

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	36	8/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: the presidential acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention. Handwritten notes added by unknown. 2 pgs.
1	36	10/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: how to overcome obstacles to re-election in the closing weeks of the campaign. 3 pgs.
1	36	10/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: how to overcome obstacles to re-election in the closing weeks of the campaign. 3 pgs.
1	36	8/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: the campaign's focus on the Vietnam War and unemployment. 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>
1	36	8/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: the campaign's focus on the Vietnam War and unemployment. 2 pgs.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 17, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

(Per L. Higby)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

The President's acceptance speech should be directed to the whole nation of course, but politically to the voters between RN's rock bottom 40 percent, and his top of 65 percent. That 25 percent of the electorate is our target. It is: not Republican at all; Independent and Democratic, conservative socially, moderate politically; middle income, working income economically; Northern Catholic and ethnic largely but Southern Protestant also; in addition, there are several million young people who are largely apolitical, one would guess -- they are probably not the brightest or best students; they are more likely from Ohio State, SMU, Notre Dame, NYU, than from Harvard and Yale.

This is the segment of the population which is the "swing vote" this fall, where the opportunity is great, where our appeal can and should be made -- without alienation of the 40 percent base, which is essentially Conservative and Republican.

STRUCTURE

The speech in my view, should be essentially of three parts:

1. What the President has accomplished. Foreign policy, Vietnam should dominate here, but the Supreme Court, the efforts against crime and pollution, the new approach to the cities, etc., can all be included.

The purpose of this section simply would be to remind the voters of tremendous accomplishments of RN, and to set the stage, for the last crucial part of the speech -- which deals with RN's Vision of where we should be going. Would argue that RN detail briefly and toughly what was the situation in the nation when we took over the helm in 1968 -- what was it at home; what was it abroad and how all that has changed dramatically.

2. The middle part of the speech should strongly contrast the President's positions and views with those of McGovern -- on Defense, Amnesty, Permissiveness, Welfare, Foreign Policy, Isolationism, Taxes, and Spending. We should draw McGovern's position without naming here in stark terms on one side -- and RN's views on another. This should be interspersed with the strong political material, making clear they are dreadfully wrong in their approach and options, and we should be fairly tough here.

3. The third section is the Vision, RN's view of where we are going if you choose to join us. My view is that this section goes into two parts -- the evils we will continue to halt, and combat, in the society -- but more important the concrete dream of what we and our gathering here intend to do. We are to be the instrument of a new elite or a new order in American society, where the sons and daughters of workingmen and middle class are going to assume the helm of the nation, at every level from that elite which has dominated so long.

We should portray the President and his people as the instrument who are pushing open the door -- not to affluence for these people -- they are fairly well off, but to leadership, to bringing in to Government the successor generation to the New Deal types who did their thing, but who now must give way as the Hoover business types did. We should be concrete here.

And what are the accomplishments of this new generation of leaders to be:

The ending of the agony in Vietnam, the building of a new enduring structure of international relations that can preserve for our children the peace this generation of war veterans has never known. The remaking of American society so that not just the sons of Harvard and Yale, but of SMU, Notre Dame, of NYU and Whittier move into the decision-making positions in American life. They chart the destiny of the nation, henceforth. The President is the John the Baptist of a new leadership emerging in all aspects of national life. The Old Establishment must give way to these new blood, new men, with new ideas and old values.

At home, their jobs are to preserve and protect the environment that has been destroyed, to provide new guarantees for the rights of the victims in society. In any event, this will be spelled out in much more detail in subsequent memoranda and paragraphs. These will be coming up today and tomorrow.

Buchanan

What about
wv-college
grads?
many
people
young &
old

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1972

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

With four weeks to go the political situation seems to have stabilized. With McGovern not moving as dramatically as necessary; indeed hardly moving at all, according to Harris.

The following are what I see as potential problem areas for us politically, which could cause a rapid dissipation of the present lead.

- 1) Sam Ervin & the Watergate. Should a Congressional hearing be called the focus of the campaign could be turned off of the "negatives" of McGovern onto our "negatives." Given the present disposition of the national media -- the major domos are disappointed in the lack of a contest and enraged and frustrated by RN's above-the-battle tactics -- the hearings would be the most celebrated since Army-McCarthy.
- 2) The McGovern anti-Nixon Commercials. McGovern's people seem finally to have come to the conclusion that their best hope lies not so much in resurrecting their candidate's image -- they don't have the time -- but in tearing down our man. My guess is that they will be extremely rough, and if they are not overdone, fairly effective.

My personal view is that we ought to, now, go on a crash program for some more anti-McGovern commercials to keep in stock.

Beyond that, the latest poll is certain to put pressure on McGovern; and given the fact that his three most sensitive points seem to be Vietnam, (he is proud of his "consistency) Eagleton and "credibility," maybe we ought to begin moving, with some of our surrogates, in a more direct way.

If we can get him talking and arguing about these -- we do well. Frankly, I would like to see the entire Eagleton business, which is such a loser for McGovern, re-elevated by some of our people.

so the commercials momentarily -- HHH's anti-Nixon commercials brutal in my judgment, but effective -- and we should expect that McGovern's will go after the "scandal", "corrupt" issues -- and if they start they will not use their principal, McGovern, as they have often in the past, to act as the Prosecutor.

A sharp McGovern movement upward in the polls could conceivably use a reverse leverage on the "analyses" and "polls" and "local statements" which are right now so damaging to him. Every time a newspaper or survey comes out they come in with startling negative returns for McGovern. And every time a local pol speaks off the record it seems, he raps George. This has to hurt in community after community -- if McGovern starts up, however, this will reverse and one will find poll after poll saying "McGovern closing the gap." While the possibility recedes with each week, the possibility remains of the "comeback" theme catching with the press and public.

4) The apathetic electorate and the low turnout. Though the liberal press has egg on its face now, for its earlier discussion of aroused and alienated electorate looking for McGovern's kind of politics, there seems to be some truth in the possibility of a low turnout, over-confident Republicans, and a McGovern-hard-core maximizing his vote, while we minimize ours. We ought to be giving this problem serious consideration -- although I do not believe it at all calls for RN to hit the stump at this point in time.

5) The media hostility. One has to have seen Agronsky & Co. to visualize it. Since the Broder column there has been piece after piece, taking up the theme that RN has "outwitted" the press, that he is using the enormous resources of the White House to such effect that it is no contest; that McGovern is at an unfair disadvantage; that the President is ignoring the issues, playing above-the-battle, refusing to "engage" in campaign debate, even by long distance, and -- to top it all -- appears headed for a landslide which the press can do nothing about. If one took a poll of the press corps, I would guess that ninety-five to one hundred percent want to see the gap closed.

Recognizing that they are negatively disposed to our campaign at this point, and anxious to leap on any embarrassment -- perhaps we should give consideration to an offensive media strategy to feed the animals, so they aren't chewing on us the rest of the campaign.

Dont' know what we have of substance coming down the pike -- but the more of that the better. One notes that RN's Texas visit which had some substance to it was played extremely well -- and the NY to LA jaunt was played equally badly. We should be thinking of something to give these fellows to write and talk about -- rather than bemoaning our "lack" of a campaign.

THOUGHTS & SUGGESTIONS:

A) We ought to have adopted in advance a strategy for the McGovern ads, whether to ignore them -- or attack them as "smear" -- hopefully they will be so bad that they will indict themselves. But it would be serious for us, I think, if McGovern's ads succeeded in moving the focus off of McGovern's screw-ups and incompetence and his radicalism -- which should be the last four weeks of this campaign.

B) We should be planning now -- not locking in, however -- some election eve, Saturday, Sunday, Monday type drills, which are certain to create massive national interest and participation in the election -- by our folks. We do need to have our troops excited more out there -- they do need to get stirred up -- and given the Presidential podium, one can get the national attention with relative ease.

C) In two weeks or perhaps three, the time may be ripe to be calling not for a mandate for RN -- but for a repudiation of McGovern by Democrats. On these grounds, we should move out the line that the McGovernites have given up; they are interested only in a large vote to control the party machinery -- and a Connally and Meany and Fitzsimmons and other Democrat can all call for a national "repudiation of extremism" -- so that the Great Democratic Party can be restored to its rightful owners, the American people. Cast a Vote Against Extremism kind of theme -- something that will convince Democrats that if McGovern even comes close their party is gone from them forever.

D) If we can contain McGovern for twenty more days even, or two more weeks, assuredly there is a fail-safe point at which local Democrats have to jump off and start pushing out their split-ticket sample ballots; with sort of an every-man-for-himself philosophy taking over. That almost but did not happen with Humphrey -- as the unions never deserted him. But if McGovern is hanging where he was last -- two or three weeks from now it could start with him.

E) The President should stay out of the attack business altogether, as of now. This still looks good. Also, the President of all the People, standing up for America, is something disgruntled and even anti-Nixon Democrats can vote for -- if the rest of us can keep McGovern painted as an incompetent and opportunistic radical -- who would do or say anything to win. With McGovern's recent horrible charges he has diminished the possibility of his becoming a sympathetic figure, a martyr, which leaves us some room for toughening the attacks on him.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1972

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

With four weeks to go the political situation seems to have stabilized. With McGovern not moving as dramatically as necessary; indeed hardly moving at all, according to Harris.

The following are what I see as potential problem areas for us politically, which could cause a rapid dissipation of the present lead.

1) Sam Ervin & the Watergate. Should a Congressional hearing be called the focus of the campaign could be turned off of the "negatives" of McGovern onto our "negatives." Given the present disposition of the national media -- the major domos are disappointed in the lack of a contest and enraged and frustrated by RN's above-the-battle tactics -- the hearings would be the most celebrated since Army-McCarthy.

2) The McGovern anti-Nixon Commercials. McGovern's people seem finally to have come to the conclusion that their best hope lies not so much in resurrecting their candidate's image -- they don't have the time -- but in tearing down our man. My guess is that they will be extremely rough, and if they are not overdone, fairly effective.

My personal view is that we ought to, now, go on a crash program for some more anti-McGovern commercials to keep in stock.

Beyond that, the latest poll is certain to put pressure on McGovern; and given the fact that his three most sensitive points seem to be Vietnam, (he is proud of his "consistency) Eagleton and "credibility," maybe we ought to begin moving, with some of our surrogates, in a more direct way.

If we can get him talking and arguing about these -- we do well. Frankly, I would like to see the entire Eagleton business, which is such a loser for McGovern, re-elevated by some of our people.

Back to the commercials momentarily -- HHH's anti-Nixon commercials were brutal in my judgment, but effective -- and we should expect that McGovern's will go after the "scandal", "corrupt" issues -- and if they are smart they will not use their principal, McGovern, as they have mistakenly in the past, to act as the Prosecutor.

3) A sharp McGovern movement upward in the polls could conceivably cause a reverse leverage on the "analyses" and "polls" and "local statements" which are right now so damaging to him. Every time a newspaper or survey goes out they come in with startling negative returns for McGovern. And every time a local pol speaks off the record it seems, he raps George. This has to hurt in community after community -- if McGovern starts up, however, this will reverse and one will find poll after poll saying "McGovern closing the gap." While the possibility recedes with each week, the possibility remains of the "comeback" theme catching with the press and public.

4) The apathetic electorate and the low turnout. Though the liberal press has egg on its face now, for its earlier discussion of aroused and alienated electorate looking for McGovern's kind of politics, there seems to be some truth in the possibility of a low turnout, over-confident Republicans, and a McGovern-hard-core maximizing his vote, while we minimize ours. We ought to be giving this problem serious consideration -- although I do not believe it at all calls for RN to hit the stump at this point in time.

5) The media hostility. One has to have seen Agronsky & Co. to visualize it. Since the Broder column there has been piece after piece, taking up the theme that RN has "outwitted" the press, that he is using the enormous resources of the White House to such effect that it is no contest; that McGovern is at an unfair disadvantage; that the President is ignoring the issues, playing above-the-battle, refusing to "engage" in campaign debate, even by long distance, and -- to top it all -- appears headed for a landslide which the press can do nothing about. If one took a poll of the press corps, I would guess that ninety-five to one hundred percent want to see the gap closed.

Recognizing that they are negatively disposed to our campaign at this point, and anxious to leap on any embarrassment -- perhaps we should give consideration to an offensive media strategy to feed the animals, so they aren't chewing on us the rest of the campaign.

Dont' know what we have of substance coming down the pike -- but the more of that the better. One notes that RN's Texas visit which had some substance to it was played extremely well -- and the NY to LA jaunt was played equally badly. We should be thinking of something to give these fellows to write and talk about -- rather than bemoaning our "lack" of a campaign.

THOUGHTS & SUGGESTIONS:

A) We ought to have adopted in advance a strategy for the McGovern ads, whether to ignore them -- or attack them as "smear" -- hopefully they will be so bad that they will indict themselves. But it would be serious for us, I think, if McGovern's ads succeeded in moving the focus off of McGovern's screw-ups and incompetence and his radicalism -- which should be the last four weeks of this campaign.

B) We should be planning now -- not locking in, however -- some election eve, Saturday, Sunday, Monday type drills, which are certain to create massive national interest and participation in the election -- by our folks. We do need to have our troops excited more out there -- they do need to get stirred up -- and given the Presidential podium, one can get the national attention with relative ease.

C) In two weeks or perhaps three, the time may be ripe to be calling -- not for a mandate for RN -- but for a repudiation of McGovern by Democrats. On these grounds, we should move out the line that the McGovernites have given up; they are interested only in a large vote to control the party machinery -- and a Connally and Meany and Fitzsimmons and other Democrats can all call for a national "repudiation of extremism" -- so that the Great Democratic Party can be restored to its rightful owners, the American people. Cast a Vote Against Extremism kind of theme -- something that will convince Democrats that if McGovern even comes close their party is gone from them forever.

D) If we can contain McGovern for twenty more days even, or two more weeks, assuredly there is a fail-safe point at which local Democrats have to jump off and start pushing out their split-ticket sample ballots; with sort of an every-man-for-himself philosophy taking over. That almost but did not happen with Humphrey -- as the unions never deserted him. But if McGovern is hanging where he was last -- two or three weeks from now it could start with him.

E) The President should stay out of the attack business altogether, as of now. This still looks good. Also, the President of all the People, standing up for America, is something disgruntled and even anti-Nixon Democrats can vote for -- if the rest of us can keep McGovern painted as an incompetent and opportunistic radical -- who would do or say anything to win. With McGovern's recent horrible charges he has diminished the possibility of his becoming a sympathetic figure, a martyr, which leaves us some room for toughening the attacks on him.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH As Requested)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Have received the poll briefing and while the findings on the issue are unexceptional, the conclusions that are drawn are wrong, I think -- if I do not mistake them. Our surrogates and the Vice President should not spend a disproportionate amount of their time defending our record on unemployment, and economic management. By most everyone's judgment, our record is not considered as that good; this is our "weakest" point -- and a national debate over whether we managed the economy well is perhaps the one debate with McGovern we can lose.

Agreed that Vietnam, inflation, etc. are the crucial issues. We can win on these issues by not so much verbally defending our record, but by portraying McGovern as disasterous to the stock market, disasterous to the job market with his budget cuts in defense and space, disasterous to the security of the U.S., disasterous to the price situation, because of his \$1000 program, or his \$6500 welfare giveaway. In short, let's not so much defend our record, which is subject to criticism, as to attack McGovern with being a clear and present danger to the prosperity we now have.

The point is this: If the Democrats had nominated Harpo Marx, the Teeter polls would have said Vietnam, economy, inflation are the major issues. Would we, in a race with Harpo, talk about those issues -- or would the winning issues rather be the manifest lack of qualification of their candidate -- despite our record.

The decision in November and our rhetoric must not focus upon their issues -- i. e., "unemployment" and the unequal economic record of the last four years -- it must focus upon our issues -- i. e., the extremism, elitism, radicalism, kookism, of McGovern's person, campaign, and programs, against the solid, strong, effective leadership of the President. The first campaign described above is the only way we can lose in 1972 -- and if I am not mistaken

this is something close to what the Teeter folks recommend, when they say we ought to talk up the economy, and spend an inordinate amount of time defending our record on unemployment.

Nor should we forget the capacity of a candidate (i. e., Kennedy and the "missile gap," Goldwater and "extremism") to create issues, on which elections turn, sometimes legitimate issues, sometimes illegitimate. When we portray McGovern's ideas as preposterous, foolish, and even dangerous to U.S. security and the nation's economy, we are right now pushing against an open door -- with the media at large, as well as the country.

The campaign should turn, we should make it turn, upon the manifest unqualification of this character and his ilk to even be in the Presidential contest -- not whether a damn referendum in our spotty economic performance, which talking, talking, talking about the economy and jobs, and unemployment would make it. So, I disagree strongly with what I view as the central thrust of recommendations of the Teeter polls.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH As Requested)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Have received the poll briefing and while the findings on the issue are unexceptional, the conclusions that are drawn are wrong, I think -- if I do not mistake them. Our surrogates and the Vice President should not spend a disproportionate amount of their time defending our record on unemployment, and economic management. By most everyone's judgment, our record is not considered as that good; this is our "weakest" point -- and a national debate over whether we managed the economy well is perhaps the one debate with McGovern we can lose.

Agreed that Vietnam, inflation, etc. are the crucial issues. We can win on these issues by not so much verbally defending our record, but by portraying McGovern as disasterous to the stock market, disasterous to the job market with his budget cuts in defense and space, disasterous to the security of the U.S., disasterous to the price situation, because of his \$1000 program, or his \$6500 welfare giveaway. In short, let's not so much defend our record, which is subject to criticism, as to attack McGovern with being a clear and present danger to the prosperity we now have.

The point is this: If the Democrats had nominated Harpo Marx, the Teeter polls would have said Vietnam, economy, inflation are the major issues. Would we, in a race with Harpo, talk about those issues -- or would the winning issues rather be the manifest lack of qualification of their candidate -- despite our record.

The decision in November and our rhetoric must not focus upon their issues -- i. e., "unemployment" and the unequal economic record of the last four years -- it must focus upon our issues -- i. e., the extremism, elitism, radicalism, kookism, of McGovern's person, campaign, and programs, against the solid, strong, effective leadership of the President. The first campaign described above is the only way we can lose in 1972 -- and if I am not mistaken,

this is something close to what the Teeter folks recommend, when they say we ought to talk up the economy, and spend an inordinate amount of time defending our record on unemployment.

Nor should we forget the capacity of a candidate (i. e., Kennedy and the "missile gap," Goldwater and "extremism") to create issues, on which elections turn, sometimes legitimate issues, sometimes illegitimate. When we portray McGovern's ideas as preposterous, foolish, and even dangerous to U.S. security and the nation's economy, we are right now pushing against an open door -- with the media at large, as well as the country.

The campaign should turn, we should make it turn, upon the manifest unqualification of this character and his ilk to even be in the Presidential contest -- not whether a damn referendum in our spotty economic performance, which talking, talking, talking about the economy and jobs, and unemployment would make it. So, I disagree strongly with what I view as the central thrust of recommendations of the Teeter polls.

Buchanan