

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>
3	4	5/28/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: information from Jay Lovestone on labor and Meany. 2 pgs.
3	4	5/26/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: Muskie's image in contrast to that of RN. 2 pgs.

May 28, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Jay Lovestone - AFL/CIO

The latest intelligence from Jay Lovestone, which is generally accurate although sometimes colored is:

1. Meany has really become very antagonistic toward Muskie and is becoming increasingly outspoken for Scoop Jackson. In a recent meeting at which Meany was in attendance, Lovestone announced emphatically that he was a Jackson Democrat and that if Jackson weren't nominated he (Lovestone) would vote for Richard Nixon. It provoked a considerable discussion. Meany simply smiled benignly.
2. Meany now really believes that Jackson is a viable candidate and can be nominated; the Democratic Party would as a result be disastrously split, there would obviously be a new left candidate, the Democrats would be beaten, but would have purged themselves.
3. Meany would support however Ted Kennedy or Humphrey, but is having growing doubts about whether he could or would personally work for Muskie.
4. In one private conversation, Meany and Lovestone both agreed that unless Jackson is nominated, that the labor machinery will be relatively inactive. It may endorse Muskie or Kennedy or even McGovern but there would be very little enthusiasm in the rank and file and the organizers would not make an all out effort.
5. Lovestone's views have become so outspoken within the AFL/CIO hierarchy with respect to his choice of Jackson first, Nixon second, that he stands a very good chance of not having his contract renewed next February. We might consider ways we can use Jay if this happens. He said that Meany would try to protect him but doubted that he would be able to.

2.

6. Meany refused to attend the Kennedy opening last night and refused to attend Muskie's pre-gala dinner party. Lovestone said it was because Meany did not want his appearance to have any political connotations. (Personally I suspect it is because Meany was smart enough to avoid a very boring evening.)

7. Labor's current projection is that it will control 17 to 20 percent of all of the delegates to the Democratic Convention next year. By control they mean these will be card carrying AFL/CIO COPE members. Obviously labor will influence a good many more delegates. According to Jay the bloc will go to the convention, solidly pledged to Jackson and will work throughout the convention for Jackson as long as he has any chance. Jay believes that this will be a very potent influence because the rest of the convention may be split badly and a solid bloc of well-disciplined union organizers can be very potent.

8. Muskie is having financial troubles, has been deserted by Fineberg and other rich NY Jews, and is now letting 14 people go from his staff.

9. Jay is convinced we can't trust the Soviets, that SALT can't be successful and anything negotiated can't be enforced. I tried hard but he is too hard-line for reason.

May 26, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Nixon-Muskie Contrast

In conversations I have had of late with pollsters (Harris and Becker) and with friends whose political judgment I trust, I frequently ask why it is that Muskie does so much better in the public opinion polls than other Democrats, why it is that he has been leading us in the trial heats even though he gets a lower public confidence score on handling most of the major issues than we do and generally what it is that makes Muskie a contender.

I have gotten many opinions. The one point which seems to continually come through in almost every analysis is that Muskie projects the cool, calm, confident image which is reassuring to people. The more problems there are in society, the more violence on television, the more doom and gloom talk which pervades the country, the more people are drawn to someone who projects quiet, calm confidence. Hence it is Muskie's blandness that, while it may well prove to be his undoing, is nonetheless his greatest strength.

The point is also made that we indirectly help him enhance that image whenever the President gives the appearance of being very strident. The tough-talking, vigorous armwaving speech puts the Nixon-Muskie contrast in sharp focus and gives Muskie points up if indeed people are looking for calm, quiet leaders.

I raise this point because I personally hold to the view (although I publicly constantly say otherwise) that Muskie would be our most formidable opponent and I think we need to be very careful not to do anything which enhances his candidacy. We should avoid these situations where the public contrast can be drawn between a strident President and a cool, calm opponent.

2.

I also raise this point because of the President's statement yesterday that he had "nothing but utter contempt for the double hypocritical standards" on race relations in the North. This is just the kind of statement that gives us the strident image that Muskie's candidacy feeds on. This also raises the point that Al Capp makes that in effect a President should not have contempt for anyone whom he must govern. He can view with sadness, with distress, with pity, his opponents but he should never view them with anger or viciousness. Contempt is a very strong word and to many Northern Negroes and Northern Republicans, particularly the self-appointed liberals, this phrase could have a very negative and counter productive reaction. The same thing could be said in a very positive way that the time has passed when we can have double hypocritical standards in America, that all Americans should appreciate the progress made in the South, etc., etc.

The President, as President, should have contempt only for criminals, revolutionaries, child molesters, bigamists, cop killers and maybe one or two other reprehensible categories of citizenry.

I hope I am overreacting to this one comment. I happen to agree with it completely and I am therefore not letting my personal views get in the way. If I were on the other side politically, however, I would try to play this up for all it's worth because it is an indictment of millions of well-intentioned but misguided white suburbanites (as well as many blacks) in the North and West and it is a very strong phrase.

I make a particular point of this also because it illustrates the dangers inherent in our appearing strident and thereby, by contrast, enhancing Muskie's image and in turn Muskie's candidacy.