

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	67	8/10/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Rodgers RE: union endorsements for RN. 2 pgs.
3	67	10/20/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Letter	From Horton to Colson RE: financial information on McGovern. 1 pg.
3	67	9/23/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson "For the 10:00 File" RE: McGovern's efforts to entice Wallace to support him. 1 pg.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

DON RODGERS

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

You will be happy to know that the Secretary of Labor has a consistent and perfect batting average now in terms of matching his promises with his performance on union endorsements. Usery told me last week that he would have some railroad endorsements and the airline pilots this week. Thus far they have not come through.

Of course, Hodgson and Usery assured us that the Retail Clerks would be neutral -- that was the very worst that would happen; as we know, they endorsed McGovern and now, Tonnelli, who it was almost impossible to lose, in my opinion, has apparently been lost. You may recall Hodgson telling us that Tonnelli and his union would endorse us, that he was merely waiting for the merger to be concluded so that he could get a new executive council together and have the executive council vote an endorsement. When I saw Hodgson at Camp David Tuesday night, I asked him if there was any way to accelerate this so that we could come up with a union endorsement this week, trying to break McGovern's momentum in the union area. He said perhaps he could get Tonnelli to endorse us this week personally, and then have him convene his executive council for a formal union endorsement the week after the Republican Convention.

This morning Hodgson called to say that he had not gotten Tonnelli's personal endorsement, but thought he could get it if I could arrange for a breakfast with Tonnelli, the President and Hodgson. I said to him that that seemed to me to be unnecessary in view of the fact that he already had the commitment he wanted and he told me that it was quite unnecessary and that "of course" there wouldn't be an endorsement by the union since he couldn't get his executive council to agree. I reminded him of what he had said earlier and he said that "you fellows in the White House have to live in the real world". I, of course, don't mind living in the real world, but I do like to be told the facts straight. We now have a consistent record of Hodgson overstating his case right from the beginning.

Since you know Tonnelli as well or perhaps better than Hodgson, I would strongly urge that you go back and start working your own route with him. I am convinced that if there is a way to screw up a favorable situation, Hodgson will find it.

Last week he told me to be sure that we stayed away from the Building Trades because he was obtaining their endorsement as a department. This week Usery tells me that there is no way the department can endorse, which of course is what I've been telling Hodgson all along, and that the only way we will get the Building Trades is on a one by one basis, precisely what you and I have discussed from the outset. Since we now have at least four instances where Hodgson has blown major labor support, I think you have got to move into this area yourself. I will take this up with MacGregor, Ehrlichman and Haldeman to get a green light. Jim just is not political, does not understand what is going on and gets terribly misled.

This now may become a much bigger task than we had thought in view of the fact that we have lost 3 or 4 weeks waiting for Hodgson to deliver things which it is apparent he can't deliver. You may have to bring in some big guns for help. I don't mind spending time myself with some of the Building Trades leaders whom I have developed some relationships with over the past three years and, of course, you should start spending a great deal of time in this area. Frankly, I think we have something of a crisis on our hands because we have been assuming that Hodgson would do things which he is not doing. Nor unfortunately is Usery and there has been nothing this week from the airline pilots or the railroad unions and again, of course, we have stayed away from them because of Usery's assurances that he had them in the bag.

Please keep me advised, but keep this ball rolling and rolling hard!

SUITE 2500
SIX ELEVEN WEST SIXTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017

Personal and Confidential

October 20, 1972

Dear Chuck:

One of my McKinsey associates came up with some interesting information pertaining to Senator McGovern that may be helpful to you in the closing weeks of the campaign.

Enclosed is a memorandum to me outlining what this associate, Peter Braun, has uncovered. Naturally, neither he nor I can vouch for the validity of the information; but if it can be proven that McGovern is investing heavily in tax-adjusted situations, this could help to undermine his credibility.

I am sending this memorandum along to you thinking that you or someone on your staff would be the best person to evaluate and take whatever action is appropriate regarding this information.

If I can be of any assistance to you in this regard, please let me know.

My best personal regards to you and all of my friends on the White House staff. Keep up the good work!

Sincerely,

Bill

William L. Horton

Enclosure

Mr. Charles W. Colson
Special Counsel to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 23, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR THE 10:00 FILE

I continue to get reports from Baroody and Marsh that Wallace is very unhappy and feels that we are not paying him adequate attention, that we have not recognized fully what he has done for us, that we have not hired the staff people he wanted hired, that we have not paid obeisance to his platform positions.

Marsh also tells me that the McGovern forces are trying to win Wallace over, they want his endorsement; Kennedy's visit was a deliberate effort to get it. Kennedy is telling Wallace that if he becomes a regular Democrat and supports McGovern now, that it will enhance his chances for '76 for one of the two spots on the ticket or for a major Cabinet position. Wallace has no future with the Republicans, so argue the McGovernites; therefore, he should now join forces and campaign for McGovern in Michigan and the South. Interesting but not as far fetched as it sounds!

CWC