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September 29, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Jeno Paulucci Advertising Agency

On September 20, you read the memorandum attached at Tab A outlining 1701 problems with Jeno Paulucci, who has raised $8500 for the campaign but will receive 95-100,000 in commissions for placing all DFN ads.

Dailey has asked MacGregor for authority for the November Group to take over the media buying responsibility from Paulucci/JFP Advertising. MacGregor is expected to accept Dailey's recommendation but is out of town.

Dailey called George Christian to get Connally's reaction to November Group taking over the DFN placement responsibility from JFP/Advertising. Christian says Connally doesn't care. However, there was apparently a financial agreement arranged by Colson with Paulucci when DFN was established. If there are no insuperable political problems Dailey would prefer to assume the cost ($100,000) of paying off Paulucci in order to place DFN commercials accurately. Last week JFP/Advertising violated the law placing the ads, has only one buyer, and suffers from a series of ills described in the Dailey/Joanou material attached at Tab B.

RECOMMENDATION

That Colson inform Paulucci/JFP Advertising that November Group will all DFN ads. Colson should arrange the financial payoff to Paulucci as best he can.

[Signatures for agreement or disagreement]

COMMENT
September 20, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:  H. R. Haldeman
FROM:  Gordon Strachan
SUBJECT:  DFN - Jeno Paulucci and Leonard Marx

Jeb Magruder reviewed the problems 1701 is having with Jeno Paulucci. Magruder's basic criticism is that Paulucci will not a $25,000 profit from the operation. This conclusion is based on Paulucci raising only $8,500 for DFN, having contributed $75,000 for the August DFN ads, but due to the DFN advertisement placement procedure through Paulucci's ad agency, he will receive $95-100,000. Magruder is prepared to accept this as an erroneous decision in August, but now he is encountering difficulties placing next week's DFN newspaper ads. You may want to cover this point with Magruder if you decide to talk to him about DFN and Connally.

During Magruder's lunch with Leonard Marx on September 18, Marx mentioned in a serious tone that "although Governor Connally was contemplating going back to Texas to practice law after the election, changes within the State Department could make it an interesting assignment". Magruder received the distinct impression that Marx wanted this information passed.

GS/jb
TO: PETE DAILEY
FROM: PHIL JOANOU
SUBJECT: Coordination of Media Buying Effort.

Currently, we are operating under a dual media buying system, with the November Group purchasing time and space for the "positive" CRP advertising, and JFP and Associates purchasing media for the "anti-McGovern" DFN advertising.

This is to recommend a revision in the media buying program in which the November Group would be responsible for all media purchases, certification, reporting and related activities.

The reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

1. Reduced Flexibility

The current system seriously reduces the flexibility needed to re-allocate media budgets, switch from one medium to another, and revise the selection of TV commercials and newspaper advertisements in each market.

Most of these decisions will be made at the Monday afternoon budget/media review meetings, and traffic and media payments are then finalized by Friday afternoon. We have not succeeded in getting JFP to coordinate with this procedure. When decisions are made in the middle of the week, we have even less chance to coordinate our activities with theirs. As we progress into the final weeks of the campaign, this dual buying system causes us to risk:

   a. Missing purchasing time and space in key markets.

   b. Traffic errors in which a buy will be made but materials (TV prints, newspaper ads) not delivered to the media in time.
2. Media Cooperation

Our short turnaround system of purchasing media on a Friday-for-Monday basis is predicated on close cooperation with the media, in which escrow agents, omnibus certifications, and other details were established. In media buying to date (three newspaper insertions and one week of TV in markets covering approximately 50% of U.S. households) JFP has not adhered to agreed-to procedures, with these results:

   a. The November Group provided certification to media representatives while JFP mailed checks and variable portions of the certifications from Duluth, Minn., directly to individual stations across the country. It appears that this has resulted in some stations not airing the DFN commercial.

   b. Several omnibus/escrow agents are requesting termination of the arrangement which will jeopardize CRP's entire system.

3. Legal Compliance

Because of the problems cited above and other JFP accounting problems not detailed here, it appears that DFN advertising certifications issued by the November Group are now in violation of the law. Moreover, discussions with JFP suggest that their reporting procedures have not been properly established or implemented. If this comes to the attention of the press, it may reflect badly on the President's campaign spending as a whole.

4. Budget Control

JFP has not provided details to date which are needed for administration of the advertising budget. This includes such details as production expenditures, fee and cash discounts. In addition, frequency rebates, which could afford considerable savings, are difficult to control under the current dual system.

In summary, we are in the position of losing the two most important considerations of the media campaign:

   a. Quick re-allocation of expenditures from market to market.

   b. Quick revision of advertising messages from market to market.
Revision of the media buying program to consolidate this function within the November Group can be made without undue friction with JFP or DFN by:

a. Explaining the need for coordinating this program over the last several weeks of the campaign.

b. Consulting with JFP and DFN on all media decisions that bear upon them.

c. Re-negotiating the JFP fee so that it is reduced from the current estimated level of $70 M, but is still substantial enough to avoid economic problems for that agency.

Attached is a memorandum which expands on some of the financial and logistics problems with JFP cited above.
September 21, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Campaign Advertising

Peter Dailey confirmed the purchase of two 5-minute spots for the Russia commercial. After the NBC Monday Night Movie on September 25, probably from 10:55-11:00 p.m., and on CBS after the Thursday Night Movie, probably from 10:55-11:00 p.m., are set.

Dailey is quite upset at the Ken Clawson story in tonight's Star (attached) describing the DFN commercials which may be run. It is Dailey's view that Clawson partially destroyed the credibility of Connally and the DFN by disclosing White House knowledge and participation in the DFN ads. Dailey believes that if anyone must talk to the press about campaign advertising it should be him.

Colson suggested at this morning's 9:15 attack meeting that it might be a good idea to show the press a preview of the DFN commercials during a George Christian press conference. This would increase speculation and interest. It is Dailey's view that this is a mistake. He does not want to make advertising, per se, an issue nor does he want to give McGovern time to think about a response to the commercials before they are aired.

Recommendation

That Peter Dailey be established as the sole spokesman on campaign advertising with control over public disclosure of the ads themselves.

Approve  Disapprove  Comment
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