

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>
4	35	2/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to "The Staff Secretary" responding to an article on the Ashbrook candidacy. 2 pgs.
4	35	2/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: a proposed meeting with the Advertising Council. 1 pg.
4	35	2/1/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: coordination of efforts between "1701" and the RNC. 2 pgs.
4	35	2/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: distributing information for the upcoming campaign and dealing with press issues. 2 pgs.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

February 29, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE STAFF SECRETARY
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Action Memorandum #P-2010
Ashbrook Candidacy

Request

It was requested in Presidential Action Memorandum P-2010, taken from the February 1 News Summary, to counter the Human Events article that Ashbrook's candidacy has already paid off in "concrete concessions from the White House".

Response

Ken Clawson has been making the point with the press that none of the items in the Human Events article were reactions to Ashbrook's candidacy, but were prior decisions. Pat Buchanan has contacted Human Events and outlined their error. In addition, Buchanan indicated to Ryskind that these kinds of statements were actually counter-productive to the conservative cause and also asked that Ryskind pass this on to Ashbrook. Ryskind indicated that Ashbrook was not saying any of these things himself.

It is very hard to directly counter this kind of charge because no matter what we say, the conservatives have to say this to save face. Most of these kinds of comments have come from the conservatives and it is imperative to them to build this kind of rationale so they can justify getting back on track when and if Ashbrook goes out of the race.

I still have high hopes that at the right point they can be brought back into the fold; therefore, I would not try to assault them frontally on this charge. We will try to discourage it whenever we can, but we should recognize that it's important to them that they build this face-saving in their own literature.

Eyes Only

February 29, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Attached Schedule Proposal --
Advertising Council

I know all of the reasons why you will want to turn the attached down, but I earnestly hope you will not. I realize that these are not the powers that they represent themselves to be, but we have used the Ad Council politically very much to our advantage and I think not to have them could be a serious negative. They are doing a superb job for us on advertising the "New Prosperity" and "holding the lid on prices". They have been much more political than I expected they would be and, in view of the disappointment last year, I really hope this can be done.

I know you won't think there is anything to be gained and perhaps there isn't, but there is something to be lost by not doing it. What will be lost will be our ability to manipulate the group to our advantage politically this year, as we are finding now that we can do. It isn't the people that I am concerned with, it is the ability to obtain free advertising, time and space for messages that are politically significant to us.

EYES ONLY

February 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: RNC/1701 Organizational Effort

This is none of my business but I have very serious concerns that the organizational effort at 1701 is not being properly coordinated with the RNC organizational effort. I am sure that this is something that the AG will straighten out as soon as he is on board, but at the moment the situation is not healthy.

Teddy White observed in a conversation with a mutual friend a few weeks ago that we were making precisely the same mistake that Johnson made, that we were allowing the RNC to wither on the vine and that our Presidential campaign effort is in effect trying to take over all organizational effort for Independents, Democrats and Republicans. White pointed out that the party organizational effort can increase the turnout of party faithful by 4 - 5 percentage points. With a well organized Republican effort, we might get 76 percent of the registered Republicans to the polls and without that effort the number might be 72 percent. I don't know how valid the statistics are, but that is the example that White used.

I've always marveled at the way Len Hall structured the 1956 campaign. The Citizens' effort was totally separate from the organized party effort. The Citizens' Committee went after Independents and Democrats -- and the party machinery had the sole task of producing the Republican vote. From what I have learned of the operation at 1701, it is being geared up to organize the entire effort -- Republican as well as Democrat and Independent.

If this is true, what will inevitably happen is that tried and true party workers will be neglected. We simply do not have the capacity -- no one does -- to set up organization structures that duplicates the

established party structure. As a result the State Committee member or County Chairman in Pinellas County, Florida, for example, will feel neglected if he is not brought into the Nixon effort. He may be a complete dud -- we may not want him. On the other hand, it is better to have him feel that he is performing -- perhaps for the National Committee -- than to feel that he is simply being left out of the action. In short, the two efforts have to complement one another, not be duplicating or competing for the same constituencies.

This is a very basic, fundamental and simple point but I am not sure from what I hear that it is clearly understood. The Nixon operation should coordinate the two. The Citizens should have one clear assignment and the RNC, another clear assignment -- and only at the top of either the State or National organization does someone try to oversee that both are performing their mission.

My fears could be totally unfounded and based on ignorance. I do get a lot of isolated reports from around the country, however, that (a) the Republican organization is not gearing up; (b) that a lot of the faithful feel neglected; and (c) that we are dealing in many cases through some party leaders in some states, but ignoring others. There's room for everybody. All of the regular party workers can feel very much involved with the job of turning out the Republican vote and the Nixon leaders can concentrate a Citizens' effort on the non-Republican vote.

I have been discussing many things of late with the Attorney General. I have deliberately not raised this point, although I have been sorely tempted to do so, because I think I might be straining my new relationship with him. I think he would quite correctly feel that I was butting into his affairs in an area of no concern to me.

If in your mind, the point has any validity, I would hope that someone would take a hard look at it.

February 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Answer Desk

In response to your memo of the 17th regarding the "Answer Desk", Noel Koch is now riding herd on this, recommending counter-attacks and suggesting replies. The mechanism we have established is a hell of a lot better than anything we had in the past in terms of getting the material out. As I think I have indicated to you, at least 50 percent of the battle, maybe more, is effective distribution and timing of press releases. This part of it we have nailed down beautifully.

The other part of the problem is what our people say. You are quite correct that we need to sharpen up the rhetoric considerably. I have had some extensive talks with Koch, Karalekas and Hallett to this end and I think all understand the need for hitting it sharply and directly and in language that people understand.

I might point out with the specific article that you cited from the New York Times that the important objective here is to get our answer out on the record fast and to hit back hard. If you look at that article again, you will see that the headline is superb, "Kennedy Criticized for Attack on Nixon" and that the first paragraph sums it all up, "Republicans struck back today at Kennedy...". Specifically what is said is important, but the key is how the press plays the attack. In this specific instance, the Dole language, while obviously Greek to the man on the street, nonetheless was sufficiently novel to at least get into print. If Dole had called him a political opportunist or one of our other usual phrases, I'll wager you two to one that it wouldn't have been printed. The fact that it was printed gave

rise to the first paragraph of the article which is what we want. Also, with respect to your comment that the Ford reply was so oblique that it had to be explained by his press secretary, that's what we hoped would happen. The reference was to Chappaquiddick, but it was a little subtle which it had to be. It, nonetheless, suggested Chappaquiddick and caused the press to call Ford's office to ask if that is what he meant. Rather than criticizing that, I think it really was a good technique for building up the Ford statement.

In any event, your point is well taken. We will do our best to sharpen up the rhetoric and now that we do have a machinery that gets the stuff delivered to the press in a way that they will use it, I think we will see more and more of our stuff getting into print.

Your other point about the press getting ready for a massive attack is absolutely accurate. I think they are lining up their forces as the Soviets have on the Chinese border. Fifty divisions is about the right estimate and we are going to have to really be on our toes. As we are set up now, Noel is the go-between for the Members of Congress, the Committee and our writers. Karalekas and Hallett crank most of the stuff out, although Koch does do some writing himself and we hope as time goes on to be able to draw more and more upon Buchanan and Khachigian as their time permits. I think we are well set up for it and we are alert to the problem.