for a family of four. President Nixon's is \$2600 for a family of four -- and only to those families who have proved their need and only with stiff work requirements which encourage people to get off welfare, not stay on. ~~McGovern~~-Congressman Mills suggests that

the McGovern proposal

~~proposal~~ would cost nearly \$70 billion while the Family Assistance Plan would ~~cost~~ a mere fraction of that. Yet here is Newsweek trying to draw the comparison to make George McGovern look more like Richard Nixon and less like ~~Richard~~ Karl Marx.

Newsweek also refer<sup>s</sup> to McGovern in the most glowing terms as a man who came~~d~~ back from the war "nursing an idealistic sense of social injustice and the need for international reconciliation;" as a man who only "flirted" with the ~~the~~ Communist-infiltrated Progressive Party of Henry Wallace (when <sup>McGovern</sup> ~~he~~ was an ardent supporter and attended ~~VTS~~ <sup>actually</sup> convention); as a man whose values -- "candor integrity, hard work -- are old-fashioned and Biblical, a heritage from his Methodist-minister father." Why old George isn't a radical after all -- he only ~~was~~ <sup>seems</sup> like one! What's more (and please understand the implicit comparison) his ~~or~~ rhetorical style is uninflamatory." Is this the same man who said: "I think the re-election of Richard Nixon in 1972 would be an open hunting right for this man to give in to all his impu<sup>s</sup>ses for a major war against the people of Indochina." Or the man who said: "Every Senator in this Chamber (the ~~the~~ U.S. Senate) is partly responsible for sending 50,000 young Americans to an early grave. This Chamber reeks of blood." Or the man who said (in 1964): "I regard Mr. Goldwater as the most unstable radical and extremist

ever to run for the Presidency in either political party."  
This is the same McGovern who boasted: "I have sought  
not to whip up emotions but to appeal to humanity and  
reason."

In what appears to be a contest, Time magazine has  
also done its share of covering up the stale extremist  
tracks of George McGovern. Time refers to the Senator's  
"sometime endorsement of the \$6,500 income guarantee for  
a family of four" which would cost \$72 billion and put  
104 million people on welfare. Of course it is not a  
"sometime" endorsement -- it is a flat endorsement, and  
McGovern has twice endorsed this proposal while also intro-  
ducing it in the Senate of the United States. But Time's  
effort is to make it appear to be a half-hearted embrace.

In a period of five days in June the Christian Science  
editorially three times  
~~the~~ Monitor ~~has~~ succumbed to the temptation to ease  
up on McGovern.

In the Christian Science Monitor, one of Mr. Sperling's  
colleagues writes a front page article which would ~~have~~ have  
profited  
~~from~~/from Mr. Sperling's warnings. ~~The~~ The author,  
Richard L. Strout, who is also the "TRB" of the left-wing  
New Republic, admits that Mr. McGovern's "economic proposals  
are perhaps as radical as any made by a leading contender  
for the presidency since William Jennings Bryan." But later  
he observes that "Mr. McGovern does not look like a radical.



specific programs to meet concrete difficulties." <sup>9</sup> Two days later, Kraft knew he might be speaking about the next Democratic party nominee for President, and so he ~~set~~ set out to help him. After confessing that the Senator's tax proposals were "insufficiently sensitive to the delicate nature of confidence ~~in~~ in the American ~~economy~~ economy" and that McGovern's approach to foreign policy and defense ~~problems~~ problems "seems to me to want a certain discrimination," he then delivered the saving grace:

"Still, these are details. The critical point is to get the United States moving in the right direction, and the right direction is not much in doubt."

". . . His tax proposals may not be perfect, but they will certainly set in motion a redistribution of income."

Thus, Kraft counsels, we need not worry about the minor "details" of what McGovern says. The direction is "right." Later, Kraft continued his counsel in another column, asking: "By . . . by what right would they (McGovern's opponents), or any dark dark horse, take the nomination away from Senator McGovern?" The ~~nomination~~ nomination "cannot fairly ~~be~~ be ~~denied~~ denied him by just ~~a~~ a snapping of fingers." And as if to make sure ~~himself~~ McGovern won't be tarnished by a radical image, Kraft advises that his "rough edges"

can be "planned away By a more centrist platform and running mate." Kraft has made clear that he is there to help McGovern rehabilitate himself.

McGovern gets help from other sources as well. The "love affair" of which Mr. Sperling speaks is more than apparent in the writings of a rhapsodic Mary McGrory, who suggests that George McGovern is "the master of a new Camelot." She feels that with McGovern "the government might become rational and human again, as it was in John Kennedy's day."

McGovern will continue to get these breaks from the members of the press because it is apparent that they agree with much of what he is saying. But knowing that his extremist positions will get him in trouble with an electorate which does not find itself comfortable with welfare giveaways, tax confiscation, and unconditional amnesty, these reporters are going to do what they can to engage in the biggest political cover-up in history. There will be little of the honest assessment which the Wall Street Journal gave to George McGovern's intentions to escape unpopular positions:

". . . it really would be nice if we could be spared all that talk so dear to those devoted partisans -- all the stuff about how other politicians are slippery but Senator McGovern is consistent, about how all the

rest are deceivers and only he is truthful."

There is not much question that the media are going to do the <sup>N</sup> best to help George McGovern hide those postures on the left-wing fringe of American politics.

Few members of the ~~media~~ opinion-making community will <sup>say anything to</sup> hurt the ~~media~~ so-called ~~media~~ "Prairie Populist." Thus far, no major television network, with the ~~media~~ ability the networks have to ~~reach~~ reach nightly into millions of homes, has laid bare the ~~media~~ facts on McGovern's extremism. They would prefer, it seems, to save up all their ~~media~~ investigative reporting for the Nixon Administration. As Sperling put it: ". . . McGovern has pretty much been given a 'free ride' from the press" on his radical proposals and that there is a ~~media~~ "new political reality: George ~~Mc~~ McGovern has become the new 'sweetheart' of the liberals."

Concluding this rare <sup>(and)</sup> honest appraisal, Sperling writes:

"But, as of now, I would say that many of those newsmen who accompany McGovern along the campaign trail have already let their bias show through -- not so much by what they have ~~written~~ written about McGovern but by what they have not written about ~~him~~ and his programs. Their ~~media~~ omissions tell a great deal."

This bias will continue in all likelihood with McGovern getting a fresh break to get him over each crisis. And finally, most sadly, we may have in 1972 the same unfortunate situation of 1960 where reporters wore their emotions on their sleeves and did little to hide their preference for one candidate over another. Theodore White recorded this phenomenon in his book, "The Making of the President -- 1960:"

"By the last weeks of the campaign, those forty or fifty national correspondents who had followed Kennedy since the beginning of his electoral exertions into the November days had become more than a press corps -- they had become his friends, and, some of them, his most devoted admirers. When the bus or the plane rolled or flew through the night, they sang songs of their own composition about Mr. Nixon and the Republicans in chorus with the Kennedy staff and felt that they, too, were marching like soldiers of the Lord to the New Frontier."

Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 13, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN



Herewith a minor sample of the apprehension over the "McGovern Market." The stock market downturn of the week of the California primary has been attributed directly to McGovern in many quarters. It is likely that, should McGovern be nominated on July 12, the market is going to drop on July 13.

Your idea about getting Pierre Rinfret to allude to this in one of his newsletters is one approach. Also, as you suggested, the Kiplinger letter ought to pick this thing up. We should have 1701 watch for all these kinds of newsletters coming out of Wall Street, and at the appropriate time we should paste them up (with a classic Frank Leonard job) and get them out to the entire financial community in a direct mail operation. I would think that Maurice Stans would love to have this in his hand when he goes out looking for contributors.

The idea of stock market crash should McGovern be elected is something that should be freely talked about. Millions of voters are investors, directly or indirectly, and nothing would scare them more than the thought of a financial community collapse should George get in.

Attachment

Chen

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

June 13, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHUCK COLSON

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

Here is some of the material on the Wallace Convention. No proceedings were drawn up for the public record, and if they were, the Library of Congress doesn't have them. Other inquiries are now being made by Fred Fielding in order to see if McGovern made a speech at the convention.

The platform is attached plus the speeches given by Wallace and his runningmate. The relevant parts are marked up for those who want to extract the information.

Also attached is an analysis done by the Americans for Democratic Action (!) accusing Wallace of having Communists or Communist sympathizers in his camp. I would use it this way: The organization which endorsed McGovern in 1972 is as left-wing as they come. Yet, in 1948, when McGovern was ardently supporting Henry Wallace, even the ADA could not stomach the source of Wallace's support. There's a great deal of irony here. Maybe the ADA ought to be asked to rescind its support of McGovern inasmuch as he was in bed with the fellow the ADA had so much trouble with in 1948.

Attachment

6/13/72

MEMORANDUM FOR ~~CHUCK~~ CHUCK COLSON

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Here is some of the material on the ~~Wallace~~ Wallace ~~Convention~~ Convention. No proceedings were ~~drawn~~ drawn up for the public record, and if they ~~were~~ were, the Library of Congress doesn't have them. Other inquiries are now being made by Fred Fielding in order to see if McGovern made <sup>a speech</sup> ~~an appearance~~ at the convention.

The platform is attached plus the speeches given by Wallace and his ~~runningmate~~ runningmate. The relevant parts are marked up for those who want to extract the information.

Also attached is an analysis done by the Americans for Democratic Action (!) accusing Wallace of having Communists or Communist ~~sympathizers~~ sympathizers in his camp. I would use it this way: The organization ~~which~~ which endorsed McGovern in 1972 ~~is~~ is as left-wing as they come. Yet, in 1948, when McGovern was ardently supporting Henry Wallace, ~~the~~ even the ADA could not ~~stomach~~ stomach the source of Wallace's support. There's a great deal of irony here. Maybe the ADA ought to be asked to rescind its support of McGovern inasmuch as he was in bed with the fellow the ADA had so much trouble with in 1948.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 9, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

At the risk of being repetitive, let me be a bit more explicit concerning my thinking that the word to tar McGovern is "extremist" and not "radical."

"Radical" seems to be losing its connotation. It didn't help us a whole lot in 1970, and it has become somewhat fashionable to be "radical." Look at it this way; McGovern is asked if he is radical. He responds: "If it's radical to get poor people a fair share of the enormous economic wealth in America, then I plead guilty to being a radical."

McGovern doesn't look like a radical -- with his \$200 suits, his modish styling, his Gucci ties, sideburns no longer than most, relatively short hair -- this coupled with the fact that his tone is rarely anarchic but more like the New York Life agent. He looks like a Paul Harvey without the silver tongue.

Finally, the "extremist" label is much better because it can't be turned around to his advantage. "If cutting bloated defense budgets is extremism, I plead guilty." That wouldn't fly at all. Barry tried to reverse the extremism thing, but it got him further into the quicksand. The same will happen to McGovern -- to deny the "extremist" label is to give it credibility. Moreover, one doesn't have to look like an extremist to be one. Goldwater was the most solid-looking guy you could think of -- a square-jawed all-American -- yet it stuck with him; the same for George. And with apologies to Barry, the extremist tag is not cold to the memory of 1964 and giving it to McGovern as good as he gave it to Barry is going to have somewhat the same effect -- though perhaps not as well.

In short, can we eventually get the word to higher ups that "radical is thru in '72" and that "extremism has clout to keep George out?"

6/9/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

At the risk of being repetitive, let me be a bit more explicit concerning my thinking that the word to tar McGovern is "extremist" and not "radical."

"Radical" seems to be losing its connotation. It didn't help us a whole lot in 1970, and it has become somewhat fashionable to be "radical." Look at it this way; McGovern is asked if he is radical. He responds: "If it's radical to get poor people a fair share of the enormous economic wealth in America, then I plead guilty to being a radical."

McGovern doesn't look like a radical -- with his \$200 suits, his modish styling, his Gucci ties, sideburns no longer than most, relatively short hair -- this coupled with the fact that his tone is rarely anarchic but more like the New York Life agent. He looks like a Paul Harvey without <sup>the</sup> silver tongue.

Finally, the "extremist" label is much better because it can't be turned around to his advantage. "If cutting bloated defense budget is extremism, I plead guilty." That wouldn't fly at all. Barry tried to reverse the extremism thing, but it got him further into the quicksand. The same will happen to McGovern -- to deny the "extremist" label is to give it credibility. Moreover, one doesn't have

to look like an extremist to be one. Goldwater ~~was~~ was the most solid-looking guy you could think of -- a square-jawed all-American -- yet it stuck ~~to~~ with him; ~~the~~ the same for George. And with ~~the~~ apologies to Barry, ~~the~~ the extremist tag is not cold to the memory of 1964 and giving it to McGovern as good as he gave it to Barry is going to have somewhat the same effect -- though perhaps not as ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup>.

In short, can we eventually get the ~~word~~ word to higher ups that "radical is thru in '72" and that "extremism has cloud to keep George out?"