<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Folder Number</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
<th>No Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2/10/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Ray Price and Dwight Chapin RE: Rockefeller Speech. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/31/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Charles W. Colson RE: Campaign bumper sticker disclaimers. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/8/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Dwight Chapin RE: Eagleton Withdrawal Pool. List of pool participants and amount of money they contributed attached. 2 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/16/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: L. Higby To: Gordon Strachan RE: Campaign Ads. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/28/1972</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Peter Dailey RE: Film Crews at Conventions. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/25/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Rob Davison RE: 700,000 White House support names. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/31/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan RE: Follow-up on Independent Polling capability. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/15/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan RE: Follow-up on campaign bumper stickers. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/14/1972</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan RE: Follow-up on Vice Presidential approval ratings. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/14/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Bruce S. Flushman RE: Personal update. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/2/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From: Bruce Flushman To: Gordon Strachan RE: Personal update. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/14/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Len Garment RE: Intellectuals for the President. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/10/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Charles Colson To: Mickey Gardner RE: Recruitment of academics. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/10/1972</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Len Garment RE: Intellectuals for the President. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/1/1972</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Bruce Kehrli To: Charles Colson RE: Polls. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/15/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Larry Higby RE: Registration of youth vote. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/11/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Larry Higby RE: Haldemans from California to Miami Beach. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/1/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: H.R. Haldeman RE: Action memorandum on support groups. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/25/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Larry Higby To: Gordon Strachan RE: California situation. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/2/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Frank Herringer RE: Clearance procedure for voting bloc and citizens groups. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/2/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Gordon Strachan To: Larry Higby RE: Political matters and talking paper. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7/31/1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From: Larry Higby To: Gordon Strachan RE: McGovern's polls. 1 pg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Magruder, et al, 8-45-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Price &amp; Chapin, 8-10-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Colson, 8-31-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Note, Strachan to Higby, 8-9-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Notes, &quot;Nix...&quot; n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Bumper Stickers, n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Colson, 8-31-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Caliendo, 8-28-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Return Private/Political &quot;Comments from Strachan,&quot; 8-22-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Return Private/Personal Memo, Strachan to Chapin, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Retain Close Invasion of Privacy Memo, Strachan to Chapin, 8-7-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Caliendo, 8-1-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Dailey, 8-28-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Dailey, 8-22-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Dailey, 8-28-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Dailey, 8-28-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Dailey, 8-25-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Davison, 8-25-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Retain Close Agency Policy Memo, Strachan to Dean, 8-14-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Ltr, Strachan to Davies, 8-9-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Retain Close Agency Policy Memo, Strachan to Dean, 8-3-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to JDE, 8-3-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Follow-up, 8-31-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Finch, 8-17-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Follow-up, 8-15-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Follow-up, 8-14-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Personal Ltr., Strachan to Flushman, 8-14-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Follow-up, 8-4-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Garment, 8-14-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Garment, 8-10-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Garment, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Garrison, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Herringer, 8-31-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-28-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-26-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-11-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-15-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Personal Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-11-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Herringer, 8-9-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Close Invasion of Privacy Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-8-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-4-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-4-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-4-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Presidential Materials Review Board**

**Review on Contested Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection:</th>
<th>H. R. Haldeman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box Number:</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-3-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Herringer, 8-3-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-2-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 8-1-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 15, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JEB MAGRUDER
FRED NALEK
PETER BALEY
DWIGHT CHAPIN
PAT BUCHANAN
LEN GARMENT
ED HARPER
DICK HOWARD

FROM:

GORDON STRACHAN

In case you did not see the Andrew Glass article in this week's National Journal, it deserves your attention. In addition to several quotes from McGovern and his staff, the descriptions of their targets deserves your attention.

GS/jb
The McGovern Presidential campaign has fallen three weeks behind its timetable to plan a strategy and raise a war chest aimed at defeating Richard Nixon in November.

At the same time, Sen. George S. McGovern of South Dakota has slipped further behind Mr. Nixon in the national public opinion polls since he became the Democratic nominee a month ago.

Vice presidential woes: The McGovern staff blames both developments on what they call "The Eagleton Affair" — an unforeseen episode in the unfolding struggle to control the White House in the next four years.

The Democratic National Committee staged a show of unity at an extraordinary mini-convention in Washington, which on Aug. 8 ratified the choice of Sargent Shriver to succeed the original vice presidential nominee, Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton, D-Mo.

Nevertheless, McGovern aides acknowledged privately that their campaign had received a severe setback when, on July 25, Eagleton disclosed that he had had his way on three occasions in the past 12 years for psychiatric treatment, which included electric shock therapy. The ensuing furor absorbed nearly all of McGovern's time and energy until Eagleton at McGovern's urging, resigned from the ticket Aug. 1.

A member of McGovern's staff who had tracked the controversy from its inception said that the situation "went to the heart of the truth-and-candor issue, which is the bedrock of our campaign." Had McGovern been informed at the time he selected Eagleton, he added, "I'm pretty sure, in the circumstances, we would have chosen him anyway."

Plus side: On the other hand, the eventual choice of Shriver as a replacement proved popular in Democratic circles where there was little disposition left to revive the intra-party struggles that had marked the Miami Beach convention.

It still remained to be seen where Shriver — a former director of the Peace Corps and of the Office of Economic Opportunity and a former ambassador to France — would fit into the over-all campaign scheme.

Ted Van Dyk Jr., the McGovern issues coordinator and a top strategist in the 1968 Democratic Presidential drive, said that despite the Eagleton episode McGovern is in a better position today than Hubert Humphrey was four years ago. The advantage lies with McGovern, Van Dyk said, because:

The Democrats still have extra time to repair the damage, having met six weeks earlier in 1972 than in 1968.

Opposition to McGovern within the party is not directed from the kind of intense and activist circles that opposed Humphrey in 1968.

The party was bitterly divided in 1968 on a single emotional issue: Vietnam. No comparable issue divides the party that deeply today.

The incumbency of President Lyndon B. Johnson put a drag on the Democratic ticket. McGovern has no comparable handicap.

Candidate

In his search for a new running mate to replace the departed Eagleton, McGovern sought to propel his campaign toward the political center. Having vanquished the party's centrist candidates in his drive for the nomination, McGovern now optics bid for their support — and that of their long-standing allies — in his quest for the Presidency.

His tool in this effort was the vice presidential nomination, which, in circumstances McGovern could not have foreseen at the Miami Beach convention — had once again become available.

Direct dealings: To his dismay, it took McGovern a full week to find an acceptable replacement on the ticket who was willing to run with him. (While Eagleton announced his decision to step down on the evening of July 31, after confering with McGovern in the Marble Room of the Senate, McGovern had already all but decided the issue by the early hours of July 29, as he flew back to Washington from his crisis-tracked sojourn in the Black Hills of South Dakota.)

In contrast to the procedure he had followed in initially choosing Eagleton, McGovern did not rely heavily on the senior members of his campaign staff in making the second series of decisions. Instead, he turned almost exclusively to counsel from his Democratic Senate colleagues. (For a report on the 1972 Democratic National Convention, including the events leading to the choice of Eagleton, see Vol. 4, No. 30, p. 1177.)

Several prominent Democrats who had been offered the vice presidential nomination in Miami Beach, but who had declined, once again were approached to determine whether, in view of the changed circumstances, they would now be willing to serve on the ticket. None of them was.


Under strong prodding from Senate Democrats who were urging him to move toward the political center, McGovern next asked Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota to join the ticket. Humphrey had been McGovern's chief rival in the pivotal California primaries and Humphrey's lieutenant, allied with friends in the labor
movement, had organized the futile stop-McGovern drive at the convention. "Poor old Hubert," the Senator told reporters in mock self-pity while announcing the reasons for his decision. "He just had to get on. He just couldn't remain off. He smelled the savasst again and there he's in the ring. Well, bullshit. I don't need to be in the ring. That's the way I feel. I'm just not going to leave myself open to any more humiliating, debilitating exposure."

After Humphrey refused to join the ticket, despite McGovern's urgent pleas, the candidate turned to Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, who had been Humphrey's running mate in the 1968 Presidential race and who had been widely regarded as the front-runner for 1972, before being overwhelmed in the spring primaries. On Aug. 5, however, Muskie cited family concerns as his reason for not making the race and this finally prompted McGovern to turn to his fallback choice, Sargent Shriver.

Criticism: Not surprisingly, McGovern's inner circle was dismayed by this reselection process, which they felt might damage McGovern's political interests. A McGovern-Humphrey or a McGovern-Muskie ticket, they said privately, was not the right way to win the Presidency from Richard Nixon.

(The eventual choice of Shriver, however, elicited widespread approval among McGovern's senior advisers. Shriver has long been close to Frank Mankiewicz, McGovern's national political director as well as to Henry L. Kaufman, McGovern's campaign finance chief. Kaufman is a social friend while Mankiewicz had once served under Shriver at the Peace Corps. Shriver was named the corps' first director by his late brother-in-law, President John F. Kennedy, on March 1, 1961."

(On Aug. 4, when it appeared that Muskie, having delayed his decision, would accept McGovern's bid, Mankiewicz and Kaufman telephoned Shriver, who was at the Kennedy family compound in Hyannis Port, and urged Shriver to keep himself available for the post, not in case..."

In sacrificing McGovern's shot to the center, the result was, as congratulated by the vice presidential selection process, an independent national politician who asked not to be considered in name and fact."

"If Frank McGovern is on the wrong track, rather than ameliorating the power centers, he should be alienating them. McGovern's only hope, it seems to me, is to say, 'to hell with the Catholic vote.'"

"He's got a rock-bottom minimum that he'll get with the traditional Democrats. But he's got to make it or not make it with higher-income, well-educated voters. On each of McGovern's prime issues, his position, which is the liberal position, increases in popularity demonstrably as the educational level goes up, the income level goes up and the age goes down."

"That's his coalition, whether he likes it or not. And that's where he's been bombing out since June. Reason: Before that time, he looked like an anti-politics figure; now he looks like a typical pol. I predict that the more he doses it, the weaker he'll get."

The publisher's private point of view also is shared, privately, and at times not so privately, within both the upper and lower echelons of the McGovern campaign staff. Thus, in a recent interview, Mankiewicz said: "If he (McGovern) turns out to be just like Nixon, only better, we will lose."

Another long-time McGovern associate, who asked not to be quoted by name, said: "Before the convention, McGovern maintained: 'The center is moving to me. I'm not going to move to it.' We've seen since the convention the powerful pull of traditional politics on the man."

Defense: McGovern's movement to the center could be accounted for only in part by his decision not to heed the strategic advice of the campaign team that he had welded together to bring him through the pre-convention struggle to the party's nomination. Some McGovern lieutenants see deeper reasons for the shift.

Frederick G. Dutton, a senior McGovern adviser who has declined to take a formal title in the campaign, said in an interview: "As we try to respond to the Old Guard, we have to balance the men and the Old Guard carefully. We have to make compromises because of the political process itself, because of the conditionings of the press, the 'right' politics (of various interest groups) and because of Senators and Congressmen and people that in general make these are not the kind of compromises we would make if we could just cut out chances..."

"As politicians always do, we juggle into an unsatisfactory compromise of the alternatives. The pollsters are telling us to take our risks, close our eyes, so to speak, take a chance, and go with the 'moral group.' That would mean we would have to accept whatever breakup we got out of the old groupings. But, as you soon learn, there are some things you just can't do."

Dutton argued that the press has been a major influence in contributing to McGovern's political shift to the right. According to Dutton's thesis, political reporters and editorial writers have put intense, although indirect, pressure on McGovern to mount a 'mainstream' campaign and to shed his image as a fringe candidate—an image that McGovern had retained in the press through the early round of Presidential primaries. In so doing, McGovern supposedly gains credibility in the eyes of those who report on his activities and, eventually, with the public-at-large. But Dutton feels the process is, on balance, harmful to McGovern.

Although McGovern has bent his ideological stance with the political winds, he also remained eager to establish a basis on which he could clearly differentiate his approach from that of Mr. Nixon.

During his two-week stay at Sylvan Lake, a South Dakota retreat, McGovern managed to review campaign plans with his staff several times before the Eagleton controversy broke upon them. One idea which was adopted called for a series of regional McGovern "listeners" with prospective voters.

McGovern reported in a July 23 televised interview on Face the Nation (CBS) that "we talked at considerable length... about the importance of keeping a sensitive ear to the concerns of people in all parts of the country..."

What I personally would like to do is to use the month of August to get out over the country on a modest book, to spend as much time listening to the concerns of other people as I do talking."

The August listen-in plan, which has to be canceled because of the vice presidential selection crisis, carried the additional benefit of providing a necessary base for McGovern's full media campaign. The McGovern might consultants, Charles Grodenhaim, had earlier utilized document
tery-style techniques in videotaping ads in the pre-convention period. In late August and early September, Eaglenghein will utilize the McGovern "listen-ins" to tape new material for the campaign. (For a report on Goodenough's media techniques in the California primary, see Vol. 4, No. 24, p. 966.)

New balance: Dutton, as well as other senior members of the McGovern political high command, maintain that such intangibles as trust and credibility will have a major bearing on the November result. In large part, these are factors that lie within the respective candidates and can only be affected by staff decisions to a limited extent.

"This is why a statistical approach to the election is highly questionable," Dutton said. "This is really a 'mood' election. The general level of higher incomes will release people to a certain extent from simply voting their pocketbooks. That means that their personal feelings and other such intangibles will bear far greater weight than in the past."

"The Dutton view was seconded by Patrick H. Caddell, the 22-year-old McGovern pollster, who heads his own Massachusetts-based polling firm, Cambridge Survey Research Inc. "This is not the year when campaign techniques have the impact that they once did," Caddell said in an interview.

"The essential thing in 1972 is not staff, media, polls or anything else like that. It's George McGovern. The country is a very different place politically than it has been. That's the reason he's the nominee."

Organization

The driving force of the McGovern Presidential campaign is the candidate's personal political organization, forged, state by state, in the past two years.

Much of it was assembled under the direction of Gary W. Hart, a 34-year-old lawyer from Denver who has been organizing the McGovern campaign since 1970 and who in the present loose command structure appears to be in over-all charge at McGovern's newly opened headquarters at 1910 K Street NW in downtown Washington. While the organization built by Hart helped vanquish McGovern's opponents in a series of pre-convention primaries, it has yet to be tested, under full pressure from the Republicans, in the setting of a national election.

System: Three regional directors work under Hart in the fourth-floor political nerve center at McGovern headquarters. Along with Hart and Stein, they are known in the McGovern campaign as "the heavies."

Harold Himmelman is responsible for the Northeast and Middle Atlantic states; Eli J. Segal supervises the Midwest and the South; and Richard G. Stearns is in charge in the West and Rocky Mountain states. McGovern campaign directors had been chosen for most states by mid-August. In selecting these key men and women, Himmelman said, "The operating principle was to use an outside figure with no enemies collected en route and no in-state political ambitions. It's basically the same procedure we followed in the primaries."

Desk assistants—The staffs of each of the regional coordinators include four "desk people," who, in effect, function as subregional supervisors. Judy Harrington, a veteran McGovern aide who has been assigned to one of Segal's midwestern desks, said of her role: "We serve a liaison function for the political people. But we also serve a monitoring function because we must know what's going on out there. We are part supporter and part service."

Sterns said the regional supervisors in each of the three national sectors are there "to untangle all the snarls." He added: "They are crucial because they establish a continual telephone link with local political leaders, such as county chairman. When and if those people call Washington, they'll have the name of someone on the other end of the line in our campaign who knows them, or at least knows of them, and who will probably be able to meet their needs in a hurry. That's very important."

Double level—The McGovern forces are waging a two-tier effort. In nearly all of the 50 states and the District of Columbia there is an official campaign structure and, alongside, a "citizen's campaign" structure which is, in reality, comprised of the hard-core McGovern supporters in the state.

The object of the double-level system, according to Stearns, is "to minimize conflict between the regular party organization and the McGovern people, but in a way that it doesn't appear that we're running separate campaigns."

In most states, broadly based "policy committees" have been formed to supply over-all direction for the campaign. But actual control in most areas will be lodged in the hands of a small "steering committee," composed of between eight and 10 persons. "The steering group will include some regular party types," Stearns said. "But most of the weight will go to the McGovern (citizen's) organization."

In addition to the subregional supervisors, Himmelman, Segal and Stearns each have an assistant who is responsible for campaign logistics and another aide who acts as a liaison agent on issues. Additional troubleshooters are joining the campaign.

In-state coordinators, usually known as state directors, are being paid a uniform salary of $200 a week. Their deputies in turn earn $150 a week and field staff personnel is being hired, when funds are available, at a weekly salary of $75.

Centralization—"Essentially, the campaigns will be run in the states," Himmelman said. "But budgets, scheduling and media will be run from the Washington headquarters. We coordinate, in effect, extra arms of Gary Hart. We may operate as an appeals board but, let me assure you, the day-to-day decisions will be made in the states."

Nevertheless, Stearns, Himmelman's opposite number in the West, retains apprehensive over the degree to which centralized structure is being imposed on the McGovern campaign.

Stearns believes that the Nixon campaign is "a lot more decentralized than we are," a process that he thinks will redound to Mr. Nixon's benefit. On the other hand, Stearns noted, "You can't get away with anything anymore since all your statements are under constant scrutiny by the press. In those circumstances, there are certain advantages to keeping no centralized control."

Registration: A vital and somewhat independent facet of the McGovern campaign is its voter registration drive, which got under way in mid-August.

It is being directed from Washington by Anne Wexler, who made her political debut in 1968 as a Connecticut coordinator for former Sen. (1959-71) Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn.

In 1970, Mrs. Wexler managed the unsuccessful Senate campaign of the Rev. Joseph D. Dulles in Connecticut
and afterwards briefly ran a registration project for Common Cause. After serving a short stint in the Muskie campaign, she joined the McGovern forces in early May.

Mrs. Wexler is being assisted in the registration drive by Ms. Factor III, a Los Angeles lawyer, and Factor's longtime friend, Thomas M. Lemberg, a Washington attorney. Factor, the Harvard-educated heir to a cosmetics fortune, played a leading role in the McGovern registration drive for the California Democratic primary.

Policy for the registration drive will be set by a large group of party regulars—with the understanding that staff members are to be granted maximum flexibility between meetings of the policy group.

The purpose of wrapping the registration drive within the cloak of the traditional Democratic Party structure, other sources in the McGovern campaign made clear, is to make the drive appear less threatening to old-line Democratic leaders.

Their support is regarded as vital, particularly in the nation's major urban centers, if the drive is to achieve its goal. "But they will never go along if they get it into their minds that we're creating a youth monster that will gobble them up in 1974 or in 1976," a McGovern aide said privately. "That's why they have to retain control of this game."

Targets—Initial priority is being placed on blanket registration of students, working people, blacks and Latins—all groups with a traditionally high level of support for Democratic candidates.

"We're going after all groups where we hope to get a plurality (in November)," Factor said. "We're confident that they will give pluralities for most of the Democratic candidates who run this year," he added.

(And Lemberg disputed the results of Gallup Poll released in late July which appeared to show that among non-college, unregistered young people, the McGovern and Nixon candidates were running even. The McGovern workers said the poll was taken between April and June, before McGovern was well known to the public. Moreover, they maintained, most of the sampling was conducted on weekdays, during daylight hours, when most young people who work for a living are away from their homes.)

(For a report on political polling techniques, see Vol. 5; Na. 13, p. 1693.)

The McGovern plan calls for registering a sufficient number of new voters before early October between the ages of 18 and 24 to yield an additional net plurality for McGovern of about 1.8 million votes from this group. (In theory, there are about 35 million new voters who will be eligible to vote in 1972 for the first time; the McGovern staff believes that between 11 and 13 million may actually cast ballots this year.)

The McGovern target among new black and Latin voters, again on a net-voting basis, is between 1.5 million and 2 million ballots.

The plan calls for registering 1.2 million young people and minority-group members in both California and New York; 730,000 in Texas, 595,000 in Illinois, 572,000 in Pennsylvania, 500,000 in Michigan and 406,000 in Ohio.

McGovern headquarters is providing a series of taped messages for radio stations to advertise the registration drive on an ostensibly non-partisan basis. (Among the pluggers are Sen. Edward Kennedy and the Rev. Jesse Jackson, a Chicago-based black leader.) The McGovern staff is also offering free legal services wherever local registrars prove recalcitrant in putting young people or minority-group members on the rolls.

In addition, a system of computerized printouts will match lists of potential voters within the target groups with rosters of already registered individuals. Wherever possible, those who fail to match up will be contacted by volunteers and registered.

Finances: The necessity for fresh sources of capital to pay for the massive registration effort, as well as to underwrite the actual campaign, remains one of McGovern's thorniest problems.

The Eagleton dilemma effectively delayed the start of the fund-raising drive by three weeks at a time when the McGovern campaign—having expended its reserves in gaining the nomination and paying for an expensive convention operation—was all but broke.

As an economy move, the McGovern headquarters was shifted from a series of town houses on Capitol Hill to the former Muskie Presidential headquarters on K Street, a 10-story structure scheduled for demolition in the fall. The building is owned by Edward Bennett Williams, a law partner of Joseph A. Califano Jr., counsel to the Democratic National Committee. The McGovern campaign, as the Muskie forces before them, pay only a nominal rent to Williams for use of the structure.

In his acceptance speech at Miami Beach, McGovern called on one million persons to denote $25 each to his campaign treasury. That $25 million, in turn, would provide the major share of the $35 million that Kinkel and McGovern's other finance managers say is needed to mount an effective drive for the White House.

Even though McGovern voiced his appeal for funds at nearly 3 a.m. on the East Coast, the speech succeeded in raising $250,000 for the impoverished McGovern campaign. This prompted McGovern to renew his appeal for grassroots financing in his Aug. 8 speech to the special meeting of the Democratic National Committee, called to ratify his choice of Shriver as a running mate.

To augment a pre-convention list of more than 100,000 names compiled by the McGovern campaign, a special mailing urged each of the original contributors to supply the names of 10 new persons who might be willing to help the candidate financially. In that way, the original McGovern list has been swollen to 220,000 names, with the expectation that some $8 million could be raised through direct-mail solicitations before November. However, an initial mailing of 12,000 was suspended for two weeks in late July in the wake of the Eagleton affair.

Issues

One evening in mid-May, after Frank Mankiewicz, the McGovern campaign aide, boarded a jumbo jet that would carry him from Washington to Los Angeles, he slipped into a seat beside a reporter and chatted for part of the trip.

"To be honest with you, I really don't know whether we can get this nomination," Mankiewicz said at the time. "But I do know one thing: If we do get it, then there will be only one issue in the fall campaign: Richard Nixon."
White House image: Mankiewicz cur- rently is devoting top priority to mark- ing good on that pledge. In a recent in- terview at the McGovern Washing- ton headquarters, he swung his chair away from a battered pre-World War II typewriter, pushed away a tangle- tided series of file boxes on his desk marked "Int.," "Out," and "Procrasti- nate," in one of his menthulled ciga- rettes and reflected on the tasks ahead. About the hardest thing we have to do is to 'de- Presidentialize' Nixon,'" Mankiewicz said. "But it's also the most essential. That's why, for example, we invariably refer to the 'Nixon for Presidents Committee.'"

The official title of the Nixon cam- paign arm is "Committee for the Re- election of the President."

"We will swing away from McGov- ern's proposals. They were, after all, ideas that proved useful for the period of the primaries. Instead, the em- phasis will now be on why a program is needed and why the present ap- proach is inadequate to meet the nation's needs. In all cases, the ques- tion will be: who has got the best alternative?

"An incumbent should be on the defensive, not the challenger. Nixon is an accidental President and the nation's needs. In all cases, the ques- tion will be: who has got the best alternative?"
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August 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: RAY PRICE
FROM: DWIGHT CHAPIN
SUBJECT: GORDON STRACHAN

Rockefeller Speech

The November Group has suggested that it might be best to introduce the campaign slogan - "President Nixon - Now More Than Ever" - in Rockefeller's speech at the Convention. The use by McGovern of "Come Home America" is sighted as an excellent way to introduce the slogan without making it appear as a McGovern's creation. As I understand it, you are working on Rockefeller's speech and might have some views regarding the appropriate time to introduce the campaign slogan.

H F/U 7/15
GS:car
August 31, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHARLES W. COLSON
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Bob asked Peter Dailey to have the attached bumper stickers "NIXon McGovern" prepared in mock-up format. You will notice that there is no appropriate legal disclaimer. It is Bob's understanding that you have the responsibility for contacting the Teamsters, etc., and arranging for distribution with the appropriate disclaimer.

Would you have someone get in touch with Bill Novelli of The November Group regarding the production and keep Bob posted on the status of this project?

Thank you.

GS/jb

cc: Peter Dailey
Dailev had these bumper stickers prepared.

You mentioned that they should be distributed by "Teamsters, etc." Does Colson have the responsibility for contacting the Teamsters and arranging for distribution with appropriate legal disclaimer?

[Signature]
MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM FOR:  GORDON STRACHAN
FROM:       WILLIAM D. NOVELLI
SUBJECT: Requested Bumper Stickers

August 28, 1972

Attached is a batch of "Nix on McGovern" bumper stickers without a legal disclaimer, as you requested.

Please let me know if you would like to proceed further with this project.

cc: Peter H. Dailey
    Phil Joanou
Peter Dailey submitted these mock-ups of the requested bumper sticker. Dailey had received the original note showing the layout and was apologetic about not submitting exactly what was requested.

Dailey remains opposed to doing any bumper stickers along these lines because they are "unPresidential".
August 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Bumper Sticker

Attached is the suggested bumper sticker "NIXon McGovern".

Before you think 1701 is incredibly responsive to requests, you should know that samples were sent to Sandy Cram at 1701 unsolicited. They are done by a small committee in Texas. Mike Scott is after more information on the committee and its distribution.

Peter Dailey is opposed to the slogan because it is "non-Presidential". Asked if he would approve distribution by a labor union he was neutral.

GS/jb
Bob wants a mock-up of a bumper sticker done as indicated on the piece of paper below. Don't deviate much from the size, relationships, or lay-out, with the exception of you may want to put McGovern on the far right-hand side.
Date __________

TO: [Name]

FROM: L. Higby

Do feel and the

St. could not

Then present lost

Of them
August 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Bumper Sticker

Attached is the suggested bumper sticker "NIXon McGOVERN". Before you think 1701 is incredibly responsive to requests, you should know that samples were sent to Sandy Cram at 1701 unsolicited. They are done by a small committee in Texas. Mike Scott is after more information on the committee and its distribution.

Peter Dailey is opposed to the slogan because it is "non-Presidential". Asked if he would approve distribution by a labor union he was neutral.
NIXON M.
GOVERN
EYES ONLY
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 31, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHARLES W. COLSON
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: McGovern Contributors

Bob read your August 26 suggestion regarding McGovern contributors and asked that you refer this directly to Chotiner. If you have any questions, please give me a call.

GS/jb
FU - 9/6
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 8/29

TO: LARRY HICBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Weren't you contacting Nixon about this operation? Do you want to advise Colson or not?

Yes

He said refer it to Chotiner.
MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: McGovern Contributors

The attached article adds very much to my concern about our investigative capabilities. To whom should I send this kind of thing for follow up? This is just loaded with potential. We, of course, can inspire some attacks based simply on the facts as reported in this article, but I would think with some digging we could turn up stuff on these individuals as also on all of the procedures being used by McGovern for large loans. I just have the gut feel that there is a wealth of material here and if there is a mechanism for us to exploit it, I am unaware of it. I've talked to John Dean and he has no capability in this area; nor does Buchanan. I think this one ought to have very high priority.
Young Millionaires Are Big McGovern Contributors

By MICHAEL C. HENSEN

Millions of dollars in donations and loans have flowed into the Presidential campaign of Senator George McGovern, the Democratic nominee, largely from a small group of young millionaires whose wealth is mostly inherited and whose concern is expressed with social issues in connection with a future ambassadorship.

Some of the donors are heirs to industrial fortunes. Others are 25-year-old law students from New York and a youthful Harvard professor. Some of the young millionaires are working in McGovern campaign headquarters, and campaign committees. In most of them has a desire for community. Some have been active in the job of finding other like-minded young money.

Notwithstanding the large interest and contributions from rich sources, however, only 80 of the contributors have been under $100,000, according to the reports. About $20,000 is in the $100,000 range, and $20,000 is in the $200,000 range. A few are over $200,000.

Revenue from less than $50,000 is not reported in the last month. The amount is not being reported is the major source of information from the small contributions.

Among the wealthy young millionaires, it seems to be the millennial generation that is the most active.

The 25-year-old law student at New York University, for instance, has made loans and outright gifts in excess of $10,000 to the McGovern organization. Why did he help to finance the campaign? “He is a man who speaks for the people needs an alternative source of support,” said in the telephone interview. “His [McGovern’s] main interest is in people, and he’s been an example of people getting along with each other.”

Lent Over $100,000

Another young McGovern supporter is Morris Dees, 25, a civil rights lawyer from Montgomery, Ala., who works in the Senator’s Washington campaign office. He has lent more than $100,000 to the McGovern effort.

Mr. Dees, who was born in a small town in Alabama and moved to a big city, said he was President Lyndon B. Johnson’s threat to our civil liberties.

In addition to the war, he said, there is the threat to our civil liberties.
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August 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Ray Caldierno
FROM: Gordon Strachan

Would you advise me of the status of the Cassius Clay announcement, when it will be done and by whom?

cc: Jeb Magruder
GS/jb
COMMENTS FROM STRACHAN

COLESON - Thought the film was good, thought it should be definitely run tonight, considered it showed a personal side of the President.

GARMENT - Did not see the film but talked to Shana Alexander of Newsweek who really loved Nixon the Man film. Thought it was the best thing she had ever seen on the President, liked the tough "clowns" scene.

CLAWSON - Thought it was a great film, an exquisite taste, best brings out human side of President, perfect slide into re-nomination, only problem was we showed our best product prematurely.

DICK COOK - Thought it was lousy, though didn't see all of it. Didn't like the President-Ehrlichman exchange thought it was strained and rehearsed. Thought the First Lady picture was much better.

ELBOURNE - Thought the film was fair, thought the Ehrlichman-President exchange was pretty good but saw only parts of it.

PAT HITT - Liked the First Lady film much better, saw bits and pieces - thought the one on the floor was better than the "record" - Nixon the Man better because it showed more people in the Administration, as the "record" film had too much foreign policy.

DENT - Liked it - very much liked the President-Ehrlichman exchange - it was tough, especially the "clowns line" - only criticism is that Bob Brown should have been later in the film, not right after the Blacks comment. Particularly liked the tough President, showed the human Richard Nixon stuff the public doesn't know. Makes him look like a forceful President.

RAY BROWN - On floor as floor manager - Felt it was a good
film but too partisan, that effect was good.

MALEK - Thought it was excellent, the delegates that he talked to thought it was great, they particularly liked the Ehrlichman exchange. Dick Richards, one of the regional directors of the Mountain states thought it was good and his only criticism was that the Ehrlichman-President part was somewhat staged. He thought the content and impact on the audience was emotional and excellent.

MAGRUDER - who talked with several reporters Kaplow, Keicher, and Henry Hubbard said that they hate propaganda films but that this was a damn good one. The delegates under Magruder's operation liked the bussing line and the newsys liked the Pat Buchanan line.

TESTER - Thinks that the only criticism he heard was the segment on the phone seemed a little staged and hoaky; however, the comments that he received was that it was an excellent film, very good emotional appeal.
By order of the Counsel to the President, John W. Dean III, you receive the ill-gotten gains from the Eagleton withdrawal pool.

Truth, Justice, Equity and Compassion for the true winner, Larry Higby requires that you spend this money on boozes for him.

cc: Mr. Larry Higby
    Mr. John Campbell

GS/jb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ann</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight</td>
<td>Friday &amp; Tuesday</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna</td>
<td>No Withdrawal</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Technically on date letter sent
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: RAY CALDENRO
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

SUBJECT: Celebrities

Could you submit a brief update to Clark MacGregor with a carbon copy to Bob, on the status of the projects described in your July 21 memorandum on Celebrities. Would it be possible to have this report by Friday, August 4?

cc: Jeb Hagenauer

GS/jb
FU - 8/4
August 20, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PETER DAILEY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Advertising Materials

Bob wants to continue the current system of reviewing all the advertising materials in their as-close-to-final form as possible. As I mentioned to you in Miami Beach, he is particularly interested in reviewing the boards with you. For example, in the Democrats for Nixon newspaper advertisement, he saw only the text and would have preferred to see the boards. As you know, he wants to see all the materials for the Democrats for Nixon before it goes to Connally. Would you work with Novelli, Joannou and whoever else to make sure that Bob sees the materials not in text form but in story board form?

Thank you.

cc: Jeb Magruder

GS/jb
August 16, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRAGAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

We’ve got to make an arrangement from now on with Dailey so that we see the Beards before they’ve gone out — not after he’s shown them to Connally. What I’m particularly concerned with here is this “Democrat for Nixon” ad that ran today. Bob, as you know, only saw the text, not the layout, and, while the text was good, the layout that appears in this morning’s WASHINGTON POST is ridiculous. The ad will be read by no one. Let’s get this changed so that Bob sees all future layouts. If this ad is going to run again, let me know so we can try and change it.

LHikb
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 26, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PETER DAILEY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Film Crews at Convention

Would you advise me of the status of the film crew coverage of the Convention, how the Convention was covered and when the films will be available as well as your use of the films?

GS/jb
FU--9/1
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PETER DAILEY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Utica Campaign Film

Pursuant to our conversation last night, would you please review the film done at Utica last week. Apparently, the crowd coverage camera angle and content of the speech were excellent. You should determine whether or not these materials can be used commercially via outtakes, etc. The film, of course, can be obtained through Dwight Chapin. Would you please advise me of the status of this project on August 31?

cc: Dwight Chapin
GS/jb
FU - 8/29
Let people look at film in Vitas to see if not commercial use - outlets etc.

G -> Bailey 8/25
MEMORANDUM FOR: PETER DAILEY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Campaign Song

Would you advise me of the status of the "Reaching Out" campaign song? I noticed it was not used at the Convention and I am not sure of the status of the plan to introduce this song. Also, I need an update as to who will be recording the campaign songs and when those versions will be ready for Bob's review.

Thank you.

GS/jb
FU - 8/30
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 25, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PETER DAILEY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Changes in Advertising

Pursuant to our conversation, the changes in the scripts of the TV spots should be as follows:

1) On the Youth spot "we should tone it down because no thinking person would go along with this statement as it stands." Basically, he's worried about the last phrase:

"no American fighting anywhere in the world in this century and succeeding centuries."

2) China -- The audio should read, "China is one of the most populous countries in the world". The word powerful should not be used.

3) Other comments on the Domestic spots included the following:

(a) The 60-seconds are OK, except for the SST.

(b) There is some concern about spending a full five minutes on the Environment. Similarly, concern was expressed regarding spending five minutes on Older Americans.

We realize that certain liberties were taken with the truth, I will check regarding the two points, i.e. hydrocarbon and Medicare.

GS/jb
FU - 8/30
GENERAL HAIG'S COMMENTS

TITLE: YOUTH - Revise #4
COMMERCIAL NO. 3-5
LENGTH: 4:20

Page 3 - AUDIO

We should tone it down because no thinking person would go along with this statement as it stands. Basically he's worried about the last phrase:

"no American fighting anywhere in the world in this century and succeeding centuries."

TITLE: CHINA - Revise #5
COMMERCIAL NO. XXNG 0506
LENGTH: :60

Page 1 - AUDIO

2. "China is one of the most populous countries in the world" The Chinese are very sensitive about the word "powerful"; therefore General Haig feels "powerful" should be substituted with the word "populous".
Administratively Confidential

August 25, 1972

Memorandum for: Rob Davison

From: Gordon Strachan

As Fred Malek has probably explained to you, we have to go back to the drawing boards for the preparation of a proposal to use the 700,000 White House support names. The approval remains valid — that is, the 700,000 names can be used for a volunteer program. However, the primary concern is the security of the names. The decision is not to send the names out to the states. The reason for this is that the source of the names will become public knowledge and there will be severe criticism. When you have developed a substitute proposal, forward it to me immediately as I am anxious to get this project wrapped up.

Cc: Mike Smith

GS/jb
August 9, 1972

Dear John:

Apologies for the delay, but our campaign materials are now beginning to arrive. Under separate cover I have sent what was used in the primaries. I will continue to send the additional materials as they are received. We are having great fun putting it all together with hopes for a successful campaign.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Gordon Strachan
Staff Assistant to
H. R. Haldeman

Mr. John Davies
American Institute of
Public Opinion
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

GS/jb
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 3, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: JOHN EHRLICHMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Campaign Surveys - Wave II

Bob asked me to send you the issue materials prepared by Bob Teeter from the Campaign Surveys - Wave II. In addition, Teeter has available for your review all the demographic background information on the issues.

Bob also asked me to send you Teeter's July 31 memorandum on Inflation and Taxes. If you have any problems obtaining the material you need from Teeter, please advise me.

Thank you.

GS/jb
MEMORANDUM FOR: FOLLOW UP
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

On September 6 check with Nigby on the status of my July 27 memorandum to Haldeman on Independent Polling Capability. Benham's proposal and the updated Tester proposal should be consolidated.

GS/jb
July 27, 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. Haldeman

FROM:

Gordon Strachan

SUBJECT:

Independent Polling Capability

Hon. and I met with Tom Benson on July 21 to discuss his proposal for an independent polling capability for key state and national surveys for exclusive use here at the White House. Benson's proposal, attached at Tab A, offers a day-by-day polling capability similar to one of the three systems 1701 is considering. Benson's description of the current plans by 1701 for daily polling is attached at Tab B.

Benson's proposal would cover more than the requirements we anticipate. He offers a daily, continuous interviewing of a national sample of all adults for trend purposes with the capability to investigate any group of questions immediately. Benson's main value is alternative with capability in each of the key states as well as nationally would cost $133,000. This capability is probably that 1701 should establish, though Benson has resistance to 1701, which he claims is based on their exclusive costs. 1701 in, by the way, more expensive than Chilton, which has offered to conduct a national telephone survey of 1,000 interviews for $500 instead of the 1,000 1701 charges. However, 1701's reliability, confidentiality, and detail information has precluded serious consideration of Chilton.

To prevent the waste and duplication of establishing two systems, I propose the following solution:

1) Direct Benson to establish the 1701 daily polling capability at 1701. The cost may be slightly higher and Benson may resist this intrusion on his authority to make campaign polling decisions, but the advantages of reliability and security outweigh the negatives.
Average privately with Benham (without Teater's
drive) to have the additional capacity to accommodate
the House requirements of 10-12 national (sample
either on 50 states or on the 10 key states) and
local key state polls. Benham estimates the cost of
additional capability would be 12,000 to install lines
in 6,500 per survey. The per survey cost is 500
because of additional overtime and staff costs of
producing results in one day.

The only duplication of White House and 1701 equip-
ment would be a Xerox Telecopier (commercial alternative
to MGC and the other vendors have this capability.
It cost 50 per month to rent, but would permit
immediate transmission of written materials. kehri con-
cludes 158 is available.

4) Payment for the 1701 capability would be made in
accordance within the approved budget system. Payment
of $100,000 cost of the MGC independent polling capa-
bility would be delayed until after November 7. This
would prevent disclosure to anyone at 1701 as well as the
general public due to the campaign spending legislation.

Approve general idea; Strachan work out details
with Terenzy and Benham.

Shugrue.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------
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GS/jb
August 17, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: COUNSELLOR ROBERT FINCH
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Campaign Song

Bob thought that you might be interested in this candidate for a possible campaign song.

Please listen to the tape at your convenience and let us have your comments.

Thank you.
August 15, 1972

Memorandum for: FOLLOW UP
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

On August 25 check with Bill Novelli regarding the Nixon-McGovern bumper sticker that he was to have prepared in layout. Obtain the original and prepare a proposal for paying for the item so that the President's Re-Election Committee does not appear on the bottom of the bumper sticker.

GS/jb
August 14, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FOLLOW UP
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Check on August 16 whether Teeter has submitted the modified description of the Vice Presidential approval ratings by ADI.

GS/jb
August 14, 1972

Dear Bruce:

Thanks for your letter. It's great to know someone is practicing law in San Francisco.

You are right — Washington's summer remains its one great drawback.

Some evening try Charley at Battery and Pacific — great French food.

Hope to see you in California soon.

All the Best,

Gordon Strachan

Mr. Bruce S. Flumman
1430 Amador Street
Vallejo, California 94590

GS/jb

Orig. mailed from office
Mr. Gordon Strachan
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gordon:

I wanted to drop you a short note to tell you that I am currently employed at the California Attorney General's office in San Francisco. Bette and I arrived safely out here at the beginning of this month and I started working shortly thereafter. Our address, if you desire to reach us, will be at Bette's parents' house--1438 Amador Street, Vallejo, CA 94590.

I hope Christine and Lauren are doing well and that the summer in Washington hasn't got you all down. I imagine, though, that you are all overjoyed at the results of the Democratic convention and its aftermath. I will say no more on that subject.

San Francisco is great but really hard for me to compare with Washington. The weather has been fabulous and the City is beautiful, but after being in D.C., it seems very provincial. We do really miss it back there. If only there wasn't a summer.

Hopefully, you'll be out here soon so we can get together. In any event, keep in touch.

Take it easy,

BRUCE S. FLUSHMAN

P.S. Our best to Bruce and Sterling, et al., too!
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FOLLOW UP
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

On August 8 check with Tom Benham regarding his plan and electoral projections based on the state-by-state polls.

GS/jb
MEMORANDUM FOR: LEN GARMENT
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Intellectuals for the President

August 14, 1972

As you know, Bob read the plan you prepared regarding Intellectuals for the President and was under the impression that it was being implemented. Chuck Colson, however, noted that Ithia Desola Poole has not been contacted yet, suggesting several Democratic Scholars for Nixon that appeared in your original proposal. He has included Irving Kristol, Sidney Hook, Marty Lipset and others. Would you check with Mr. Colson and determine whether there is any overlap or inconsistency.

GS/jb
FU - 8/18

CC: Chuck Colson
August 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:    MICKEY GARDNER
FROM:               CHARLES COLSON

One area that needs early attention on the part of Democrats for Nixon is the recruiting of academics. Ithia Desola Poole is sitting in Aspen waiting to hear from someone. Remember my conversation with him -- he said he would be delighted to be a chairman of Democratic Scholars for Nixon and could recruit Irving Kristol, Sidney Hook, Marty Lipset and others. These names would be very significant. These are all old-line, liberal Democratic scholars. We need them. Connally could very easily slip into Colorado on his way back to the ranch or from the ranch. One meeting with the President and we would be off and running, but this one should not be allowed to drag on or we are likely to have these people cool off, particularly as the campaign heads up.

Max Kampleman, by the way, you should feel perfectly free to call on for this. He is well plugged into all these people and moreover can recruit others. He has volunteered to help in this regard.
August 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LEN GARMENT
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Intellectuals for the President

I have learned that Professor Brooks Townsend, Political Science Instructor at UCLA, supports the President. You may want to have the Intellectuals for the President group contact him.

cc: Jeb Magruder
    Fred Malek

GS: car
ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: TED GARRISH
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Pursuant to phone conversation today, would you please prepare an analysis on the attached comments.

GS/jb
FU - 8/11
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
August 1, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. CHUCK COLSON
FROM: BRUCE KEHLI
SUBJECT: Polls

The July 31 News Summary contained the following note:

-- Sindlinger says the Eagleton affair has been "very damaging" to McG himself as questions are raised as to whether McG knows what he's doing. But more startling, says Jerry Greene, is Sindlinger's finding of widespread apathy toward the election with only 56% of those qualified now expecting to vote. And RN leads among those 52-44.5. Among all potential voters, RN is preferred as the respondent's spokesman by 49-28. And the 51% of the respondents said their friends preferred RN while 24% said McG. --

Referring to the above, it was noted that this shows the need for us to get out the votes.

Due 8/11

cc: H.R. Haldeman
    Alexander P. Butterfield
MEMORANDUM FOR: L. HIGBY
FROM: G. STRACHAN
SUBJECT: New Political Field Men

At 3:00 p.m. today, Fred Malek, Fred LaRue, Ed Morgan, John Whitaker, Jerry Jones, met at the Doral Hotel. I sat in.

Malek learned of the meeting by accident from Whitaker at 2:20 p.m. Jerry Jones had talked with Whitaker and knew that the plan was to bring Whitaker, Morgan and Harry Dent into the political field operation as "the President's men".

Malek saw MacGregor in my presence at 2:50 p.m. and asked MacGregor if he was going to attend the meeting. MacGregor said "No" and said that while he was aware of the suggestion, Malek should listen only to the proposal which MacGregor didn't think was a particularly good idea.

The meeting opened with Morgan describing the new arrangement. According to Morgan, the President was very concerned about the lack of coordination between the RNC, 1701, and the Democrats for Nixon. According to Morgan, the Post article on the disputes between the RNC and 1701 acted as a catalyst for an Ehrlichman, Haldeman discussion and agreement that Whitaker, Morgan, and Dent were to become "the President's men" to resolve differences and determine effectiveness of programs in the field. They were to divide up the key states and travel around to resolve problems between MacGregor and Dole. They would also move within the states and determine whether the plans were "really working".

Malek responded by saying he was inalterably opposed and that the proposal was totally unacceptable. Strong words followed with Whitaker's humor and jokes about who would throw whom off the penthouse roof adding a note of levity.

Morgan said, "There must be some misunderstanding", picked up the Signal line and tried to reach Ehrlichman. He was unavailable.
According to Whitaker, Ehrlichman asked Morgan and Whitaker over to the Key Biscayne yesterday for a description of the new system. Apparently Dent was already aware of the arrangement and so did not attend.

To elaborate on Malek's opposition, he said to establish Whitaker, Morgan, and Dent as "the President's men" would completely undermine his field men and destroy the work of the last 7 weeks.

Dent arrived and explained that the problem was that the political coordinators are unknown and not "the President's men".

Malek responded that he admitted to having limited political judgement and would seek advice from Dent, Whitaker, and Morgan, but that there cannot be a side-by-side field organization.

The meeting broke up with Morgan and Whitaker hoping to locate Ehrlichman to determine the status of the project.

Malek remains opposed and will fight any intrusion into the field operation tooth and nail.

Malek expressed to me afterwards that if there are any complaints about his handling of the field operation, he would appreciate hearing them directly from Bob, you, or me, rather than through the establishment of a new field operation under Ehrlichman's direction.
August 31, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FRANK HERRINGER
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Evans and Novak Column

Bob read Chuck Colson’s August 25 memorandum regarding the Evans and Novak column entitled "The Connally Syndrome". Recalling the excellent job you did on the HEW leak two weeks ago, Bob asked that you take on the assignment of tracking down this leak to Evans and Novak.

In addition to the backup materials attached to this memorandum, you should know that Jeb Magruder talked with George Christian in an attempt to discover the source of the leak. In any event, the matter should be pursued vigorously and a report submitted to Bob on September 6.

Thank you.

GS/jb
FU - 9/6

cc: Charles Colson
    Fred Malek
Frank Herringer on Malek's staff did an excellent job on that HEW leak two weeks ago. He should receive the assignment of tracking down this leak to Evans and Novak.
Attach is a copy of a memo I sent to Clark MacGregor, with the attachment. This is the third story of this kind that I know about. All signs very much point to 1701 on this one.

You will recall earlier when ABC named me as the man responsible for the media bias campaign, I found out through my own sources that that was a 1701 story.

Evans and Novak have a piece coming out on Sunday which details the whole 9:15 attack meeting and attack strategy here. Novak told me today that Evans had gotten the story, although Evans never called me. Novak implied that they had gotten their information from 1701. I have no idea what is in the story, but we are calling everyone who is at our 9:15 meeting today to ask whether they have been contacted by Evans and Novak this week.

What all of this adds up to in my mind is that we have a serious leak somewhere and we damn well better find it or roll a few heads and at least shake people up.
MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Attached Evans and Novak Column

August 25, 1972

I don't know whether you've noticed the Evans and Novak column attached, but it really very viciously and unfairly zings Connally -- unfairly because I was the man responsible for Procaccino, not Connally. It is also vicious because it makes Connally appear inept and unwanted.

Some of Connally's people have the very strong suspicion that this could have only come from 1701. It couldn't have come from Rockefeller's people alone because it refers to the Tennessee and Virginia situations which were known only to Connally and to people at 1701. It also would not have come from the Rockefeller people since Rockefeller and Connally met in New York and came off with a very satisfactory resolution of their differences on the Procaccino situation. Simply by process of elimination, one would have to suspect at least that someone at 1701 was involved in this story.

This is the kind of thing that as you know goes on in a campaign. There is probably no way to stop it, but we damn well ought to try because it is very counter-productive and creates animosities that can be damaging as hell in the campaign. I think it is well worth having someone look into.
The Connally Syndrome

MIAMI BEACH—The bizarre choice of the politically discredited Mario Procaccio to head John B. Connally’s Democratic re-election campaign in New York explains why party leaders attending the Republican national convention are so much less enthusiastic than President Nixon over the surprising Connally operation.

Connally’s campaign to mobilize anti-McGovern Democrats behind Mr. Nixon’s re-election campaign has run into so much Republican opposition that Clark MacGregor, the President’s campaign manager, has issued a disloyal order barring the Connally operation from states where Republican leaders do not want him.

Thus, in endless political discussions filling time here, there is disenchanted especially strong in the South—about conservative Democratic Connally. With Mr. Nixon holding a staggeringly lead, those party leaders say, Connally is damaging the Republican Party in their states.

The Procaccio case is symbolic. With Texas Connally aide Stephen Callahan staying Connally’s Governor of New York

politics, he knew nothing about Procaccio, who ran an inept campaign for mayor of New York in 1969. So Connally accepted without question a recommendation to make Procaccio vice chairman of his New York operation (with Connally himself as chairman). When they learned Mr. Nixon’s New York political operatives bluntly informed Connally that Procaccio was a “laughing stock” without influence or organization, the solution: Connally quickly named half a dozen other “vice chairmen” diminishing Procaccio’s visibility.

“CONNALLY’S worst problems are in the South, where some Republican leaders bitterly complain his Democrats for Nixon undermine their party building efforts. With Connally remaining a Democrat and backing the Texas Democratic ticket except for Mr. Nixon, Southern party leaders make small secret here that they see his Democrats for Nixon as an easy out for prominent Southern states to avoid the hard political choice of turning Republican.

A case in point is Virginia, where Democratic Senator William Sproul, fearful that Sen. George McGovern may defeat his re-election bid, has disassociated himself from McGovern’s presidential campaign. With a full-blown Connally operation in Virginia, other moderate Democrats such as Attorney General Andrew Miller might hang their hats on the Democratic for Nixon pole and ride out a Nixon landslide.

“We don’t want to let the Andy Miller ticket off the hook,” one Virginia Republican leader here told us, “and that’s what Connally would do.” The upshot: An announcement that Sidney Kelloff, long-time conservative Democratic leader in Virginia Beach, would be Democrats for Nixon vice chairman was quietly reversed. Connally will avoid the Old Dominion.

REPUBLICAN leaders in Tennessee also have looked the door on Connally, sending this ultimatum to MacGregor: If John Connally’s Democrats for Nixon in Tennessee also have locked the door on Connally, sending this ultimatum to MacGregor: If John Connally’s Democrats for Nixon as easy out for prominent Southern states to avoid the hard political choice of turning Republican.

Connally has suffered bitter reverses. He quietly offered a campaign job to President Nixon administration probably secretary of state) and a run for the 1976 Republican presidential nomination.

Connally confronts not only organizational obstacles in his pro-Nixon campaign but also growing hostility from ambitious Republicans beginning to regard him as a threat in their own state. In Texas, Sen. John Tower has fought partisan battles against Connally for a decade and would scarcely welcome him as Mr. Republican in Texas. Even worse, in Connally backing Tow­er’s Democratic opponent for the Senate (Patton Sanders) Tower’s infamy fear Connally’s ticket-splitting campaign in Texas.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak
August 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:  LARRY HIGBY
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN

This is the third Draft of the proposed poll. The first thirteen questions are those approved on August 26. Those which you questioned are noted. Benham recommends an alternate wording of question 13 (effect of breakin on vote).

The next /3 are suggested by Benham in response to your request for certain subjects.

GS:car
MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: "Democrats for Nixon" Brochures

You received the attached package of the Democrats for Nixon brochures at Camp David on August 18. Clark MacGregor reviewed the material in Miami Beach on August 22. He approved of the material but expressly requested that Bob review the language on amnesty. It appears in the Urban Ethnic Brochure. The language is marked. Buchanan is in California and you may want to check with him because, as you may recall, he did a substantial amount of research on amnesty at your direction.

As the cover memorandum indicates, the cover letter for these brochures has not yet been approved by Connally. However, because of the lead time involved in printing the brochures, it is requested that Bob's comments on the brochures in general and amnesty in particular be obtained as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

GS:KC
Teeter's analysis of the advisability of registering young voters is attached. This research is the crux of the brewing dispute between Colson and Malek on whether a voter registration drive should be conducted in the military. This dispute was covered in the August 11 Political Matters memorandum and you indicated you were going to talk with Malek.

Colson (Howard) is pushing for a resolution of this matter as soon as possible because of the lead time problems with DOD.

My personal view is that Teeter is right. His arguments about the difference between Gallup's national sample (over-representing the South and Farm States) as distinguished from the Wave II sample in key states is very persuasive. His argument on the source of draftees - lower socio-economic groups - also makes sense.

GS:car
H/PU - 8/25
August 11, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR:  LARRY HIGBY
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT:  Families from California to Miami Beach

I checked with Nofziger about a California charter to take Bob’s mother, wife, and daughter to Miami Beach. There is space available for one leaving Sunday, August 20 at 10:00 a.m. from Los Angeles International Airport. The cost of a one-way ticket is $100 each; round trip is $200 each. The contact is Sharon Tochilin at 415 456-7310.

The alternative is Ken Rietz’ offer to transport the three for free either on the celebrities or youth charters. Rietz will have the details hopefully on Monday, August 14.

GS:dg
August 9, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FRANK HERRINGER
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Clearance Procedure for Voter Bloc and Citizens Committees

Thank you for your August 8 memorandum on clearance procedures. The system you and Nalah have established seems adequate. The basic point though is that "no name can ever be used in advertisements, etc., without written permission." The individual group or voter bloc must obtain this. If your system has to be modified to assure this, please do so as the written permission on ads is essential.

GS/jb
As I discussed with you last week, the procedure for clearance of national Voter Bloc and Citizens committees is that each proposed committee member must be cleared with his home state Nixon Chairman (or a designee). The responsibility for obtaining the clearance rests with the Voter Bloc or Citizens Director, who calls the State Nixon Chairman and requests a reply within a reasonable period of time. If no reply is received, the person is assumed to be cleared.

In the case of State committees, each State Voter Bloc or Citizens Chairman is jointly selected by the appropriate Voter Bloc/Citizens Director at 1701 and the State Nixon Chairman, so he is automatically "cleared". The State Voter Bloc/Citizens Chairman then clears his committee members with his State Nixon Chairman.

The necessity for adherence to these procedures was restressed to the Voter Bloc and Citizens Directors at a meeting this morning. In addition, we mentioned the obvious need to obtain an individual's own approval before he is named to a committee.

cc: Fred Malek
August 2, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:  FRANK HERRINGER
FROM:  GORDON STRACKAN
SUBJECT:  Clearance Procedure for Voting Bloc and Citizens Groups

Pursuant to our conversation today, would you forward me a description of the exact method used in the clearance of the national and state Voter Bloc and Citizens Groups. The description you and Fred Malek gave me seems adequate. I would very much like to have it in writing.

8/5 will do
8/8 on way

cc: Fred Malek

GS/jb
August 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Action Memorandum on Support Groups

You sent Colson the attached Action Memorandum on setting up a system that runs a complete check on individual Democrats' names who might join Democrats for Nixon. Each individual was to be checked personally for authority to use his name. Colson responded that "none will be used unless we have permission in writing". (See attached at Tab A)

You sent me the same memorandum that you sent Colson except that you added "and all other support groups". (See attached at Tab B)

Discussion with Fred Malek on July 27 indicated that there are approximately 500-600 national, state, and local Citizen Groups and Voting Bloc organizations. At the national level, there are nearly 30 different Citizens groups with 10-15 members each. There are also nine Voter Bloc groups. Each of the names on the national groups are checked by Malek's office. Permission is not required in writing of the members.

The question is whether you want me to personally call each of the members of the national Citizens and Voter Bloc groups and obtain their permission in writing. Malek strongly recommends against this approach because he is satisfied with the current arrangement.

Yes, Strachan calls the national Citizens and Voter Bloc members. That is the #1 priority for the week. But no name can ever be used in ads etc. w/ written permission. Other.

No, rely on Malek's system.

The group should get the permission, not us.
MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Democrats for Nixon

Rest assured on the use of names for Democrats for Nixon. None will be used unless we have permission in writing.
Be absolutely sure that in the process of setting up the Democrats for Nixon there is a complete check made on every name that is used. Regardless of how we’ve gotten the name and how much confirmation we have, no name should be used publicly until there has been a final follow-up, probably by phone, from our office, confirming for sure that the individual is agreeable to have his name used.
MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: H. R. HALDEMAN

Be absolutely sure that in the process of setting up the Democrats for Nixon there is a complete check made on every name that is used. Regardless of how we've gotten the name and how much confirmation we have, no name should be used publicly until there has been a final follow-up, probably by phone, from our office, confirming for sure that the individual is agreeable to have his name used. Make sure this word gets to all our campaign organizations.
August 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:    LARRY HIGBY
FROM:               GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT:            Media Monitoring

You received a memorandum from Chuck Colson updating you on the media monitoring situation.

Attached are the copies of the most recent media monitoring reports from the Key States.

Are you convinced that this project is now back on track?

GS/jb
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ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Shriver Research

In addition to the basic background research produced by the HNC yesterday, there are three current projects seeking information about Sargent Shriver. All are under the general direction of Pat Buchanan. The first is the Ken Khachigian-supervised HNC research. This is being done at HNC by Bob Chase and his staff. The second project is being done by Al Abrams, recently employed at 1701. He had been at ORO and is using his contacts there to develop negative material. The third project is that being done by Bill Gifford. Gifford worked for then-Congressman Charles Goodell. Each week Goodell issued a press release attacking some part of the War on Poverty. Gifford is reviewing his files with Khachigian to pull out the most usable information. The deadline for each of these projects as determined by Buchanan for a preliminary report is Thursday, August 10 before noon.

GS/jb
FU - 8/10
August 8, 1972

MEMO TO: Cathy Bockman

We have a crew of six currently going through the Congressional Record and OEO files looking for material on Shriver from the early and mid-60's. Expect to get out a more comprehensive report by Friday. Will see that you get a copy as soon as any information is available.
ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, JR.

BIOGRAPHY

Born: November 9, 1915, in Westminster, Maryland.

Education: Yale College, B.A., Cum Laude, 1938.
Yale Law School, LL.B., 1941.

Family: Married Eunice Mary Kennedy, 1953; five children: Robert Sargent III, Maria, Timothy, Mark, Anthony.

Religion: Roman Catholic.

Career: 1940-1941 Withrop, Stimson, Putnam and Roberts, law firm.
1945-1946 Assistant Editor, NEWSWEEK.
1948-1961 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, assistant general manager.
1971-Present Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson, law firm.

Chicago Council of Foreign Relations.


Author: Point of the Lance, 1964.
1961 - 1966 Peace Corps Director

After the election of his brother-in-law, John F. Kennedy, Sargent Shriver was asked to head the fledging Peace Corps. After the appointment John Kennedy reportedly said, "It's easier to fire a relative if it flops." As head of the Corps, Shriver was praised by his fellow Democrats for his administrative capabilities and his success in lobbying Congress for funds.

1964 - 1968 Office of Economic Opportunity

Shriver's success with the Peace Corps led President Johnson to name him to head up the Great Society's war on poverty as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Shriver's tenure at OEO was more.

In 1968 a rising crescendo of protests against OEO waste, mal-administration, payroll-packing and political meddling required Shriver's appearance before various congressional committees. Representative Edith Green (D-Ore.), sponsor of the Women's Job Corps legislation, said at the time,

"Outside of the outrageous costs for this program, the additional tragedy is we are reaching so very few who need help." (Indianapolis News, August 31, 1967).

In 1967, GAO probers researched the Job Corps center in Pleasanton, California, and found that after two years of operations the estimated cost of the center had jumped from $12.8 million to $25.5 million, the dropout rate was 55 percent and only eight percent of the enrollees were placed in jobs related to their training.

1968 - 1970 Ambassador to France

In March, 1968, Shriver was saved from the OEO and appointed Ambassador to France. Pundits viewed the appointment as a master political stroke by President Johnson. It appeared to be a move to "neutralize" Shriver in brother-in-law Bobby Kennedy's attempt at the Democratic presidential nomination. What LBJ forgot to tell Shriver was that he would not seek re-election. When Shriver did not return to campaign for Senator Kennedy, it created some ill-will within the family.
Although Shriver has never held an elective office he has made several attempts. Shriver, however, was unable to find a state suitable or receptive to his candidacy.

1968

In late 1967 Sargent Shriver was mentioned as a possible opponent to Senator Everett Dirksen. At that same time Shriver also talked over the possibility of running for governor of Illinois with several Daley lieutenants. In both instances Shriver received little support from the White House.

1970

In 1970, after leaving his post as Ambassador to France, Shriver traveled throughout Maryland in an attempt to ignite a Shriver for Governor movement. That also fizzled. That same year Shriver's name was mentioned as a possible opponent for Governor Nelson Rockefeller in New York. That assignment went to Arthur Goldberg leaving Shriver somewhat of a frustrated office seeker.

Vice Presidential Hopeful

This year makes the third presidential year in a row that Shriver has been on the list of vice-presidential possibilities. In 1964 there was talk about a Johnson-Shriver ticket, that is, until LBJ ruled out choosing anyone in the Cabinet. In 1968. Shriver appeared on Hubert Humphrey's list, but the Kennedy family discouraged that. Each time Shriver was mentioned for vice-president, including this year, the argument was made that his Kennedy ties would help.

Congressional Leadership for the Future

Forever a loyal Democrat, Sarge Shriver paid his party dues in 1970 by heading up an organization called the "Congressional Leadership for the Future." Shriver campaigned for Democratic candidates in 24 states and raised $95,000 in the process. The effectiveness of his crusade is questionable however. In New York, for example, he campaigned for Arthur Goldberg (candidate for governor), Richard Ottinger (candidate for senator), and seven other congressional candidates. Out of that lot only two incumbent congressman were able to retain their seats. Shriver did make a lot of friends nevertheless, and he will probably collect those I.O.U.'s this year.
ON THE ISSUES

Vietnam

"If we disengaged there tomorrow, we'd gain stature in most of the world."
Buffalo Evening News
September 17, 1970

"[The] time for us to get out is now."

"What we went out there to do has actually been achieved...at a terrible cost in life. The basic issue is that the Vietnamese people...are now in a position where they can sink or swim on their own."
Washington Post
April 6, 1970

War on Poverty

Asked whether eliminating poverty would take closer to 10 or 30 years (Shriver) said:

"I think it will be closer to ten, but it depends a great deal on the amount of money...the Congress appropriates for this purpose, the amount of support we are able to get Nation-wide."
Washington Post
March 1, 1965

Shriver told his questioners on "Face the Nation" that he had proposed to President Johnson that the poverty budget be increased until it was eventually comparable to spending for the Vietnam war.
Washington Post
August 21, 1967

One of Shriver's chief lieutenants described OEO as a "sad shop" that will get even sadder unless President Johnson replaces Shriver with a "magical name."
Washington Post
February 11, 1968

Economy

"Nixon believes you can cure unemployment by putting people out of work. He thinks the most disposable product we have is the worker. We Democrats believe in human beings, not dollar bills and ABM's."
Hartford Courant
September 26, 1970
**Abortion**

"As a Catholic I'm opposed to abortion," but Shriver added that if he were governor he would have signed Maryland's new, liberal abortion law.

**Washington Post**
April 7, 1970

"I believe that if you repeal the abortion laws, at the same time you should add a new statute to provide psychiatric guidance, for example, and counseling, to provide better family planning information, to provide better child care clinics, to provide better education across the board about child health and human development, so that young men and women have a better understanding of their responsibilities as citizens and what it means to be a parent, what it means to raise a family."

"Meet the Press"
April 5, 1970

**Gun Control**

"The firearms problems in cities is very different from that in Maryland's rural areas. I think there should be strict control laws in urban areas and different, much softer laws, in rural areas."

**Baltimore News American**
April 17, 1970

**Drugs**

Shriver said that marijuana is no worse than alcohol or nicotine and has been viewed "with a double standard." Hard drugs, however, are frightening.

"I hate to say this about myself, but if I saw a pusher giving heroin to my boy I'd want to kill the pusher."

**Baltimore Sun**
April 15, 1970

**Shriver--The Politics of Hate**

"The Nixon-Agnew strategy is to draw attention to the campuses this autumn and to stir up anger towards the students. They want demonstrations. They want hecklers. They jump at them with glee."

**Newark News**
September 29, 1970

"Spiro Agnew has become this nation's great divider... (he) appeals to everything low and mean and bitter in the American character."

**Hartford Courant**
September 23, 1970
"Maybe Agnew and Ky could go around the country together.... It could be a very good tour.... It would be interesting for Americans to see the kind of allies we have in Southeast Asia. Of course, he is exceptional," Shriver said, noting that Ky is an admirer of Adolf Hitler.

Hartford Courant
September 23, 1970

"He (Agnew) attacks young people because he lives for today not for the future. He thinks they're all bad because of a few kooks."

Hartford Courant
September 26, 1970

"While Mr. Agnew may speak very tough about law and order," Mr. Shriver said, he is "offering American resentment, division and anger."

New York Times
September 20, 1970

A short time after Rawlings made the comment about putting "the Greek from Baltimore" on a leash, Shriver said: "I might just add a thought that if they (high elected officials) don't like (young people) here, maybe they can go back to Greece with the young people there--not just to Baltimore, but all the way back to Greece."

Washington Post
October 8, 1970
August 3, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: July 25 Memo on California Situation

Although Fred Malek's report on California went to Bob today, you will note from your attached July 25 memo that the three problems which were described - no Democrats on our Committee, no Democratic organization, and Nofsiger still running the Campaign out there - none have been solved. When you review Malek's memo with Bob, you might want to cover these three points.

GS/jb
Bob asked that you personally cover with Malek, in conversation, the California situation, although he will be hitting MacGregor on it also directly. We've still got a problem to solve in California. There are no Democrats on our committee, we have no Democratic organization, and apparently we still have Nofziger still running the campaign out there. What are we doing, what's the status, and what changes are contemplated?
August 2, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: FRANK HERRINGER
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Clearance Procedure for Voting Bloc and Citizens Groups

Pursuant to our conversation today, would you forward me a description of the exact method used in the clearance of the national and state Voter Bloc and Citizens Groups. The description you and Fred Malak gave me seems adequate. I would very much like to have it in writing.

cc: Fred Malak

GS/jb
August 2, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Political Matters and Talking Paper

Attached are copies of my July 29 Political Matters memorandum and your original copy with your notes. Also attached is a copy of the Talking Paper prepared for Bob's meeting with the Ehrlichman Political Group. You wanted to cover both of these personally with Bob. After you have completed that review, please advise me of the decisions as many matters are proceeding without guidance.

GS/jb
August 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: McGovern's Pollster

Discussion with Bob Teeter last night disclosed the following preliminary information regarding Pat Caddell, McGovern's pollster:

1) Pat Caddell owns his own polling company, a small outfit called Cambridge Research Group;

2) However, Cambridge Research Group uses a fairly standard list of Democratic supervisors to do the actual interviewing;

3) Caddell also works for Kelly, the candidate opposing Griffin in Michigan, so Teeter will have access to Caddell's questionnaire;

4) Teeter believes that Caddell also may be using Quayle for some of the interviewing;

5) Teeter doubts that Caddell uses as much open-ended questions as he claims in his press interviews;

6) He does not use as much "scaling" as we do;

7) Instead, many of the questions that Caddell uses are similar to the Harris Domestic Issue Poll of last September — that is, one general question followed up by three or four specific;

8) Much of Caddell's interviewing is done by telephone because the massive samples (11,000) indicate that it would be impossible to pay for full field interviews;

9) Teeter will pursue the question of the type of polling Caddell does and will report to us in one week. He says there is almost no risk of him being discovered.
How does McGovern work his polls? Is he doing it independently or through some company? It might be interesting to see if he has conducted any sort of a secret poll regarding Eagleton and it would probably be good for us to know in general how polling is done.

Pat Addell has his own company
Cambridge Res Group - but uses old list of supervisors
- use Demographic
Also doing work for Kelly
May use Quali
Doubt uses as much open-ended doesn't use much labeling
Uses Harris Banes as Q. - Massive samples - by telephone, can't afford field
No risk