

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>
1	31	6/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman RE: the role of national defense in the campaign. 2 pgs.
1	31	6/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman RE: the role of national defense in the campaign. 2 pgs.
1	31	6/8/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman RE: a sharp drop in McGovern's poll numbers and the McGovern/Humphrey split. 1 pg.
1	31	8/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman and Colson RE: Buchanan's input on the campaign for a meeting he needed to miss due to an appointment. 3 pgs.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN (Per Higby)  
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some of the ideas in the Rose memorandum are good ones; others, in my judgment, are not.

First, Packard and his friends will be with us anyway. They have a "vested interest" in arms production; their group will be viewed in the press as the "Military-Industrial Complex -- West." Having millions in profits tied up in military spending, they are hardly the ones to make the case for us.

Second, the union folks should be gotten the message; and the ideas of the UCLA computers running out a print of jobs to be lost under the McGovern budget is excellent -- but keep the Captains of Industry away from it. We have them. We want the workers. As for the UCLA thing, Rose should get in touch with Ken, as we already have defense cranking out something -- and this could be used as the basis to be run through the computer.

Third, am not too concerned about the Post-Convention thing here -- as McGovern has already been hurt in Southern California. The arguments have already been made -- we can expand on them credibly since HHH did the spadework.

Fourth, any analysis should not be restricted to Southern California. But should include defense plants all over the United States, name them and the number of workers, etc. Rose should get together with Ken Khachigian on this -- this is one of the ideas we had in our original memorandum.

Fifth, am against the "transition colloquium" idea. All this says is that we agree with McGovern -- but he is going too far. Our case ought to be that "no jobs" are going to be lost under RN; we don't need any conferences to indicate that just a few will be changed. Our argument is

that McGovern is a madman on defense, would strip us naked, and throw thousands out on the street in the process -- and this chatter about us being against defense spending, too, at this point in time does not strengthen, but weaken, our presentation and makes George look less rather than more radical.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN (Per Higby)  
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some of the ideas in the Rose memorandum are good ones; others, in my judgment, are not.

First, Packard and his friends will be with us anyway. They have a "vested interest" in arms production; their group will be viewed in the press as the "Military-Industrial Complex -- West." Having millions in profits tied up in military spending, they are hardly the ones to make the case for us.

Second, the union folks should be gotten the message; and the ideas of the UCLA computers running out a print of jobs to be lost under the McGovern budget is excellent -- but keep the Captains of Industry away from it. We have them. We want the workers. As for the UCLA thing, Rose should get in touch with Ken, as we already have defense cranking out something -- and this could be used as the basis to be run through the computer.

Third, am not too concerned about the Post-Convention thing here -- as McGovern has already been hurt in Southern California. The arguments have already been made -- we can expand on them credibly since HHH did the spadework.

Fourth, any analysis should not be restricted to Southern California. But should include defense plants all over the United States, name them and the number of workers, etc. Rose should get together with Ken Khachigian on this -- this is one of the ideas we had in our original memorandum.

Fifth, am against the "transition colloquium" idea. All this says is that we agree with McGovern -- but he is going too far. Our case ought to be that "no jobs" are going to be lost under RN; we don't need any conferences to indicate that just a few will be changed. Our argument is

that McGovern is a madman on defense, would strip us naked, and throw thousands out on the street in the process -- and this chatter about us being against defense spending, too, at this point in time does not strengthen, but weaken, our presentation and makes George look less rather than more radical.

Buchanan

June 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

From my knowledge only these can explain the precipitate McGovern drop of fifteen points:

a) The Field Poll was wrong; I discount this -- as I have it from a source that the Field Poll actually played down the McGovern spread, which was larger than twenty points.

b) Humphrey attacks begin to pay off -- his attacks primarily on defense cuts and jobs in California, on the welfare giveaways of McGovern, on Israel and POWs. Despite the Humphrey stridency, and panicky approach -- he must have sufficiently frightened many people to convince 300,000 to come his way. This I believe explains it coupled with:

1. The Jackson and Yorty endorsements of HHH, which tended to reinforce the Humphrey attacks on McGovern as a radical; and
2. The surfacing in the California press of increasing numbers of national Democrats calling GM and extremist, a guy who will sink the whole ticket, etc.

What needs to be remembered is that for most of the nation, George McGovern is someone they have become aware of for two weeks at least, two months at most. First impressions are favorable -- but they are not firm impressions.

What seems interesting is that McGovern who was 46-26 over Humphrey got just about that: 46%. But Humphrey was who went from 26% to 40% in a week -- So, did McGovern really lose any votes? Or did HHH simply pick up from all the other Democrats, and pick up all the undecideds as well -- by scaring the hell out of them.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 14, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN  
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

SUBJECT: Monday Morning 9:15 a.m. Meeting

Have to be at the doctor's for a 9:00 a.m. appointment at Naval Medical, but the following are followup attack recommendations for today:

1. Ramsey Clark, along with the Shriver charge, this is issue number one today. Clark will have a press conference. We can piggy-back on this for tonight's TV. Suggest Mitchell Written Statement by PJB -- iterating our demand that McGovern either endorse or repudiate Clark's performance and his "perfect" choice for the FBI. Ignore McGovern charge of "treasonous allegations," and focus on McGovern once again evading re-endorsing a man whom he seems ready to dump over the side. Also, Fletcher Thompson in attacking Clark, and others should keep before the public that he is McGovern's "perfect choice" for the FBI job. Suggest that MacGregor go on TV -- this is "the" story of day, for tonight, demanding anew, along the lines of Mitchell statement that McGovern stop evading and obfuscation and answer to American people if this individual who last week was broadcasting Hanoi's propaganda is still in line to head up the FBI. Also, Mitchell statement of page and a half should contain defense of U.S. pilots slandered by McGovern yesterday. (PJB can have this by noon, by one at latest.)

2. On the Shriver story, that RN "blew it" we should get Lodge on TV; we should turn the focus of this on Shriver and McGovern's credibility; and re-issue that resignation letter from Shriver; as long as the issue turns on whether Shriver was telling the truth or not telling the truth, they can't be making ground. Further, this boiling controversy keeps the Watergate Caper off of page 1. Everything should be done, in statements and the effort to portray Shriver as a) not telling the truth and b) keeping silent for three years, seeking a GOP job, and then speaking out only when it was politically profitable. Shriver was a "Silent Partner" in the escalation in Vietnam; endorsed RN's policy, and now for

crass political gain is stabbing in the back a President whose policies he endorsed wholeheartedly while in the President's employ.

3. The White Paper of McGovern's on the environment got hardly any serious coverage. We can and should elevate this -- with an EPA, and/or CEQ press conference today -- which attacks McGovern for "gross ignorance of the President's record, for "sloppy staff work" for utter lack of knowledge of the toughest environmental record ever compiled by any President. Impossible to believe Senator McGovern could have seen or signed this idiotic paper -- then a briefing listing of RN's environmental achievements. But the attack on McGovern's "incredible document" should be the lead. Once again reflecting the sloppy staff work that has plagued the McGovern campaign. Tone incredulous that McGovern could have issued such a paper.

4. Don't respond to the false allegation that we accused Clark of treason -- this is what they would like to make the issue -- our issue is that this tool of Radio Hanoi is McGovern's perfect choice for FBI Director, and this is a travesty; and that McGovern should repudiate Clark (even as Senator Proxmire did) and tell the American people in no uncertain terms that he withdraws his endorsement of Clark for FBI Chief.

5. We might need some polling in Pa. to see the damage done on this flood controversy.

6. Page 30 of Saturday News Summary -- Jesse Jackson has some negative remarks on McGovern -- we should get these out to the black press, and have Floyd McKissick use them in attack on McGovern and defense of his decision to go with RN.

7. We should have Paul Keyes working up some humorous lines of ridicule to use against McGovern; if we can get the country making him and his campaign as ridiculous, he may never be able to regain credibility and recover.

8. Within the attack book there are three or four McGovern predictions about what the NVN would do if we halted bombing, etc. All provided wrong. We should have a foreign policy spokesman who can speak to these points, and indict McGovern for having been wrong about every other opportunity, wrong about Hanoi's intentions throughout his career, and a record of misjudging the enemy, reflected anew in his endorsement of Shriver's charge.

9. Note page 18 of N. Y. Times, where McGovern is working on Hill to remove equal time requirement, in which event networks will get free time. Can we block this?
10. Important thing -- ride the big stories of the day -- Clark, and Shriver credibility.

Buchanan