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MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
July 30, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: JOHN DEAN
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Can you tell me if there is any problem with the President's using Jack Dreyfus' house on Minot Island. I understand that Dreyfus has been involved in some kind of a suit and settled out of court, along with Bill Rogers and some others. I just want to know if there could be embarrassing ramifications if the President uses his home.
MEMORANDUM FOR:  MR. H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM:  DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

July 15, 1971

Several weeks ago, I asked Bill Carruthers and Mark Goode to come up with a list of the ten best film documentarians in the country. The idea was to start zeroing in on finding someone who is friendly to the President and very competent in the area of films, both for the purpose of working on any films that might be used at the Convention as well as those which could be produced for the general campaigning purposes.

We know that the best documentary producer in the country is Wolper. We also know that Wolper did the Jack Kennedy and Bobby Kennedy films and they were extremely effective. Based upon Wolper's work with Kennedy, I had ruled him out of consideration with Carruthers.

Carruthers has done some checking and come back with information which indicates Wolper is available and some facts which may indicate that we should work out some kind of arrangement with him.

It seems that Ed Borchardt who owns Hollywood Video Center has merged with the Wolper organization (the Hollywood Video Center is where Carruthers has done most of his work), Borchardt is a registered Republican and according to Carruthers is loyal to the President. Carruthers talked to Borchardt and made the point that we would be very concerned about Wolper's affiliation with the Kennedys and that we must be assured that the people who are working with the President are top-flight professionals and also loyal to the President. Borchardt recommended to Carruthers that he (Borchardt) talk to Wolper and see what his thinking was.
Following is the result of their conversation:

1. Wolper points out that Paul Davis of Lehman Brothers, former Finance Chairman for Nixon in 1968, is on the Board of Directors of the Wolper organization. (Davis' son-in-law is Lang Washburn.)

2. Wolper's number one man is Warren Bush, a registered Republican and a "loyal, Nixon supporter."

3. As a result of the merger of the Wolper and Hollywood Video companies, Ed Borchardt would be responsible for all liaison with the Republican National Committee and the White House projects on any contracts for which we contracted.

4. It is reported that "David Wolper himself is most anxious to work with us and lend us his full support."

Carruthers comes in with the recommendation that we should take the Wolper matter under serious consideration. He feels that we are on safe grounds since we have the guarantee of the security of three loyal Republicans -- one of whom (Paul Davis) has been strongly associated with the President. Carruthers feels that Wolper himself, although closely identified with Democratic candidates, personally senses that joining the Republican camp would be a good business move for him. Whatever his business motives are, we must remember that he is "without peer" in his craft and is known to be a man of integrity.

**QUESTION**

Can we proceed on an exploratory basis to see what type of a financial arrangement can be worked out with the Wolper people and to what degree we can trust Wolper's integrity? This will involve my calling and talking with Paul Davis and talking to the Wolper people, along with Carruthers.

Approve ________  Disapprove _________
Gordon Strachan asked that I put together my thoughts for you on Bill Gavin’s memorandum of June 14. I think that Gavin has put together an interesting, intellectual piece on some of the ramifications of Administration activity to date and the prospects for the 1972 election. However, I sense that he is a little paranoid over Agnew. I do not know how hard his reasoning is on all of this; however, I think that the assumptions are, perhaps, a little simplistic.

I do not question that we have the President in a relatively good position in terms of the criteria of his being “reasonable”. The quality of reason is at least a point where we can always build a very good case for President Nixon.

Regarding passion, I am not sure that the Administration does out-passion everyone. I think the passion of the Peace Movement or of the new left -- let alone of the right -- has the zeal that an Agnew does. Perhaps we have been wrong (I would imagine Gavin would agree) in letting Agnew out so far front and getting so controversial and diluting the passion which he could hold in constructive areas.

On the other hand, who is to say that Agnew has not served his purpose. Gavin states that Agnew cannot be replaced since his replacement would probably harm our chances for a victory. I am not sure that this is true. To say that Agnew’s pluses and minuses have already been engraved in the public’s mind is a problem, but on the other hand, in the age of quick imagery, Agnew can be tempered quite a lot in the next several months -- or at least we can alter those causes on which he goes out front. This may be necessary, anyway, if Gavin’s statement is true, when he says, “I am not saying the public disagrees with his content; I am saying it has completely forgotten his content”. I think we can get around the problem of Agnew’s becoming a big cliche rather than being effective on key issues. He just needs to be programmed against the big issues, as do others here -- as well as the President.
In terms of imagination, I would have to concur with a lot of what Gavin says. We have done a poor job of illustrating how imaginative the President has been even on those occasions when he has either shown by action or through policy a sense of imagination. I think that we are starting into 1972 with a lack of being able to communicate imagination but not necessarily an absolute lack of imaginative appeal. In other words, we have it if we can figure out how to exploit it without doing so in a gimmicky way.

I do agree that Teddy has the imaginative appeal and that if he runs, that will be a problem. However, I also believe that Kennedy can be beat. (I do not think that we should assume that we can beat all others since Teddy is the only Democrat with imagination and the other contenders lack it.)

I tend to agree with the conclusion offered by #Gavin in terms of how we try to illustrate imagination. It can be done in a documentary sense and it can be done -- a lot of it -- by film. We can also use the forthcoming State of the Union and the other natural forms which will be coming along. We can remain solid and present ourselves as a solid Party perpetuating a solid country. It doesn't have to be gimmicky. We can hook into a transfer from a wartime to a peace time situation and make that exciting. We can talk about how the dollars that were spent on defense are going to be spent domestically. We can do it as a sound, reasoned and exciting way.

All in all, what I am saying is Gavin has sounded an alarm which we should be cognizant of if we are not already and those people determining positions and working on the selling of our programs should give some thought to what he says but not necessarily over-react.
July 22, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:        MR. RONALD H. WALKER
FROM:                   DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Be advised that Lt. Governor Jepson in Iowa, a Republican, is contemplating running against Governor Ray. This would cause a bad split in the Party. Evidently, Jepson is prone to seeking publicity in his own way and his activities at the Rathbun Dam should be well-controlled should he be in attendance.
July 7, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  MR. H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM:  DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Billy Graham called to say that the President’s talk last Saturday night had “moved him to tears”. He felt the material and the way it was presented was the best thing that the President had done in many months. He feels that this is perhaps the type of thing that should be done during the campaign.