

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
Contested Materials Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
46	27	7/1/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Chapin, via Strachan, to Haldeman responding to a campaign memorandum generated by Bill Gavin. Duplicates attached. 6 pgs.

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102  
By smc NARS, Date 7-21-80

July 1, 1971

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. H. R. HALDEMAN  
VIA: MR. GORDON STRACHAN  
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Gordon Strachan asked that I put together my thoughts for you on Bill Gavin's memorandum of June 14. I think that Gavin has put together an interesting, intellectual piece on some of the ramifications of Administration activity to date and the prospects for the 1972 election. However, I sense that he is a little paranoid over Agnew. I do not know how hard his reasoning is on all of this; however, I think that the assumptions are, perhaps, a little simplistic.

I do not question that we have the President in a relatively good position in terms of the criteria of his being "reasonable". The quality of reason is at least a point where we can always build a very good case for President Nixon.

Regarding passion, I am not sure that the Administration does out-passion everyone. I think the passion of the Peace Movement or of the new left - let alone of the right - has the zeal that an Agnew does. Perhaps we have been wrong (I would imagine Gavin would agree) in letting Agnew out so far front and getting so controversial and diluting the passion which he could hold in constructive areas. On the other hand, who is to say that Agnew has not served his purpose. Gavin states that Agnew cannot be replaced since his replacement would probably harm our chances for a victory. I am not sure that this is true. To say that Agnew's pluses and minuses have already been engraved in the public's mind is a problem, but on the other hand, in the age of quick imagery, Agnew can be tempered quite a lot in the next several months - or at least we can alter those causes on which he goes out front. This may be necessary, anyway, if Gavin's statement is true, when he says, "I am not saying the public disagrees with his content; I am saying it has completely forgotten his content". I think we can get around the problem of Agnew's becoming a big cliché rather than being effective on key issues. He just needs to be programmed against the big issues, as do others here - as well as the President.

In terms of imagination, I would have to concur with a lot of what Gavin says. We have done a poor job of illustrating how imaginative the President has been even on those occasions when he has either shown by action or through policy a sense of imagination. I think that we are starting into 1972 with a lack of being able to communicate imagination but not necessarily an absolute lack of imaginative appeal. In other words, we have it if we can figure out how to exploit it without doing so in a gimmicky way.

I do agree that Teddy has the imaginative appeal and that if he runs, that will be a problem. However, I also believe that Kennedy can be beat. (I do not think that we should assume that we can beat all others since Teddy is the only Democrat with imagination and the other contenders lack it.)

I tend to agree with the conclusion offered by #Gavin in terms of how we try to illustrate imagination. It can be done in a documentary sense and it can be done -- a lot of it -- by film. We can also use the forthcoming State of the Union and the other natural forms which will be coming along. We can remain solid and present ourselves as a solid Party perpetuating a solid country. It doesn't have to be gimmicky. We can hook into a transfer from a wartime to a peace time situation and make that exciting. We can talk about how the dollars that were spent on defense are going to be spent domestically. We can do it as a sound, reasoned and exciting way.

All in all, what I am saying is Gavin has sounded an alarm which we should be cognizant of if we are not already and those people determining positions and working on the selling of our programs should give some thought to what he says but not necessarily over-react.

July 1, 1971

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. H. R. HALDEMAN  
VIA: MR. GORDON STRACHAN  
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Gordon Strachan asked that I put together my thoughts for you on Bill Gavin's memorandum of June 14. I think that Gavin has put together an interesting, intellectual piece on some of the ramifications of Administration activity to date and the prospects for the 1972 election. However, I sense that he is a little paranoid over Agnew. I do not know how hard his reasoning is on all of this; however, I think that the assumptions are, perhaps, a little simplistic.

I do not question that we have the President in a relatively good position in terms of the criteria of his being "reasonable". The quality of reason is at least a point where we can always build a very good case for President Nixon.

Regarding passion, I am not sure that the Administration does out-passion everyone. I think the passion of the Peace Movement or of the new left - let alone of the right - has the zeal that an Agnew does. Perhaps we have been wrong (I would imagine Gavin would agree) in letting Agnew out so far front and getting so controversial and diluting the passion which he could hold in constructive areas. On the other hand, who is to say that Agnew has not served his purpose. Gavin states that Agnew cannot be replaced since his replacement would probably harm our chances for a victory. I am not sure that this is true. To say that Agnew's pluses and minuses have already been engraved in the public's mind is a problem, but on the other hand, in the age of quick imagery, Agnew can be tempered quite a lot in the next several months - or at least we can alter those causes on which he goes out front. This may be necessary, anyway, if Gavin's statement is true, when he says, "I am not saying the public disagrees with his content; I am saying it has completely forgotten his content". I think we can get around the problem of Agnew's becoming a big cliché rather than being effective on key issues. He just needs to be programmed against the big issues, as do others here - as well as the President.

In terms of imagination, I would have to concur with a lot of what Gavin says. We have done a poor job of illustrating how imaginative the President has been even on those occasions when he has either shown by action or through policy a sense of imagination. I think that we are starting into 1972 with a lack of being able to communicate imagination but not necessarily an absolute lack of imaginative appeal. In other words, we have it if we can figure out how to exploit it without doing so in a gimmicky way.

I do agree that Teddy has the imaginative appeal and that if he runs, that will be a problem. However, I also believe that Kennedy can be beat. (I do not think that we should assume that we can beat all others since Teddy is the only Democrat with imagination and the other contenders lack it.)

I tend to agree with the conclusion offered by #Gavin in terms of how we try to illustrate imagination. It can be done in a documentary sense and it can be done -- a lot of it -- by film. We can also use the forthcoming State of the Union and the other natural forms which will be coming along. We can remain solid and present ourselves as a solid Party perpetuating a solid country. It doesn't have to be gimmicky. We can hook into a transfer from a wartime to a peace time situation and make that exciting. We can talk about how the dollars that were spent on defense are going to be spent domestically. We can do it as a sound, reasoned and exciting way.

All in all, what I am saying is Gavin has sounded an alarm which we should be cognizant of if we are not already and those people determining positions and working on the selling of our programs should give some thought to what he says but not necessarily over-react.

July 1, 1971

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. H. R. HALDEMAN  
VIA: MR. GORDON STRACHAN  
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

Gordon Strachan asked that I put together my thoughts for you on Bill Gavin's memorandum of June 14. I think that Gavin has put together an interesting, intellectual piece on some of the ramifications of Administration activity to date and the prospects for the 1972 election. However, I sense that he is a little paranoid over Agnew. I do not know how hard his reasoning is on all of this; however, I think that the assumptions are, perhaps, a little simplistic.

I do not question that we have the President in a relatively good position in terms of the criteria of his being "reasonable". The quality of reason is at least a point where we can always build a very good case for President Nixon.

Regarding passion, I am not sure that the Administration does out-passion everyone. I think the passion of the Peace Movement or of the new left -- let alone of the right -- has the zeal that an Agnew does. Perhaps we have been wrong (I would imagine Gavin would agree) in letting Agnew out so far front and getting so controversial and diluting the passion which he could hold in constructive areas. On the other hand, who is to say that Agnew has not served his purpose. Gavin states that Agnew cannot be replaced since his replacement would probably harm our chances for a victory. I am not sure that this is true. To say that Agnew's pluses and minuses have already been engraved in the public's mind is a problem, but on the other hand, in the age of quick imagery, Agnew can be tempered quite a lot in the next several months -- or at least we can alter those causes on which he goes out front. This may be necessary, anyway, if Gavin's statement is true, when he says, "I am not saying the public disagrees with his content; I am saying it has completely forgotten his content". I think we can get around the problem of Agnew's becoming a big cliché rather than being effective on key issues. He just needs to be programmed against the big issues, as do others here -- as well as the President.

(JG)  
 In terms of imagination, I would have to concur with a lot of what Gavin says. We have done a poor job of illustrating how imaginative the President has been even on those occasions when he has either shown by action or through policy a sense of imagination. I think that we are starting into 1972 with a lack of being able to communicate imagination but not necessarily an absolute lack of imaginative appeal. In other words, we have it if we can figure out how to exploit it without doing so in a gimmicky way.

I do agree that Teddy has the imaginative appeal and that if he runs, that will be a problem. However, I also believe that Kennedy can be beat. (I do not think that we should assume that we can beat all others since Teddy is the only Democrat with imagination and the other contenders lack it.)

I tend to agree with the conclusion offered by #Gavin in terms of how we try to illustrate imagination. It can be done in a documentary sense and it can be done -- a lot of it -- by film. We can also use the forthcoming State of the Union and the other natural forms which will be coming along. We can remain solid and present ourselves as a solid Party perpetuating a solid country. It doesn't have to be gimmicky. We can hook into a transfer from a wartime to a peace time situation and make that exciting. We can talk about how the dollars that were spent on defense are going to be spent domestically. We can do it as a sound, reasoned and exciting way.

All in all, what I am saying is Gavin has sounded an alarm which we should be cognizant of if we are not already and those people determining positions and working on the selling of our programs should give some thought to what he says but not necessarily over-react.