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October 25, 1971

Dear Hank:

Attached is an insider's report on a small war that seems to be taking place between the Re-Elect Nixon Committee and the Republican National Committee. One of the points of bitterness and contention is the auditor's handling of the accounts in the multi-million dollar 1968 campaign. The thing -- if this Kevin Phillips survey be true -- is headed for a little blood-letting. As my old friend, Bryce Harlow, would put it, "Be sure to bring your cast-iron jockey strap."

Regards,

Sincerely,

Pat

Mr. Henry Buchanan
Suite 311
7979 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland
October 22, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Agree with this memo strongly. Whether or not he announced early next year, before New Hampshire's filing deadline, the President's name ought to be on that ballot. We should do what is required -- even if it means the President's own statement allowing his name on the ballot -- to get him on.

No one is stronger than the President in N.H.; the primary may come at a time of massive public exposure for him; a write-in for RN will guarantee a smaller vote than otherwise; and a stand-in will guarantee McCloskey a far larger vote than he would get against the President. The time and place for finish McCloskey off for good is right there. If McCloskey goes in there, incidentally, he will be filed in most other "mandatory" states, as will the President, and that does not seem bad, but good for us. We can use it to hone organization, to run up the kind of massive primary victories that show RN the near unanimous popular choice of his party; we will undercut the inevitable "coronation" argument which would otherwise be used against us.

The President can say simply -- "As I said in 1968, the nominee should be tested in his party's primaries; that applies to Presidents as well as any political figure. While I have not made up my mind and will not make it up until later this year (1972), I am allowing my name to be run in every contested primary.

Further, this can be used later against any Democrat, i.e., a Kennedy who "hangs back" from the primary horror show shaping up on the other side -- as we used it against HHH in 1968.

Buchanan
October 18, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO:     BILL TIMMONS (FYI)
FROM:                PAT BUCHANAN

Attached is a letter from Mrs. Smith to some Young GOP types in Maine indicating

a) She is using some juvenile staff members to explain her case to the young,

b) She is hurting intellectually -- given the tone of the missive,

c) She is selling her anti-Supreme Court, and anti-ABM votes to the young openly.

Am getting readings from Maine that our best chance up there may involve doing a deal to get Mrs. Smith not to run again.

Buchanan
MEMORANDUM TO: Bruce Kehrl
FROM: Pat Buchanan
SUBJECT: Your Memo on the "Bookstores"

October 15, 1971

Assume this is to be used as a way to get Edith Efron's book on the best seller list. This is the long way around Robin Hood's Barn. If we have to buy thousands of books simply to get tenth on a list -- then I think the money can better be spent elsewhere. In a meeting with Neal Freeman, and Chuck Colson, we covered this ground -- suggested and agreed on a course of action to get publicity for Edith and her book. She is, incidentally, getting excellent press coverage already -- in syndicated columns and front page stories in some papers (Boston, St. Louis). Freeman has her a good speaking schedule on the tube. She will appear now before Sam Ervin's committee in January, which will be good timing.

As for the bookstores -- Neal Freeman says there are three bookstores in New York, which one should buy at prodigiously, which are always called by "listers" which we should focus on -- if we want to go that route, which he does not recommend. My view is that -- even if our idea is to get the maximum publicity and purchases for Vic Lasky's book, there are other and better ways to do it.

Buchanan
October 18, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Kevin Phillips has called to my attention a most interesting fact which
should cloud, to some degree, the Democratic primaries, and which seems
on the surface to strengthen the hand of Senator Muskie. The fact:

The filing deadline for no fewer than 13 primaries falls on or before the
date when the Florida primary takes place. In no fewer than six of those
13 primaries -- Presidential candidates are (Wisconsin, North Carolina,
Tennessee, Nebraska, Oregon, as well as Florida) or can be (Pennsylvania)
filed without permission of the candidate himself.

In all these six primaries, the names filed in the Presidential primary
are those of "generally advocated and national recognized" Presidential
candidates. What does this mean:

a) Anyone active in the Florida primary for the Presidential nomination
(as of now probably Chisholm, Jackson, Muskie, Lindsay, McGovern,
Wallace and Harris) is almost certainly going to be filed in all those other
six or seven primaries as well -- since Florida comes after the filing
deadlines of all of them, and since they will be "active" candidates when
that deadline passes.

b) Lindsay and Chisholm and McGovern and the left candidates do not
have any "choice" as to whether they go into Tennessee, North Carolina
and Nebraska. If they go into Florida -- then they will automatically be
"filed" in the others; and Lindsay and Chisholm and McGovern will surely
wind up with a string of ignominious defeats before they get to Oregon.

c) The likelihood is high then, that the primaries are going to be
something of a mess, and that secondary candidates -- even when
eliminated -- cannot help but have their names dragged through until at
least after Oregon.
d) Unless Pete McCloskey withdraws immediately after New Hampshire -- he will automatically be filed in Tennessee (March 9 filing deadline), Nebraska (March 10) and Oregon (March 14) -- where it is certain he will be administered a massive defeat. Even if McCloskey does well in New Hampshire (say 15%-30%), it would seem that he himself could see this as his apogee, and then "stand down" immediately saying he had made his point -- instead of taking his inevitable bad beatings in the Tennessee and Nebraska primaries, even before Oregon.

e) In both Oregon and Nebraska, just who is on the ballot is the sole decision of the Secretary of State. In both cases, he is a Republican (Clay Myers of Oregon, up in 1972) and Alan J. Beermann in Nebraska). We should decide ourselves just who we want filed in the Democratic primaries -- do we want "George" or not in the Democratic primaries -- and then get the word to these Secretaries of State.

f) Without having done much analysis, I would thank at this point that Muskie whose strength is much broader, whose recognition is wider, would be the beneficiary of these cluttered primaries, or perhaps Jackson -- if Wallace is kept out.

But if Muskie, as the centrist, between the extremes, as the front-runner and best-known wins in all these contests, he is going to build considerable momentum for a victory in California, which would cinch his nomination, as of now, it seems to me.

g) If the left takes a string of beatings as it seems Harris, McGovern, Lindsay and Chisholm will certainly do in the "mandatory primaries" of Florida, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Tennessee and Nebraska -- before Oregon even comes up on May 23 -- it would seem that by the time of Oregon they would be forced to unite behind one of their number in Oregon -- or get whipped again. The "drubbing" of the left, which would seem inherent in the shaping up of these primaries, might well produce the kind of bitterness that would result in a fourth party.

(Note: If Lindsay is doing the same analysis as here, it would seem almost certain that he would want to hang back until after the Florida deadline, February 10, to announce. Also, Hubert would seem to have a vested interest in staying out of these "mandatory" primaries, where he, too, would see likely to get beat. But if Hubert wants to go into Wisconsin (filing deadline January 31), he has to go into all of the six "mandatory" primaries, since all their deadlines come after Florida.
h) The California deadline is April 7. By the only New Hampshire Florida, Illinois and Wisconsin will have taken place -- Wisconsin just three days before!

At this point, the Left -- in the persons of Harris, Chisholm, McGovern and Lindsay -- will have to decide whether they will go into the California primary. As will Edward M. Kennedy. If both Kennedy and Lindsay go, of course, that makes for a split in the Left vote, and perhaps or probably a victory for Muskie.

The above is a very sketchy analysis based on the deadlines for filing and the dates of the primaries themselves. At this point in time, it seems to me we should have an experienced, professional analyst looking over these maze of dates and regulations in the primaries, to give us some kind of accurate scenario over what each candidate is likely to do -- in light of them.

Buchanan

cc: Attorney General Mitchell
    H. R. Haldeman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Primary Date</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>January 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>January 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>January 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>February 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>February 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>February 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>March 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>March 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>March 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>March 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>April 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>