

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>
7	3	5/7/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: reconciling younger conservatives with White House figures. Handwritten notes added by unknown. 3 pgs.
7	3	5/3/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	Copy of a memo from Buchanan to RN RE: attempts to improve the White House's image. 4 pgs.
7	3	5/3/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: attempts to improve the White House's image. 4 pgs.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

*file*

May 7, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
SUBJECT: Political Memorandum

Evident from the attached, there is a new strain of bitterness, frustration and alienation among younger conservatives, toward the Administration. Increasingly, it has focused on the White House Staff -- especially in attacks directed at John Ehrlichman and his staff.

Basically, these are the reasons for it:

First, younger conservatives, more True Believer than the older National Review columnists crowd, are distressed at the departure from the White House staff of conservatives Burns, Harlow, Freeman, Anderson, Allen, Mofziger, Huston, Mollenhoff, etc. They do not see anyone replacing the departing conservative voices.

Second, they are convinced that the White House staff has been structured to systematically exclude "conservative" input in domestic policy - thus, the recent attacks on John Ehrlichman from the Right in recent months.

Third, they believe that the President makes his decisions, not on the basis of who he sees, but what he reads; and they contend there is no conservative view presented in the day-to-day paper going in and out of the President's office. They feel that the President's instincts are basically conservative, but he just does not get enough conservative proposals, and conservative views; and they feel this is the reason for what they see as the mistakes (i. e. FAP) of the Administration. As for conservative ideas

*news summary  
is liberal?*

(i. e. special revenue sharing) these seem to them to be dying without any major Administration concern.

Fourth, they believe that the golden opportunity to build a "new Republican majority" of conservative Democrats, and regular Republicans, is being lost -- because of the Administration's domestic policies, which they see as by and large extensions and refinements of the Great Society, only more so.

Fifth, they are all Nixonites -- but they contend that if the President is re-elected with his existing staff structure without conservative representation -- then, they will have totally lost their leverage with the President and Administration -- the dream of the New Republican Majority will be gone forever, "we will be out of the ball game completely."

In short, they are convinced with Richard Goodwin that "structure is policy," and with those Congressmen who believe that the "White House Staff" is responsible for the leftward direction of an Administration whose President has basically conservative instincts.

What they have in mind, if they don't see some changes, is to try to co-ordinate a conservative attack on the White House staff, to persuade some of the older columnists to join it; in the hope that the attacks will bring about some changes in the present staff structure, perhaps force the addition of political conservatives to the President's top staff.

While the number of individuals involved in the effort is not great, they do have at least one columnist among them -- and they are determined to win as many Congressmen and columnists and publications to their effort as possible. Some of the far right anti-Nixon conservatives would probably join the effort.

The whole effort has been building for months. We have managed to stave it off -- arguing that the exercise would be counter-productive, that you cannot attack the President's staff without striking the President; and that any damage done to the

President only enhances the possibility that a Muskie or Kennedy will be sitting in the White House in two years; and if that happens, the Western World can close up shop.

All of those involved, incidentally, were to my knowledge Nixon Conservatives in 1968, not Reagan conservatives.

*ie who are they?*

I have passed this along, as these fellows consider me their "conduit" to the President; and as I think their present spirit, mood and plans could present us with some serious problems in the months ahead.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 3, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
SUBJECT: POLITICAL MEMORANDUM  
THE PR CAMPAIGN

We face an increasingly serious political problem in the rising crescendo of news stories about the "image makers" in the White House. It reached a new level this weekend, when Bob Pierpoint went on network television news for the first time with his theme of "twenty-two image makers" now on the White House staff, following the three additions, who are allegedly the ones counseling the President to make the recent spate of public appearances. Others are certain to pick up the line, using the arrivals of Scali and Moore as their take-off point.

Further, Both Humphrey and Muskie have touched on the matter, (HHH accusing us of "public relations gimmickry) and if pressed, it could present a serious problem for if there is anything that turns off Middle America, it is Madison Avenue.

Secondly, for every minor color item we have moved into the media, there has probably been one major story on the "new effort to humanize the President." This latter theme coursing through the national media is decidedly not to our advantage. One wonders if the trade-off was worth it between the Barbara Walters Show/Potomac Nine Interview on the one hand -- and all the news stories about what we were actually up to on the other.

While I do not have any complete answers to this problem, I think it is a serious one, which could become quite serious in the 1972 campaign; and herewith some thoughts:

First, we should de-escalate the time and energy and thought spent on pushing little "color anecdotes about the President -- and shift our emphasis on associating the President with "accomplishments" of his Administration. The President did not get here by being warm and human and witty and charming -- he got here by being capable and tough and qualified and politically courageous. And if we stay here, it will be because of those latter virtues and accomplishments -- not the former. I do not recommend that we eschew altogether telling the press and media anecdotes and stories which flesh out the President's personality. ~~But if we are relying on that, we are in trouble. And further~~ the efforts to push these to the press becomes at once counter-productive, as Ziegler tells me; for the press room quickly buzzes with the story that we are "pushing" these materials. And they insert in future stories that the "PR campaign" is geared up again.

Again, in speeches and interviews and backgrounders, the colorful anecdote is useful, and should be utilized -- but this effort should not call forth the present institutionalized effort. More than one friendly reporter has told me we "are turning people off," with these efforts.

Frankly, the one in the best position to drop the "anecdotes" about a meeting is Ron Ziegler, or some official who has "reason" to be in the meeting -- where it occurs -- a reason other than there to write up the color. Example: PJB attends the Congressional leadership meetings; it is an easy and natural thing to do when asked about that meeting to relay the anecdotes. But unless it's an extraordinary incident, a phone call from me to Time to "tell" them the anecdote will produce an entry in the "Time File" to the effect that we are out pushing anecdotes.

~~The McGinnis Book leaves us far more vulnerable than we might otherwise be to this type of political attack.~~

One concern about press conferences is that invariably the media zeroes in on "Vietnam," an issue on which every American has probably made up his mind, and every American is tired of hearing debated and discussed. Thus, the President's decision to hold the second conference -- Saturday -- and to focus it on domestic affairs, was the right one. For once, the President could swing out a little, hit the marijuana thing, hit those who create "hysteria" in this country by raising the spectre of police

state. He could talk about unemployment in Southern California; could put the needle to Humphrey "who I am glad is going to support us." In short the range of opportunities for the President to expand on what we have done, and what positions we take was a golden one. It is time the President was associated with his popular political positions, more often in the press, time we were more closely identified with what we have done in the area of environment, etc. All those things that give the President the "activist" problem-solving image which the liberal press has made the sine qua non of the successful President.

We ought to find out the major concerns of the American people, "their issues" and wed the President's public appearances to those concerns. Surely, the President's appearance at Pendleton was directly consistent with this. We ought not to make the mistake of thinking "our" issues, i. e. revenue sharing and reorganization, are the concerns of the public: we should find out for sure the concerns of those national communities, ethnic, racial, political -- and associate ourselves with them. Again, this does not argue for abandoning our "six great goals" at all -- these have given us the stamp of an activist progressive administration; but if we are to rally great enthusiasm for the President, then we must closely identify with issues where their enthusiasm resides. One example: As of this point (9 a.m. Monday) certainly the capital city and perhaps the country's point of concern is the hell-raisers in Washington. As of now, the President should be given the credit for sweeping out that park; the President might well make a public gesture to the Washington Police and the troops who have done a first-rate job of police work. *(This was done)*

*Just a guess -- but we ought to be prepared for some in-depth pieces on the President's "public relations men." The press has been sniffing around this story for some time; and my guess is that, with Pierpoint's piece and recent arrivals, we can expect some along these lines.*

Finally, I think that what we have to sell is competence, not personality, a strong capable successful President, not Mr. Nice Guy. We should make every effort to destroy the myths about the President that have been created over twenty-five years -- but we should not depend upon this to see us through. We should recognize that the people have an impression about the President built up over years and decades of time -- and twelve months is not going to change that impression perceptibly.

Attached is a clipping by a normally hostile John Pierson, a fellow who generally finds it next to impossible to write well of us -- yet, he has something here.

PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

PR

May 3, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
SUBJECT: POLITICAL MEMORANDUM  
THE PR CAMPAIGN

We face an increasingly serious political problem in the rising crescendo of news stories about the "image makers" in the White House. It reached a new level this weekend, when Bob Pierpoint went on network television news for the first time with his theme of "twenty-two image makers" now on the White House staff, following the three additions, who are allegedly the ones counseling the President to make the recent spate of public appearances. Others are certain to pick up the line, using the arrivals of Scali and Moore as their take-off point.

Further, both Humphrey and Muskie have touched on the matter, (HHH accusing us of "public relations gimmickry) and if pressed, it could present a serious problem for if there is anything that turns off Middle America, it is Madison Avenue.

Secondly, for every minor color item we have moved into the media, there has probably been one major story on the "new effort to humanize the President." This latter theme coursing through the national media is decidedly not to our advantage. One wonders if the trade-off was worth it between the Barbara Walters Show/Potomac Nine Interview on the one hand -- and all the news stories about what we were actually up to on the other.

While I do not have any complete answers to this problem, I think it is a serious one, which could become quite serious in the 1972 campaign; and herewith some thoughts:

First, we should de-escalate the time and energy and thought spent on pushing little "color anecdotes about the President -- and shift our emphasis on associating the President with "accomplishments" of his Administration. The President did not get here by being warm and human and witty and charming -- he got here by being capable and tough and qualified and politically courageous. And if we stay here, it will be because of those latter virtues and accomplishments -- not the former. I do not recommend that we eschew altogether telling the press and media anecdotes and stories which flesh out the President's personality. But if we are relying on that, we are in trouble. And further the efforts to push these to the press becomes at once counter-productive, as Ziegler tells me; for the press room quickly buzzes with the story that we are "pushing" these materials. And they insert in future stories that the "PR campaign" is geared up again.

Again, in speeches and interviews and backgrounders, the colorful anecdote is useful, and should be utilized -- but this effort should not call forth the present institutionalized effort. More than one friendly reporter has told me we "are turning people off," with these efforts.

Frankly, the one in the best position to drop the "anecdotes" about a meeting is Ron Ziegler, or some official who has "reason" to be in the meeting -- where it occurs -- a reason other than there to write up the color. Example: PJB attends the Congressional leadership meetings; it is an easy and natural thing to do when asked about that meeting to relay the anecdotes. But unless it's an extraordinary incident, a phone call from me to Time to "tell" them the anecdote will produce an entry in the "Time File" to the effect that we are out pushing anecdotes.

The McGinnis Book leaves us far more vulnerable than we might otherwise be to this type of political attack.

One concern about press conferences is that invariably the media zeroes in on "Vietnam," an issue on which every American has probably made up his mind, and every American is tired of hearing debated and discussed. Thus, the President's decision to hold the second conference -- Saturday -- and to focus it on domestic affairs, was the right one. For once, the President could swing out a little, hit the marijuana thing, hit those who create "hysteria" in this country by raising the spectre of police

state. He could talk about unemployment in Southern California; could put the needle to Humphrey "who I am glad is going to support us." In short the range of opportunities for the President to expand on what we have done, and what positions we take was a golden one. It is time the President was associated with his popular political positions, more often in the press, time we were more closely identified with what we have done in the area of environment, etc. All those things that give the President the "activist" problem-solving image which the liberal press has made the sine qua non of the successful President.

We ought to find out the major concerns of the American people, "their issues" and wed the President's public appearances to those concerns. Surely, the President's appearance at Pendleton was directly consistent with this. We ought not to make the mistake of thinking "our" issues, i. e. revenue sharing and reorganization, are the concerns of the public; we should find out for sure the concerns of those national communities, ethnic, racial, political -- and associate ourselves with them. Again, this does not argue for abandoning our "six great goals" at all -- these have given us the stamp of an activist progressive administration; but if we are to rally great enthusiasm for the President, then we must closely identify with issues where their enthusiasm resides. One example: As of this point (9 a.m. Monday) certainly the capital city and perhaps the country's point of concern is the hell-raisers in Washington. As of now, the President should be given the credit for sweeping out that park; the President might well make a public gesture to the Washington Police and the troops who have done a first-rate job of police work.

Just a guess -- but we ought to be prepared for some in-depth pieces on the President's "public relations men." The press has been sniffing around this story for some time; and my guess is that, with Pierpoint's piece and recent arrivals, we can expect some along these lines.

Finally, I think that what we have to sell is competence, not personality, a strong capable successful President, not Mr. Nice Guy. We should make every effort to destroy the myths about the President that have been created over twenty-five years -- but we should not depend upon this to see us through. We should recognize that the people have an impression about the President built up over years and decades of time -- and twelve months is not going to change that impression perceptibly.

Attached is a clipping by a normally hostile John Pierson, a fellow who generally finds it next to impossible to write well of us -- yet, he has something here.

PATRICK J. BUCHANAN