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MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 30, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: DWIGHT CHAPIN
FROM: DAVE GERGEN
SUBJECT: Statement for Dr. Graham

Here's the proposed statement which we discussed this morning. It was drafted by John Andrews and comes with editing from Pat and me.

cc: Chuck Colson
    John Andrews

Attachment
STATEMENT BY DR. BILLY GRAHAM

My province is religion, not politics. But when the statements of a leading political figure run counter the basic religious principles on which the United States was founded, I cannot refrain from an expression of deep concern both as a Christian and as an American citizen.

America's soul -- our moral and spiritual unity as one Nation under God -- is surely more precious than the ambitions, however noble, or the personal convictions, however sincere, of any one among us. I was shocked, therefore, to learn of Senator McGovern's recent statement to an interviewer that if he loses the election, he could not "in good conscience" ask the American people to rally around a re-elected President Nixon, nor could he lead any call for national unity.

It is difficult for me to see how any defeated candidate for the Presidency could in good conscience withhold an appeal for national unity and for wholehearted acceptance of the majority verdict. Would the Senator really prefer to rend this country permanently into bitter opposing camps as the penalty for his defeat?

The contrast with the past is inescapable. Never in my lifetime can I remember a losing Presidential candidate -- from Wilkie to Dewey,
Stevenson to Humphrey -- turning his back on his responsibilities after an election. Perhaps the most vivid contrast was Richard Nixon in 1960 when -- gracious in defeat -- he insistently called a halt to journalistic investigations which hinted at massive vote frauds costing him the election. "Our country can't afford the agony of a constitutional crisis," he told one of the reporters involved, "and I will not be a party to creating one just to become President."

The defiant post-election stance favored by Senator McGovern would precipitate not a constitutional crisis but a time of moral and spiritual recriminations which could be far more damaging to the fabric of national unity. I appeal to the Senator, should he lose, to choose a course more in keeping with his own Christian heritage.

"Holy wars" have no place in a democracy. This election is not the apocalyptic choice between good and evil which the Democratic candidate has increasingly portrayed it as being. George McGovern, son of a minister and once a minister himself, surely seeks the right as God gives him to see the right. But no less so does our President -- son of devout Quakers and heir to their passion for peace -- seek the right.
One of the most deplorable features of this campaign has been the intensive effort to Richard Nixon's opponents -- whether in malice or honest conviction I cannot judge -- to portray as "satanic" this faithful public servant whom I know to be a man of the highest integrity, principle, patriotism, self dedication, and faith.

Let all Americans pray that these final days of campaigning will see the lifting of this miasma of character assassination, and that election night, whatever the outcome, will bring words and gestures of healing from all who aspire to moral leadership over the American people.