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MEMORANDUM TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

The Manhattan Twelve gathered again Wednesday. From the White House point of view, the convocation was the least constructive to date. They were not dissatisfied with the Administration (Colson, Buchanan) response to their list of "demands:" they were outraged. For some the meeting served as a catharsis, a point of final departure from the Nixon Administration. My friend, Bill Rusher, the most hawkist, leader of the group and designated spokesman, would tell me nothing other than they were heading off, and "you are welcome to join us." Rusher, as he told me some time ago, made a personal commitment to sever any remaining ties with the Administration, if Taiwan were expelled. By written memorandum, Rusher has urged upon the twelve the case for the defeat of Richard Nixon -- "at all costs" as they put it -- even if it carries with it the certainty of electing Teddy Kennedy. His memorandum, which argues the case that this is the last best hope for conservatives, is reportedly witty and well-written -- but badly argued. Have been unable as stated, to lay hands upon a copy, so that I could write a rebuttal for the next meeting.

The Twelve have maintained an utterly close-mouthed attitude about both proceedings and decisions. From outside sources, however, have learned the following.

1) A number of options are being explored; they run from an open challenge to the President in the New Hampshire, Florida and California primaries to a Third Party effort in the General election. My source indicates that they have already made contact with Bill Loeb of the Union-Leader; their political man, Jerry Harkins, has explored the possibility of running a primary candidate against the President.

2) Some of them are now so anti-Nixon that they cannot, under conceivable circumstances, be brought back into the fold. Among the twelve and their other colleagues assembled, the following are the anti-Nixon hawks:
3) In the middle, those perhaps amenable to an accommodation, but still disenchanged, are Dan Mahoney of the N. Y. Conservative Party, and Jeff Bell, Editor of ACU publication. Anthony Harrigan was not present; don't know where he stands.

4) Doves include the Human Events people, Allan Ryskind and Tom Winter, and William F. Buckley, Jr. (Apparently, Bill regaled the gathering with his wit; his political recommendations, however, were themselves the subject of some humor. My guess is that since Bill is such an independent spirit, he must be a bit uncomfortable being yoked in harness in a twenty-mule team whose direction he alone cannot possibly control.)

5) The YAF leaders are reportedly anxious to make a go against the President, both to show their youth turn-out to the media and for organizational and other purposes.

6) The elements upon which any challenge to the President would be raised would include the editors and writers here involved, their publications, the New York Conservative Party, the Michigan Conservative Party, the United Republicans of California, Phyllis Schlafly and her women supporters, and the ACU organizations that seem to be popping up, in New Jersey and elsewhere.

7) My source indicates that they have covert support within the Republican Party in the Congress; and that there is no problem for a money standpoint. A number of traditional GOP moneymen, whose names I could not acquire, are said to be willing to fund the effort, when it goes.

8) F. Clifton White was not present at this meeting.

9) Am unable to determine just who they would focus upon as a candidate, should they decide to go either in the primaries or the General. Got a soft -- not a hard -- impression that Reagan is privately concerned about
trends within the Administration. There was no negative word with
regard to Jim Buckley (whose defense man, Bill Schneider) was present --
but there is a feeling among them that Senator Goldwater did his job in
1964 and could not be expected or counted upon to support them now.

10) The major issues which concern them, despite the laundry list are
a) Defense and b) FAP. One source indicated that if there were some
way we could indicate something positive from the Defense Budget, that
might help create some dissent from the prevailing view within the ranks.
They are cognizant, however, that the Budget is not presented until after
the filing deadline for New Hampshire is passed.

11) From comments from those who refuse to talk, one gets the
impression that they are readying some media-making event in the near
future. Don't know what it is or what form it will take -- but something
nice I am sure.

BUCHANAN ASSESSMENT: This seems a fairly serious problem. Right
now, we could win without these conservatives and their train; but right
now, in Octobor of 1972. So long as they continued meeting and
talking, there was no great problem. But, should they "get it all together"
and announce something rather exciting, then their efforts would take on
a new momentum of their own. A National Conservative Party in the
General election, if the threat is to be taken seriously, could be a
problem (There was talk further of canalizing efforts and running a
conservative candidate only in those states where it would be sure to
cost the President the state.)

While the possibility exists, it would be an error to write these fellows
off as bluffers or talkers without follow-through. Currently, they resemble
a milling herd of cattle, making considerable noise and doing little harm;
but if they start moving off together in one direction -- picking up every
stray anti-Nixon conservative in the country -- they could be difficult to
stop.

My hope had been that something like Child Development-OEO could be
brought down here for a Presidential veto, with a tough message, which
might then cause at least some of them to say, wait a minute, the returns
aren't all in. But that does not now seem in the cards, as the House is to
do the honors.

Any event, will keep on top of this; the ACU board is meeting Sunday;
perhaps something may come out of that.

Buchanan
MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN  
FROM: CHUCK COLSON

In talking with the Attorney General last night, he expressed the view that we must make a major effort now to "care and feed" the conservatives. He believes that we must do it regardless of Ashbrook's decision today. He thinks we have substantively neglected our own constituency and that it's very important that we, over the next year, strengthen and hold on to the conservative vote -- or regain it -- as the case may be. He has asked for a detailed plan of those things that we might consider doing. I told him that cosmetics would not do the trick and he agreed.

I think you and I should both give very careful thought to this and put together a memo jointly for the AG. If he approves, I think it can be sold to the President.

Could you put some thoughts down? Obviously our strategy with respect to FAP is a key item, but I am sure you can come up with a number of others. If you could put together a draft you and I could then collaborate on completing it. He would like to see something next week.
MEMORANDUM TO:  CHUCK COLSON
FROM:        PAT BUCHANAN

Max Friedersdorf called to say that Ashbrook may be thrown into a district with Wayne Hayes; the issue is not settled yet; which could put him in a bad way; finally, that he apparently just got a divorce from his wife of some twenty years -- which might well mean the guy must see his world falling in around him. These are factors we should be aware of.

Pat