

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>
47	32	1/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Strachen RE: attached series of questions for Muskie. 4 pgs.
47	32	1/11/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Meet the Press questions for Senator Muskie. 6 pgs.
47	32	1/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Suggested items for Klein and Face the Nation. 6 pgs.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 113] [Doc 205] [Doc 114] [Doc 115]	Memo	Khachigian to Strachan, re: Questions for Muskie, with attached draft copy ^{also withdrawn} [attached to cover slip, "Questions can be found ..."] <u>Attachments:</u> 1) memo, Snyder to Khachigian, re: Questions for meet the Press, 1/17/72 2) memo, Buchanan to Hoffenberg, re: Muskie's "Meet the Press" appearance, 1/18/72	1/14/72	c (orig)
N-2 [Doc 116]	Memo	Khachigian to Cole, re: MADRE study, with attached draft copy	1/13/72	c (orig)
N-3 [Doc 117]	Report	Questions for Senator Muskie - meet the Press - 1/16/72, with attached draft copy	1/11/72	c (orig)
N-4 [Doc 118]	Report	By Khachigian, re: H. S. Klein - Face of the Nation - suggested items, with attached draft copy	1/7/72	c (orig)
N-5 [Doc 119] [Doc 206]	Memo	Khachigian to Woods, re: Inscription card	1/5/72	c (orig)

FILE GROUP TITLE

BOX NUMBER

5

FOLDER TITLE

January [1972]

RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
- B. National security classified information.
- C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
- D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
- F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: Kenneth L. Khachigian
Box Number: 5

Folder: January [1972]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
113	Return Private/Political
114	Return Private/Political
115	Return Private/Political
116	Retain Open
117	Return Private/Political
118	Return Private/Political
119	Retain Open
205	Return Private/Political
206	Retain Open

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Questions can be found
in Chron File 1/11/71

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DETERMINED TO BE AN

January 14, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102

By: NARS, Date 1-2-72

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN 

Attached are a series of questions for Ed Muskie. They have been given to Al Snyder who will deliver them to Spivak for Muskie's performance on Meet the Press this Sunday, the 16th.

I'll let you know if we struck home with any of them.

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING 1/14/72
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By RK NARS, Date 2-2-71
CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

Attached are a series of questions for Ed Muskie.
They have ~~been~~ been given to Al ~~Snyder~~ Snyder who will
deliver them to Spivak for Muskie's performance on
Meet the Press this Sunday, the 16th.

I'll let you know if we struck home with any of
them.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 17, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: KEN KHACHIGIAN

FROM: ALVIN SNYDER 

As requested, I passed on your questions to the Meet the Press program which grilled Muskie pretty well. You may have noticed several of your points in there, including the busing issue and the defense budget, which were real zingers.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 18, 1972

bcc:
✓ K K &
AL Snyder

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

The powers that be should know that both Ken Khachigian and Al Snyder worked hand-in-glove to develop and transmit some of the questions that eventually were used by interviewers Broder, Kiker, Novak and Apple on that "Meet the Press" show which was perhaps the roughest going-over I have ever seen Ed Muskie given. At one point Muskie seemed on the verge of "blowing." Recommend that those in the White House staff who have political responsibilities take a look at that show -- to see where Muskie's vulnerability lies, and to get a good look at the fellow who has been shaping up as our primary opponent.

Incidentally, re my previous memoranda, I remain convinced that Muskie can be had in Florida and must be had there, if he is to be stopped. Is any consideration being given to some of the ideas outlined in those memos?

Buchanan

Senator: If your opposition to President Nixon's announced "Space Shuttle" program prevailed, 50,000 jobs would eventually be lost by aerospace workers in Florida, California, Texas and other states. What will you tell Floridians about your willingness to put them out of work?

Senator: you have voted against the ABM; you have voted to cut appropriations for the advanced strategic manned bomber program; you voted to remove American troops from Vietnam by December, 1971; you voted to cut the Defense budget by \$6 billion; you voted to cut off funds for American troops in Indochina after June 1, 1972; and you voted to terminate the F-14 jet program. In light of these votes, how could you ever maintain that you are in favor of a strong national defense?

Senator Muskie: Your children attend private schools in Washington, D.C. Why have you endorsed forced busing to achieve racial balance for people whose children cannot attend private schools as yours do?

Senator Muskie: You criticized the Nixon Administration for not being open; for not being credible and asked more access to government documents. Since you are an elected member of our government, will you grant reporters access to your files in the "public interest" -- including minutes of private and confidential meetings you have held?

Senator: Mr. McGovern has flatly said he would give amnesty for all Vietnam draft dodgers. Why have you failed to characterize fully your own views on this issue?

Can you answer yes or no to this statement? If Edmund Muskie were President, he would fire J. Edgar Hoover.

Senator: Explain why a black man should vote for you when the same man has been summarily rejected by you as a vice-presidential runningmate?

Senator: Have you done anything to save parochial schools from extinction?

Senator: You have advocated federal intervention to force suburbs to integrate. Why?

Senator: How many Blacks, Chicanos, and women do you have on your Senate and campaign staffs respectively?

Senator: Gene McCarthy has characterized your change of mind on Vietnam as somewhat hypocritical. How do you account for the fact that you changed your mind on Vietnam only after a Republican administration came into office and especially in light of your strong and vigorous support of the Vietnam buildup in the Johnson years?

Senator: Why have you consistently avoided support of strong gun control legislation?

Senator: Do you endorse last week's federal court decision requiring the merger of the Richmond, Virginia public school system with the school systems of its suburban counties to end segregation?

1/11/72

Questions for Senator Muskie -- ~~Meet~~ Meet the Press - 1/16/72

Senator:

(If your opposition to ~~the~~ President Nixon's announced "Space Shuttle" ~~program~~ prevailed, ~~about~~ 50,000 jobs would eventually be lost by aerospace workers in Florida, California, Texas and other ~~states~~ states. What will you tell Floridians about your ^{willingness} ~~willingness~~ to put them out of work?

Senator, you have voted against the ABM; you have voted to cut appropriations for the advanced strategic ~~un~~ manned bomber program; you ~~also~~ voted to remove American troops by December, 1971; from Vietnam ~~and~~ you voted to cut the ~~Defense~~ Defense budget by ~~1.46~~ ^{1.46} billion ~~dollars~~; you voted to cut off funds for American troops in Indochina after June 1, 1972; and you voted to terminate the F-14 jet program. In light of these votes, how ~~could~~ could you ever ^{maintain} ~~maintain~~ that you are in favor of a strong national defense?

Senator Muskie: Your ~~own~~ children attend private schools in Washington, ~~and~~ D.C. Why ~~do~~ have you endorsed forced busing to achieve racial balance for people whose ~~own~~ children cannot attend private ~~schools~~ schools as yours do?

Senator Muskie: You criticized the Nixon Administration for not being open; for ~~not~~ not being credible and asked more access to government documents. Since you are ^{an elected} ~~a~~ member of our government, will you grant reporters access to your files

in the "public interest" -- including minutes of private and ~~confidential~~ confidential meetings you have held?

Senator: Mr. McGovern has flatly said ~~he~~ he would give amnesty for all Vietnam draft dodgers. Why have you failed to fully characterize your own views on this issue?

Can you answer ~~yes or no~~ ^{statement?} to this ~~question?~~ if Edmund Muskie were President, he would fire J. Edgar Hoover ~~?~~

Senator: Explain why a black man should vote for you when the same man ~~has~~ has been ~~summarily~~ summarily rejected by you as a Vice-President ~~on~~ ^{ial running mate?}

Senator: Have you done anything to ~~save~~ ^{save} parochial schools ~~from extinction?~~ ^{from extinction?} ~~cease to die in the vast numbers that they have?~~

Senator: ~~You~~ You have advocated federal intervention to force suburbs to integrate. Why?

Senator: How many Blacks, Chicanos, and women do you have on your Senate and campaign staffs respectively?

Senator: Gene McCarthy has characterized your change of mind on Vietnam as ~~some~~ somewhat hypocritical. How do you account for the fact that you ~~changed~~ changed your mind on Vietnam only ~~after~~ ^{after} a Republican administration came into office and especially in light of your strong and vigorous support of the Vietnam buildup in the Johnson years?

Senator: Why have you consistently avoided support of strong gun control legislation?

, Senator: Do you endorse ~~the~~ last week's federal court decision requiring the merger of the Richmond, ^{Virginia} public school system with the school systems of its suburban counties to end segregation?

1/7/72

H.G. KLEIN -- Face the Nation -- Suggested Items

Obvious discussion will arise on the merits of the President's opposition in the campaign year. I suggest some of the following points be made:

-- An effort should be made to exacerbate Democratic differences. Gene McCarthy has severely criticized Ed Muskie for his strong support of the Vietnam war in 1968. McGovern has challenged Muskie to statewide debates in New Hampshire and has attacked consistently that Muskie is not liberal enough. Jackson thinks all the other Dems are too far on the Left -- he strongly opposes bussing and wants a stronger military as well as being strong on law and order. Making these points and other might help to bring to the public eye the squabbling among the Dems.

-- An impression should be conveyed of the Democrats in total disarray -- a party who has no true leader and thus has so many presidential candidates as to make their party's leadership seem ludicrous. Portray the Democratic party as bankrupt of ideas as well as leadership; of not saying anything positive, but only attacking the President; of having not much vision but a great deal of partisanship. If they can't run their party, how can they run their country?

-- I would puff up Humphrey. You probably will be asked who the White House thinks is the most likely Democratic candidate. Obviously, HHH would be our best opponent. He should be praised as a great Democratic party leader -- one who has labored in the vineyards. Offer the opinion that Humphrey is a strong leader and would again be a strong opponent. This should obviously be done in a way which doesn't amount to an endorsement of HHH, but rather an observation that HHH is much better than the rest and much stronger politically than the press portrays him to be.

-- On the Anderson Papers, the question will be raised of credibility, and I think this ought to be turned right around and thrown back at the Dems. E. g., Muskie and others have been raising the questions of RN's credibility. I would say: "Talk about credibility; Ed Muskie, Hubert Humphrey and the other Democrats were silent when Lyndon Johnson took us into war -- they relished in their portrayals of Barry Goldwater as bomb-happy. Their silence while Lyndon Johnson escalated the war is well known. Yet now they are unanimous in their desire to cut and run. I would think that there is a problem of credibility when candidates change their positions for such obviously political purposes as the Democrats have done on Vietnam -- and with hypocrisy turn around and accuse someone else of credibility problems."

-- If an assessment is asked of the opposition, here are suggested brief replies:

Ed Muskie: Has the lead. A very undistinguished record; virtually untutored in foreign affairs; indecisive. Will come under strong attack from his opponents and will be then under heavy testing as a candidate. While seeking to convey trust, he is as divisive if not more so than any other Dems.

George McGovern: A loyal Dem who sincerely believes in his leftish views. Not a serious candidate and a stalking horse for Kennedy.

Gene McCarthy: Is a spoiler. Will further divide the Dems. Will probably run a fourth party because he thinks the party does not listen to him.

Henry Jackson: One of the brightest of the Dems; loyal, etc. Must do well in Florida where he is more in tune with them than Muskie. Unfortunately the Dems have gone to the left and will not nominate him -- too bad that the Dems no longer believe in strong national defense.

Hubert Humphrey: Muskie's chief rival -- will announce January 10. Strong organization in Florida. May upset Muskie. Will challenge Muskie in Wisconsin. Has more financial backing.

John Lindsay: How can he govern the country when he can't govern his city? Many of his municipal problems were self-created.

1/7/72

H.G. KLEIN -- Face the Nation -- Suggested Items

Obvious discussion will arise on the merits of the President's opposition ~~candidate~~ in the campaign year. I suggest some of the following points be ~~made~~ made:

-- An effort should be made to exacerbate Democratic differences. Gene McCarthy has severely criticized Ed Muskie for his strong support of the Vietnam war in 1968. McGovern has challenged Muskie to statewide debates in New Hampshire and has attacked consistently that Muskie is not liberal enough. Jackson thinks all the other Dems are too far on the Left -- he strongly ~~opposes~~ ^a opposes bussing and wants/stronger military as well as being strong on law and order. Making these points and others ~~might~~ might help to bring to ~~the~~ the public eye the squabbling among the Dems.

-- An impression should be conveyed of the ~~Dem~~ Democrats in total disarray -- a party who has no true leader and thus has so many ~~presidential~~ presidential candidates as to make their party's leadership seem ludicrous. Portray the Democratic party as bankrupt of ideas as well as leadership; of not saying anything positive, but ~~only~~ only attacking the President; of having not much vision but a great deal of partisanship.

If they can't run their party, how can they run their country?
-- I would puff up Humphrey. You probably will be asked who the White House thinks is the most likely Dem candidate. Obviously, HHH would be our best opponent. He should be

praised as a great Dem party leader -- one who has labored in the vineyards. Offer the opinion that Humphrey is a strong leader and would again be a strong opponent. This should obviously be done in way which doesn't amount to an endorsement of HHH, but rather an observation that HHH is much better than the rest and much stronger politically than the press portrays him to be.

-- On the Anderson papers, the question will be raised of credibility, and I think this ought to be turned right around and thrown back at the Dems. E.g., Muskie and others have been raising the ~~credibility~~ questions of RN's credibility. I would say: "Talk about credibility; Ed Muskie, Hubert Humphrey and the other ~~Dem~~ Democrats were silent when Lyndon Johnson took us into war -- they relished in their ~~portrayals~~ portrayals of Barry Goldwater as bomb-happy. Their silence while Lyndon Johnson escalated the war is well known. Yet now they are unanimous in their desire to cut and run. I would think that there is a ~~problem~~ problem of credibility when ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~grave as Vietnam can be dealt with so~~ candidates change ^{their} positions for such obvious political purposes as the Democrats have done on Vietnam -- ~~when they~~ ~~can do this with impunity and yet~~ ^{and with hypocrisy} turn around and accuse someone else of credibility ~~problems~~ problems."

-- If an assessment is asked of the opposition, here are suggested brief replies.

Ed Muskie: Has the lead. A very undistinguished record; virtually untutored in foreign affairs; indecisive. Will come under strong attack from his opponents and will be then under heavy testing as a candidate. While seeking to convey trust, he is as divisive if not more so than any other Dems.

George McGovern: A loyal Dem who sincerely believes in his leftish views. Not a serious candidate and a stalking horse for Kennedy.

Gene McCarthy: Is a spoiler. Will further divide the Dems. Will probably run a fourth party because he thinks the party does not listen to him.

Henry Jackson: One of the brightest of the Dems; loyal, etc. Must do well in Florida where he is more in tune with them than Muskie. Unfortunately the Dems have gone to the left and will not nominate him -- too bad that the Dems no longer believe in strong national defense.

Hubert Humphrey: Muskie's chief rival -- will announce January 10. Strong organization in Florida. May upset Muskie. Will challenge Muskie in Wisconsin. Has more financial backing.

John Lindsay: How can he govern the country when he can't govern his city? Many of his municipal problems were self-created.