

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>
10	25	1/22/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Kehrlie to Magruder RE: an attached memo from Buchanan focusing on Muskie and Harriman. 1 pg.
10	25	1/20/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Magruder to Haldeman RE: a memo from Khachigian. 1 pg.
10	25	1/19/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Magruder RE: Muskie's foreign policy record. 2 pgs.
10	25	1/20/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman RE: anti-U.S. foreign policy statements made by Muskie on his trips abroad. 1 pg.

January 22, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. MAGRUDER
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI
SUBJECT: Attached Memo on Muskie
and Harriman

Before moving ahead on the points described in the attached proposal from Ken Khachigian, you should get together with Pat Buchanan to discuss the additional points covered in Bob's memo to him of January 20 (also attached).

Attachments

cc: Mr. Buchanan

BK:kh

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 20, 1971

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By *K. Gypner* NARS, Date *7-12-82*

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HALDEMAN
FROM: JEB S. MAGRUDER
SUBJECT: Muskie and Harriman

I think the ideas pointed out in the attached memo from Ken Khachigian make sense, but I would like some direction from you as to whether or not we should go ahead.

Attachment

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 19, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR JEB MAGRUDER

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

SUBJECT: MUSKIE AND HARRIMAN

On Muskie's recent trip to Moscow and West Germany, he took along with him former Ambassador Harriman. Harriman helped set up the appointment with Kosygin and generally held Muskie's hand throughout the visit.

This gives us a very important point to make against Muskie. First, that he is a lightweight in foreign policy -- that he needed to have someone with him to make the visit. Note that RN visited foreign countries and Russia in 1967 without the aid of former diplomats.

Second, it allows us to tie Muskie to discredited Democrat foreign policy. I.e., Harriman was Johnson's Ambassador to Paris. Let's tie Muskie to the Harriman/Johnson failure at the Paris peace talks (without bringing any troops home). Harriman has worked with every Democrat President since Roosevelt. Where has his expertise gotten us? Three wars; no peace; captured nations in Eastern Europe, etc. For example, Muskie is Polish yet has as his adviser the man who presided over the Soviet takeover in Poland after World War II.

The following plan might be sustained over the next few weeks and should be continued as long as Harriman oversees Muskie's foreign policy formulation.

-- Get the line to columnists, emphasizing that Muskie needed Harriman to hold his hand in Moscow and that RN had (and has) experience so that he could handle himself competently in foreign policy. Can't Muskie think for himself?

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

-- Perhaps via Nofziger, have Dole (as RNC chairman) point out that Muskie is relying on old policy which was discredited long ago. In an age of crisis, we need a President who can think for himself on foreign policy and who isn't tied to old policies.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

-- Pat Buchanan could speak with his contacts to make sure that such discussions appear in Human Events and other publications. National Review should also discredit Harriman and the visit.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

-- Have MONDAY put a jibe in there comparing Muskie unfavorably with the President.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

-- Have letters sent to major newspapers and publications pointing out the above analysis.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

-- Let it be leaked that top White House advisors find it "strange" that Kosygin would see Muskie for almost four hours while turning down a meeting with RN in 1967 and wondering whether the Soviets wouldn't like to see Muskie get elected in order to have a less tough negotiator.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

January 20, 1971

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By *Byrne*, Date *4-12-82*

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. BUCHANAN

FROM: H. R. HALDEMAN *HH*

One very effective line that could be developed now is sharp criticism of Muskie for his irresponsible conduct while traveling abroad and criticizing American foreign policy. Comparison could be made -- which you would be completely attuned to because of your travel with the President during his trips in 1967 -- with his conduct during the eight years he was out of office and traveled to sixty countries. During that entire period, he never criticized policies of the U. S. government while abroad. In fact, he refused to answer such questions at press conferences and only used such conferences for defending those aspects of the policies with which he agreed. Any criticism of policies was delayed until his return to the United States.

A related point that you might be able to develop is that Richard Nixon, in the period between 1966 and 1968, particularly when he made his four trips abroad in the six months after the 1966 elections, did it all with a minimal staff whereas it will be noted that all the Democratic aspirants have large staffs -- including Muskie's thirty-five, as an example.

Please give this some thought, get with any others who might have an idea on it and see how they think it might be used - if they think it is appropriate.

cc: Mr. Magruder

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By *Byrne*, Date *4-12-82*