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MEMORANDUM FOR:    LARRY HIGBY
FROM:            CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT:         Frank Leonard Letter

You've asked for my comment on the attached. Fortunately my attitude towards "PARTNERS" is somewhat jaundiced by the unhappy experience with Frank Leonard using the picture he did on the cover.

I was mad about that originally, I'm incensed by it now that he has denied that he ever had instructions not to use it.

In any event, it is obviously a very slick production -- beautifully done, technically speaking. I have, as I indicated to you, some serious reservations about the political punch line. First, I do not feel that anyone reading the book would come away highly motivated about the President. They would get a good view of certain aspects of the White House operation, but it is not really a powerful politically motivating book. Secondly, I have always had reservations about a political document that is "too slick". Contributors tend to be bothered by the use of funds for something that is so obviously Madison Avenueish and obviously very expensive.

In short, I feel that the book is a good subtle attractive document and if it falls into the hands of the general public will leave a very favorable impression. As for communicating with partisans, I guess I belong to the old school, that we should charge them up by showing the terrible evils of our opponents and the great virtues of our man. This book is just altogether too subtle for that.

As to the suggestion which Frank makes with regard to TV specials, we are pursuing this independently and I will see that Frank's suggestions get cranked in.
August 3, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY

FROM: CHARLES COLSON

SUBJECT: First Monday

First Monday has gone from mediocre to bad. I've just reviewed the page proofs for the August 2 edition. I am struck by such headlines as, "President's Most Agonizing Problem, Vietnam, Substantially Disposed of". It's hard for me to imagine a more negative way to say that. Instead of, "Nixon Achieves Great Triumph in Ending Vietnam Honorably", or "President Wins the Peace", "President's Journey for Peace Ending Vietnam"; it would be so easy to make this upbeat. And then there is the startling headline that, "Unilateral Disarmament 'Foolhardy' Packard Tells Senate Subcommittee", that's a really hot headline. We then have the Turkish announcement which is all right, but on the next page is a fabulous quote from Newsday which belonged right up at the head of the story. On Page 9, you will see something really exciting, "Action to Breathe New life in Red-Tape-Choked Volunteer Work", and then on Page 10, "Business-Oriented Postal Service Places Premium on Efficiency". How about something like "Nixon Reform Brings Better Postal Service"?

Interestingly in that article on Page 10 which I'm sure was written by the Postal Service, nowhere does the name Nixon appear. Then on Page 12, we have a marvelous headline, "Conference on Aging Keyed to Realistic National Policy", I can't imagine that grabbing a single vote for anybody.

I'm afraid I am just wearing out my vocal chords grumbling about this. Obviously Nafziger isn't listening to me and until we have a meeting to begin to get people understanding what we
really are after we are going to continue to waste vast amounts of money in crummy publications and in mailing costs. Frankly I just don't get it. The layout is poor, there is much too much type, no one is going to read this and if they do they will find that it is all old news; there are a couple of zany attacks on the Democrats, but they are only in there because we wrote them here. Please help. This thing has got to get under control. We can do so much better with our resources than this.