

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>
48	2	9/27/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Buchanan From: Khachigian RE: "Thoughts For Romney's Speech." 4pgs
48	2	9/10/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: "Thoughts Toward 1972." 6pgs
48	2	9/10/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: "Thoughts Toward 1972." 5pgs
48	2	7/26/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: "The Black Voter." 4pgs
48	2	7/26/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: "The Black Voter." 4pgs
48	2	9/17/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Ken Khachigian From: Pat Buchanan RE: Holding on to back-up materials; President's ripping of the "scab" off Muskie. 1pg
48	2	9/24/4971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Draft from Khachigian of a report entitled "RUNNING WITH MUSKIE - OR HOW TO SNATCH DEFEAT FROM THE JAWS OF VICTORY." 11pgs

9/27/71

FOR: BUCHANAN

FROM: KHACHIGIAN

THOUGHTS FOR ROMNEY'S SPEECH

While he should go on the attack against RN's critics, I think a spirited defense of the Administration would be useful. The defense however, should be selective rather than across the board. I. e. , Romney should defend on our long suits.

-- Should make the case for RN in foreign policy. The whole idea should be to picture RN as the heavyweight when matched up against any of the potential Dem candidates. Again: good points to make on Vietnam, SA LT, etc.

But the main point is the thematic one of RN as leading America's foreign policy with "a golden hand." The sturdy, thoughtful, precise maker and executor of foreign policy.

-- Domestic policy. There is a case to be made, but not so much a programmatic one as a symbolic one. The RN who didn't overpromise, who didn't bring bombast to his pronouncements, who simply went out to do the job that was needed. Result: a more stable society in the institutional sense, peace in our streets, etc.

-- I would put in a good word for the Nixon approach of calm in place of charisma -- but would not overdo the style thing.

-- Hitting the opponents should be a central rationale for the speech, and if, as you say, names can be used, I suggest some of the following portrayals of the opposition. Henry Jackson: An able supporter of the President on foreign policy and renouncer of extremism in Dem ranks. But it ends there, for Scoop is an ADA liberal, bent on making the Federal government the ultimate decision point in our lives. His attacks on the President's handling of the economy have been just short of Demagogy -- not the best characteristic for a man of decent instincts, but who has been driven by a political party which has as its sworn purpose the destruction of Richard Nixon no matter what the cost.

Ed Muskie: Muskie would be one of the worst choices for President. He knows nothing about foreign policy (was swayed by Kosygin in the famous Moscow meeting), would be totally untrustworthy in the important discussions of foreign policy. He just can't swing it. He is temperamental and prone to follow the troops. He is really a non-entity fashioned by the liberal press into some kind of Democratic Moses. Query: What one thing can you point to that Muskie stands for or has accomplished? In short, he is a faceless man, a man utterly without the credentials to be President of the United States. Imagine him meeting with Chou En Lai?

Teddy Kennedy: Immature, aloof, doesn't know what hard times are. Quick on the trigger; irrational, incapable of being decisive in a crises. He's like a little kid -- take away his rattle and he'll run crying to momma. The least likely person we would want to entrust affairs of state. Perhaps cite the example of Teddy's insult to Pakistani ambassador as a trait of Teddy the Tot.

George McGovern: A petulant, crybaby who sees nothing but the worst in his country. He wails and cries, loves the "kids" and will never say a bad word against them. A total joke as a candidate; he signed peoples peace Treaty with North Vietnam. Imagine his credibility were he elected President and then asked to lead negotiations with NVN.

Hubert Humphrey: So characteristic of the worst in the Dem party -- the hack who cries when things go bad. He's probably never made an honest decision in his life, and probably never been held responsible for any decision made on his behalf. The Humphrey, New Deal, high-taxes, Vietnam candidate was beaten back in 1968 and deservedly so. He's in the hands of the unions, and if it weren't for George Meany, HHH would just be another homely face.

The Others: A bunch of amateurs playing the game. They are laughable when put up against the sturdy experience of RN. It is characteristic of the Dems today that they can't produce a President -- only a bunch of vice-presidential hopefuls; party hacks who are beholden to every pressure group and interest group which ever infiltrated the Democratic party.

\*\*\*\*\*

The essence of the speech should be to show how, in contrast, every Dem is a tenor in a bass choir. Not one of them is capable of making the hard decisions RN has. Yet they run around the country with their "Chicken Littleism" -- a faint-hearted approach to American problems, holding the belief that America has lost its will. A bunch of hogwash which will be exposed in November of 1972 when the American public will realize it has a President to select.

\*\*\*\*\*

Also suggest a few cracks at Congress dragging its feet -- setting the stage for RN versus Congress.

## THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THOUGHTS TOWARD 1972

A number of things have occurred to me regarding the 1972 elections, and here they are for what they're worth.

After all the hokum, hoopla, P.R. and direct mail, the President is still the greatest determinative of the election results when you get down to the nut-cutting. How do you marshal the "Presidential Presence" to do the most good for the purpose of re-electing RN?

1. Get a good theme and stick with it. The best one -- and that which has already been articulated by RN -- is generally "What's right in America." But it needs a new casting or the rhetoric on it will get stale.

Essentially, RN is placed historically at a time of great cynicism when the fashionable left is to RN and America what the Jacobins were to Edmund Burke and the Continent. I envision an RN who casts himself in Burke's role, defending the wisdom and richness of our patrimony against those who mock and defy it. Moreover, it should be done with noble rhetoric -- clean and eloquent -- from the President.

The real America is not the racist, imperialist, rotten country that some would have us believe -- but the real America includes the hundreds of volunteers who this last summer combed the mountains looking for a frightened little boy suffering from epilepsy and aphasia. Or the young girl who collected thousands of food coupons to purchase kidney machines where they were not previously available -- and the hundreds of people who heard of her cause and sent her additional coupons. (Anecdotal rhetoric can be highly effective)

This is the real America. RN could light a fire under this spirit. Because he is the President, there is a great deal to say about a campaign filled with this kind of moral suasion. In the classical conservative sense, RN will be the nation's bulwark against the wreckers of social stability -- the defender of the very foundations of our culture.

I have a feeling that this approach would appeal pretty much across the spectrum -- from hard hat to suburbia -- to everyone who feels threatened by the times and the pace of social change.

2. While RN defends what we have, he would be remiss to eschew progress. To this extent, the rhetorical tool is: while we should preserve the wealth of our heritage, we cannot be satisfied, and we must look to enriching that heritage. One thing for RN to convey in the campaign is the impression that great work remains to be done -- that he isn't satisfied with what has gone by the boards.

It won't work to say: "We've tripled spending on X, or increased the size of Y or proposed new legislation for Z." That was Lyndon Johnson, and it would have done LBJ in if he stuck it out in 1968 -- that's a defensive trap we shouldn't fall into. Institutional departures from the norm are o. k. when built upon a solid appreciation of the past.

Take John Lindsay -- he's always hitting out in "anger" at the "large, powerful, often immovable forces" which guide our lives. That's the "Secret Liberal" in Lindsay -- on the record he is the "Real Liberal" depending on shopworn, orthodox solutions. What really makes RN so unique as a President -- and what we have to convey -- is that he is not wedded to dogma; he can and will act with a degree of innovation.

3. Let's explore not making law and order an issue in the 1972 Presidential campaign. Why? Basically, law and order simply might be our albatross in 1972; moreover, it tends to open the door for the Democrats. No matter what the Democrats' record -- they are unprincipled on this issue -- they have no compunctions about twirling a billy club if it means getting re-elected. They read Scammon too well and it worked exceedingly well for them in 1970. They will fool the voters, and believe me they will get away with it.

As for us; the public knows RN is a strong law and order type. If we force the issue, the Dems will get pro-cop, get that issue out of the way, and go on to the issues which they can claim as their own. It's simply going to be too hard to tar them as soft on criminals.

Law and order, as Scammon/Wattenberg point out is an Executive's issue -- they point to mayors, governors and Presidents. But the mistake they make, I believe, is that it is not a President's issue. The President can do almost nothing (with the exception of the District of Columbia) to lower crime rates in the country. Voters identify local police with their mayors -- Frank Rizzo can win in Philadelphia, and RN cannot.

Simply put: Bringing down crime is not an issue which will plus out for RN in 1972 -- people know that he can't do much about it, so why should we risk getting stuck with the blame when crime rates are still going up? Opening up the issue allows the Dems to do two things: (a) point out that crime is still going up despite RN's 1968 statements, and (b) that what we have done is repressive and ineffectual.

Listen to the warning words of our friend James J. Kilpatrick: "Richard Nixon dealt with this situation in his 1968 campaign: 'We have to stop this revolving door that spews embittered, sullen men out onto our streets.' Plainly, the revolving door still spins." That's tough coming from Kilpo, but at least he shows a direction we might take: "What to do? . . . it comes back to the point of beginning: Parents, schools, churches -- the unseen but palpable attitudes of our whole society. If these can be strengthened, crime can be reduced. It's as simple, and as fearfully difficult, as that."

My vote is simply this: Law and order is not a suitable central issue for the 1972 campaign. I know it is tempting to go on the attack with this issue because people are still worried about high crime according to the polls, but the best we can do is to emphasize (as the AG has done in several speeches) that local law enforcement is the front line against crime -- and that RN will give them the moral support they don't get from the liberals. But beyond this, my strong recommendation, from this vantage point is that law and order should be a peripheral issue in 1972.

At the risk of being maudlin, let me make one more argument against the law and order issue. I'm afraid I don't have a great deal of proof for it, but it is instinctual in character. Let's consider the mood of the voter on election day. Remember for millions of Americans, the Presidential election is of bland importance -- they could care less. They focus on it for one day every four years; political awareness indexes among the general electorate are usually low. What is on their minds in early November? For one thing, women are thinking of the holidays -- Thanksgiving is only 2 1/2 weeks away and Christmas comes right after that. They probably just as soon not be reminded that Ed Muskie's election will result in their mugging. The kids are back in school, the days are shorter, and the holidays are happy times. The world series and the Olympics have just ended -- two of the most permanent institutions we have. There is regularity and stability which is fostered by these events and coupled with the thought of stuffed turkeys, law and order rhetoric just doesn't fill the bill. The mood is one of serenity and well-being -- people would rather not have rapings on their minds; I think they would rather hear talk of peace and calm in a shaken world. That comes right down the alley for RN's strongest suit in the campaign -- peace, good relations with other countries, negotiation, China and SALT initiatives. As I've said in other memos, let's not lose sight of these strong political issues.

4. We need to start thinking about long-range planning on this subject of the Presidential Presence. The logical time to kick the theme off is with the State of the Union Address. I recommend that it should not be a conventional address filled with legislative programs -- because these programs will not become issues to help us in the campaign. Instead, I suggest RN make the State of the Union an address to the Nation on the moral and cultural "state" or health of the Union. This is where the theme of a "strong America" is set down. Of course, I don't say ignore all traditional SOTU remarks, but there really ought to be an emphasis on that theme which RN will carry to the country for the remainder of the year. This is a chance to set the stage -- to draw the rules according to how we want to play the game.

The American people like nothing better than to see their President be Presidential -- solid leadership for the folks put forth with lyrical and noble (though not turgid) rhetoric. Low-keyed eloquence will just probably help us wipe Moderate Muskie, Haranguing Hubert and Kinetic Kennedy off the political stage.

But the long-range thinking should look at other events which are conducive for RN to strike his theme. Memorial day (or around there) might be an appropriate time to start the peace and stability issue -- a big speech at a proper forum would do it. July 4th might be well to use for an address. And frankly, on Labor Day, I would send RN to Cadillac Square in Michigan for the most unusual kick-off to a Republican Presidential campaign.

What good reason exists that says only Democrats can address union members on Labor Day of election years. RN is President of all the people, and should not be afraid of walking into any forum. It would be highly imaginative to articulate his campaign theme to workers across the nation who perhaps most strongly resent the assault on America. (confronting your adversaries is good politics -- the same reasoning I had when I suggested RN should address a Black audience)

By and large, I feel that discussing several issues in 1972 will have a minimal impact on the campaign (with the exception of peace and the economy). Most voters have probably already locked in their perception of the issues and will be looking for extra elements on which to judge the candidates. It is this precise reason that Ed Muskie is doing as well in the polls as he is. People don't really know where he stands -- yet he projects an appealing imagery of steadiness and calm. So we must ourselves give great attention to the notion of Presidential Presence.

Some other thoughts:

-- In line with the above analysis, it becomes imperative that any media campaign dwell at length with the fact that RN is President. If I had it my way, I would not pay for any TV time to show RN on the stump -- the networks will pick up the stump speech and the crowds. As for us, our decision should be to show the President as President. In the Lincoln sitting room, the Oval Office, the Cabinet room, the Rose Garden, the EOB office -- at every instance demonstrating to the public the President at work.

-- The same thoughtful speeches which were given as radio addresses in 1968 should go on TV on at least three or four occasions -- taped in different areas of the White House showing RN at his conversational best. Ed Muskie is going to come on as the "great healer." Muskie's only problem is that no one can heal like the President of the United States. I would also like to see some film with the President and his staff (the Cabinet room drug thing on ABC got good reviews for the peek at Presidential decisionmaking). Quiet sessions with HRH or Kissinger or Ehrlichmen. I would even suggest some sessions with younger staff to highlight the point that RN has a great deal of youth working for him. The main point is to impart to the public the quiet but firm President that senior staff see every day -- the sense of direction and vision RN gives to his staff ought to be shared with the voter. Besides, there is a great deal of intrigue about seeing the President at work.

-- The advantage we have is that we can visually prove that RN is a heavyweight, and by implication that his opponent is a lightweight. You don't change Captains when you've already got a good one at the helm. In short, we ought to take the opportunity to show the finer qualities of RN as President that the media rarely share with the public. If they won't do it for us, we should do it for ourselves. An electorate which sees the Republic in firm hands will hesitate to vote the President out of office.

-- The visual impact must be one of the substance of the Presidency. We can handle attack material with our friends on the Hill, with Dole and the State Chairmen. The Veep can be used as well to provide some tough analysis of the opposition -- although it might be desirable to elevate his rhetoric as well (that is a judgement which may have to wait until the campaign itself).

But as for the President, there seems to me to be no question about it: He is the number one campaign asset. At the beginning of the campaign, he should open up with a nationwide address, explaining to the public why a President traditionally must take to the hustings -- that he will be a "partisan of principle," that it is his responsibility and privilege to carry the word to the country. It is not divisive; it is in the American political tradition, etc. With the ground rules laid by the President, he can stump the country with a hearty campaign, taking the Presidency and its considerable prestige to the people saying: we've come this far, now let's keep going. This is leadership at its finest and politics at its best.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THOUGHTS TOWARD 1972

A number of things have occurred to me regarding the 1972 elections, and here they are for what they're worth.

After all the hokum, hoopla, P. R. and direct mail, the President is still the greatest determinative of the election results when you get down to the nut-cutting. How do you marshal the "Presidential Presence" to do the most good for the purpose of re-electing RN?

1. Get a good theme and stick with it. The best one -- and that which has already been articulated by RN -- is generally "What's right in America." But it needs a new casting or the rhetoric on it will get stale.

Essentially, RN is placed historically at a time of great cynicism when the fashionable left is to RN and America what the Jacobins were to Edmund Burke and the Continent. I envision an RN who casts himself in Burke's role, defending the wisdom and richness of our patrimony against those who mock and defy it. Moreover, it should be done with noble rhetoric -- clean and eloquent -- from the President.

The real America is not the racist, imperialist, rotten country that some would have us believe -- but the real America includes the hundreds of volunteers who this last summer combed the mountains looking for a frightened little boy suffering from epilepsy and aphasia. Or the young girl who collected thousands of food coupons to purchase kidney machines where they were not previously available -- and the hundreds of people who heard of her cause and sent her additional coupons. (Anecdotal rhetoric can be highly effective)

This is the real America. RN could light a fire under this spirit. Because he is the President, there is a great deal to say about a campaign filled with this kind of moral suasion. In the classical conservative sense, RN will be the nation's bulwark against the wreckers of social stability -- the defender of the very foundations of our culture.

I have a feeling that this approach would appeal pretty much across the spectrum -- from hard hat to suburbia -- to everyone who feels threatened by the times and the pace of social change.

2. While RN defends what we have, he would be remiss to eschew progress. To this extent, the rhetorical tool is: while we should preserve the wealth of our heritage, we cannot be satisfied, and we must look to enriching that heritage. One thing for RN to convey in the campaign is the impression that great work remains to be done -- that he isn't satisfied with what has gone by the boards.

It won't work to say: "We've tripled spending on X, or increased the size of Y or proposed new legislation for Z." That was Lyndon Johnson, and it would have done LBJ in if he stuck it out in 1968 -- that's a defensive trap we shouldn't fall into. Institutional departures from the norm are o.k. when built upon a solid appreciation of the past.

Take John Lindsay -- he's always hitting out in "anger" at the "large, powerful, often immovable forces" which guide our lives. That's the "Secret Liberal" in Lindsay -- on the record he is the "Real Liberal" depending on shopworn, orthodox solutions. What really makes RN so unique as a President -- and what we have to convey -- is that he is not wedded to dogma; he can and will act with a degree of innovation.

3. Let's explore not making law and order an issue in the 1972 Presidential campaign. Why? Basically, law and order simply might be our albatross in 1972; moreover, it tends to open the door for the Democrats. No matter what the Democrats' record -- they are unprincipled on this issue -- they have no compunctions about twirling a billy club if it means getting re-elected. They read Scammon too well and it worked exceedingly well for them in 1970. They will fool the voters, and believe me they will get away with it.

As for us; the public knows RN is a strong law and order type. If we force the issue, the Dems will get pro-cop, get that issue out of the way, and go on to the issues which they can claim as their own. It's simply going to be too hard to tar them as soft on criminals.

Law and order, as Scammon/Wattenberg point out is an Executive's issue -- they point to mayors, governors and Presidents. But the mistake they make, I believe, is that it is not a President's issue. The President can do almost nothing (with the exception of the 'District of Columbia) to lower crime rates in the country. Voters identify local police with their mayors -- Frank Rizzo can win in Philadelphia, and RN cannot.

Simply put: Bringing down crime is not an issue which will plus out for RN in 1972 -- people know that he can't do much about it, so why should we risk getting stuck with the blame when crime rates are still going up? Opening up the issue allows the Dems to do two things: (a) point out that crime is still going up despite RN's 1968 statements, and (b) that what we have done is repressive and ineffectual.

Listen to the warning words of our friend James J. Kilpatrick: "Richard Nixon dealt with this situation in his 1968 campaign: 'We have to stop this revolving door that spews embittered, sullen men out onto our streets.' Plainly, the revolving door still spins." That's tough coming from Kilpo, but at least he shows a direction we might take: "What to do? . . . it comes back to the point of beginning: Parents, schools, churches -- the unseen but palpable attitudes of our whole society. If these can be strengthened, crime can be reduced. It's as simple, and as fearfully difficult, as that."

My vote is simply this: Law and order is not a suitable central issue for the 1972 campaign. I know it is tempting to go on the attack with this issue because people are still worried about high crime according to the polls, but the best we can do is to emphasize (as the AG has done in several speeches) that local law enforcement is the front line against crime -- and that RN will give them the moral support they don't get from the liberals. But beyond this, my strong recommendation, from this vantage point is that law and order should be a peripheral issue in 1972.

At the risk of being maudlin, let me make one more argument against the law and order issue. I'm afraid I don't have a great deal of proof for it, but it is instinctual in character. Let's consider the mood of the voter on election day. Remember for millions of Americans, the Presidential election is of bland importance -- they could care less. They focus on it for one day every four years; political awareness indexes among the general electorate are usually low. What is on their minds in early November? For one thing, women are thinking of the holidays -- Thanksgiving is only 2 1/2 weeks away and Christmas comes right after that. They probably just as soon not be reminded that Ed Muskie's election will result in their mugging. The kids are back in school, the days are shorter, and the holidays are happy times. The world series and the Olympics have just ended -- two of the most permanent institutions we have. There is regularity and stability which is fostered by these events and coupled with the thought of stuffed turkeys, law and order rhetoric just doesn't fill the bill. The mood is one of serenity and well-being -- people would rather not have rapings on their minds; I think they would rather hear talk of peace and calm in a shaken world. That comes right down the alley for RN's strongest suit in the campaign -- peace, good relations with other countries, negotiation, China and SALT initiatives. As I've said in other memos, let's not lose sight of these strong political issues.

4. We need to start thinking about long-range planning on this subject of the Presidential Presence. The logical time to kick the theme off is with the State of the Union Address. I recommend that it should not be a conventional address filled with legislative programs -- because these programs will not become issues to help us in the campaign. Instead, I suggest RN make the State of the Union an address to the Nation on the moral and cultural "state" or health of the Union. This is where the theme of a "strong America" is set down. Of course, I don't say ignore all traditional SOTU remarks, but there really ought to be an emphasis on that theme which RN will carry to the country for the remainder of the year. This is a chance to set the stage -- to draw the rules according to how we want to play the game.

The American people like nothing better than to see their President be Presidential -- solid leadership for the folks put forth with lyrical and noble (though not turgid) rhetoric. Low-keyed eloquence will just probably help us wipe Moderate Muskie, Haranguing Hubert and Kinetic Kennedy off the political stage.

But the long-range thinking should look at other events which are conducive for RN to strike his theme. Memorial day (or around there) might be an appropriate time to start the peace and stability issue -- a big speech at a proper forum would do it. July 4th might be well to use for an address. And frankly, on Labor Day, I would send RN to Cadillac Square in Michigan for the most unusual kick-off to a Republican Presidential campaign.

What good reason exists that says only Democrats can address union members on Labor Day of election years. RN is President of all the people, and should not be afraid of walking into any forum. It would be highly imaginative to articulate his campaign theme to workers across the nation who perhaps most strongly resent the assault on America. (confronting your adversaries is good politics -- the same reasoning I had when I suggested RN should address a Black audience)

By and large, I feel that discussing several issues in 1972 will have a minimal impact on the campaign (with the exception of peace and the economy). Most voters have probably already locked in their perception of the issues and will be looking for extra elements on which to judge the candidates. It is this precise reason that Ed Muskie is doing as well in the polls as he is. People don't really know where he stands -- yet he projects an appealing imagery of steadiness and calm. So we must ourselves give great attention to the notion of Presidential Presence.

Some other thoughts:

-- In line with the above analysis, it becomes imperative that any media campaign dwell at length with the fact that RN is President. If I had it my way, I would not pay for any TV time to show RN on the stump -- the networks will pick up the stump speech and the crowds. As for us, our decision should be to show the President as President. In the Lincoln sitting room, the Oval Office, the Cabinet room, the Rose Garden, the EOB office -- at every instance demonstrating to the public the President at work.

-- The same thoughtful speeches which were given as radio addresses in 1968 should go on TV on at least three or four occasions -- taped in different areas of the White House showing RN at his conversational best. Ed Muskie is going to come on as the "great healer." Muskie's only problem is that no one can heal like the President of the United States. I would also like to see some film with the President and his staff (the Cabinet room drug thing on ABC got good reviews for the peek at Presidential decisionmaking). Quiet sessions with HRH or Kissinger or Ehrlichmen. I would even suggest some sessions with younger staff to highlight the point that RN has a great deal of youth working for him. The main point is to impart to the public the quiet but firm President that senior staff see every day -- the sense of direction and vision RN gives to his staff ought to be shared with the voter. Besides, there is a great deal of intrigue about seeing the President at work.

-- The advantage we have is that we can visually prove that RN is a heavyweight, and by implication that his opponent is a lightweight. You don't change Captains when you've already got a good one at the helm. In short, we ought to take the opportunity to show the finer qualities of RN as President that the media rarely share with the public. If they won't do it for us, we should do it for ourselves. An electorate which sees the Republic in firm hands will hesitate to vote the President out of office.

-- The visual impact must be one of the substance of the Presidency. We can handle attack material with our friends on the Hill, with Dole and the State Chairmen. The Veep can be used as well to provide some tough analysis of the opposition -- although it might be desirable to elevate his rhetoric as well (that is a judgement which may have to wait until the campaign itself).

But as for the President, there seems to me to be no question about it: He is the number one campaign asset. At the beginning of the campaign, he should open up with a nationwide address, explaining to the public why a President traditionally must take to the hustings -- that he will be a "partisan of principle," that it is his responsibility and privilege to carry the word to the country. It is not divisive; it is in the American political tradition, etc. With the ground rules laid by the President, he can stump the country with a hearty campaign, taking the Presidency and its considerable prestige to the people saying: we've come this far, now let's keep going. This is leadership at its finest and politics at its best.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12066, Section 8-102

July 26, 1971

By \_\_\_\_\_ NARS, Date \_\_\_\_\_

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN *KLK*

SUBJECT: THE BLACK VOTER

There is no reason for us to kiss off the Black vote in 1972. I think we can get more than we did in 1968, and I think we can do it in such a way as not to alienate white voters in the South or elsewhere. What follows is a rationale for seeking the Black vote and a strategy which suggests how to go about doing it.

DO WE NEED IT?

We may need more of the Black vote than we got in 1968 -- especially assuming an election which is as close. Looking at states where a few thousand votes might be crucial, you can see the opportunities that lay there for us. For example, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, Ohio, New Jersey and California might all be extremely close votes. Twenty thousand to 50,000 more votes in each of those states might make a difference (if you consider that it means 20,000-50,000 less votes for our opponent).

In 1968, RN got 12% of the Black vote. Assuming in 1968 he got that up to 20%, it would mean enough votes to add cushions in the states I just mentioned. In other words, we begin from such a low base, and we go no where but up, because 12% is probably a rock bottom support level among Blacks. (Even in the latest Harris matchup with EMK, RN is seen getting 13% of the Black vote against 71% for EMK with 14% not sure. EMK is, with Humphrey, the most popular among the Blacks, and if we have 13% now, we should be able to build upon it. We could really move successfully if Muskie were the opponent because I think he would evoke very little emotion with Black voters)

And in the South, we have an even better chance with Black voters -- and not necessarily at the expense of the Southern vote. In a Gallup poll which shows low approval ratings for RN among Blacks, the one shining light for RN was the Southern Black -- 42% approved of the way he was handling his job as President while 40% disapproved. Thus, a respectable showing among Blacks in the South, where races will be tight if Wallace runs, will give us added cushion where we might least expect it.

In other words, I think, on balance, it is to our benefit to move our percentage of the Black vote up. Two questions remain: (1) How do we do it? and (2) Will it hurt us among RN's more traditional electoral base.

#### HOW DO WE DO IT?

First of all, we can't do it by outpromising the Democrats. Besides, we have the FDR-JFK kneejerk conditioning to combat. Moreover, too many promises with too much hokey rhetoric about equality will turn off our other supporters (and probably the Blacks themselves who would view such an RN posture with skepticism).

The way to do it essentially is to approach them frankly -- i. e., hit them between the eyes. Republicans simply cannot succeed by fawning over Blacks with the standard Democrat rhetoric of "ghettos," "oppression," "poverty," etc. That's a lot of bull anyway. The majority of Blacks are bona fide members of the great American Middle Class.

Thus, for one thing, I suggest that we choose an appropriate forum for RN to address the Blacks, and strongly recommend that we plan now for him to attend the NAACP convention which probably will be scheduled for next July. This, I believe, has great advantages. Look, for example, how JFK put the Catholic issue to rest (at least sufficiently to be elected). He went to a Protestant meeting of clergy in the heart of Protestantism -- Texas. He pulled no punches, and he put it right on the line, and if nothing else he created the image of willing to fight for what he thought was right. He also got the press slobbering all over him for his "courage." In fact, this was a public relations coup for JFK.

For the same reasons, I recommend RN going right into the lions' den. There might be some hostility, and even statements by Wilkins that he is still not satisfied with RN's policies. But I think RN would come out on top. Why?

RN could frankly ask for their vote -- something we Republicans rarely come out and say to Blacks. He would label as hogwash the notion that no movement is taking place for Blacks (see attached excellent article from Wall Street Journal). He would suggest that the Dems have had the Blacks in their back pockets since FDR and still they complain -- is it perhaps the Dems take them for granted? He would put to bed the notion of America being the most racist empire -- how about Hitler, Stalin and the Kulaks, the Ottoman Turks, etc. Why, then, do Blacks insist on America being racist? (Note: Blacks were dying in Vietnam in greater proportions under JFK & LBJ than they have under RN).

Most importantly, he should tell them that he wonders why his critics, especially the Dems, go around painting all Blacks as poor and slum-ridden, as poverty-stricken and alienated. That is pure condescension. That is why he, RN, will not indulge in that kind of rhetoric. It simply keeps current the stereotype of Blacks. If Blacks want to have the world thinking they're all poor, downtrodden ghetto-dwellers, then they ought to vote for the Democrats who show them no respect.

He could then reel off some statistics about Black progress under his Administration; the record's not all that bad. Action on drugs, welfare reform, law and order -- these are all things which click with Blacks, but the media rarely points them out to Blacks.

And here's the main point. RN will not have given an inch, but in the meantime, I think, will have won the grudging respect of Black voters -- and maintaining this posture throughout the campaign will do him no harm.

The media would play it up as a bold stroke by RN (hopefully), and at least not paint RN as a racist by implication.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS AMONG OUR OTHER SUPPORTERS?

I don't think such an approach would cause us to lose votes in the South or among blue-collar supporters. In fact, it is my belief that these people will also come away with more respect for RN, for standing up to standard ploy of giving the Blacks the moon. In all candor, many whites resent the fact that Blacks complain -- taking the attitude: "why are they so ungrateful?" After all, they say, it is their tax dollar which goes to many Black poverty programs and welfare, etc. At least RN has guts enough to say to them: wait a minute, you are not as bad off as everyone says you are. And most of all, whites resent the racist label, so it is logical for RN to put that issue into perspective.

In sum, I think the risks are minimal if this is done carefully and correctly. And in the South, I think it is important to note that we can gain votes from both races simply because RN has brought some calm into a difficult situation. Sure, he followed the Supreme Court mandate on desegregation, but he didn't bully around the South, and he didn't stomp the Black under his foot. And besides, look at racially segregated Northern schools. Emphasizing that Black and white in the South have reconciled their own problems in a largely calm manner should not do us much damage there. Obviously, there must be some hope that HEW doesn't give us too many more Austin-type decisions in the South, but by and large, it seems clear to me that RN has given a better shake to the South than it would have gotten under a Democrat -- and all this without rending the Nation apart.

Let's give this thing some thought -- I'm not sure myself on all the details. But there is every reason to approach the Black vote in a uniquely new way -- the old way doesn't work, and we might just pick up some unexpected support.

Attachment

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

July 26, 1971

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102

By \_\_\_\_\_ NAME, Date \_\_\_\_\_

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN *KLK*

SUBJECT: THE BLACK VOTER

There is no reason for us to kiss off the Black vote in 1972. I think we can get more than we did in 1968, and I think we can do it in such a way as not to alienate white voters in the South or elsewhere. What follows is a rationale for seeking the Black vote and a strategy which suggests how to go about doing it.

DO WE NEED IT?

We may need more of the Black vote than we got in 1968 -- especially assuming an election which is as close. Looking at states where a few thousand votes might be crucial, you can see the opportunities that lay there for us. For example, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, Ohio, New Jersey and California might all be extremely close votes. Twenty thousand to 50,000 more votes in each of those states might make a difference (if you consider that it means 20,000-50,000 less votes for our opponent).

In 1968, RN got 12% of the Black vote. Assuming in 1968 he got that up to 20%, it would mean enough votes to add cushions in the states I just mentioned. In other words, we begin from such a low base, and we go no where but up, because 12% is probably a rock bottom support level among Blacks. (Even in the latest Harris matchup with EMK, RN is seen getting 13% of the Black vote against 71% for EMK with 14% not sure. EMK is, with Humphrey, the most popular among the Blacks, and if we have 13% now, we should be able to build upon it. We could really move successfully if Muskie were the opponent because I think he would evoke very little emotion with Black voters)

And in the South, we have an even better chance with Black voters -- and not necessarily at the expense of the Southern vote. In a Gallup poll which shows low approval ratings for RN among Blacks, the one shining light for RN was the Southern Black -- 42% approved of the way he was handling his job as President while 40% disapproved. Thus, a respectable showing among Blacks in the South, where races will be tight if Wallace runs, will give us added cushion where we might least expect it.

In other words, I think, on balance, it is to our benefit to move our percentage of the Black vote up. Two questions remain: (1) How do we do it? and (2) Will it hurt us among RN's more traditional electoral base.

#### HOW DO WE DO IT?

First of all, we can't do it by outpromising the Democrats. Besides, we have the FDR-JFK kneejerk conditioning to combat. Moreover, too many promises with too much hokey rhetoric about equality will turn off our other supporters (and probably the Blacks themselves who would view such an RN posture with skepticism).

The way to do it essentially is to approach them frankly -- i. e., hit them between the eyes. Republicans simply cannot succeed by fawning over Blacks with the standard Democrat rhetoric of "ghettos," "oppression," "poverty," etc. That's a lot of bull anyway. The majority of Blacks are bona fide members of the great American Middle Class.

Thus, for one thing, I suggest that we choose an appropriate forum for RN to address the Blacks, and strongly recommend that we plan now for him to attend the NAACP convention which probably will be scheduled for next July. This, I believe, has great advantages. Look, for example, how JFK put the Catholic issue to rest (at least sufficiently to be elected). He went to a Protestant meeting of clergy in the heart of Protestantism -- Texas. He pulled no punches, and he put it right on the line, and if nothing else he created the image of willing to fight for what he thought was right. He also got the press slobbering all over him for his "courage." In fact, this was a public relations coup for JFK.

For the same reasons, I recommend RN going right into the lions' den. There might be some hostility, and even statements by Wilkins that he is still not satisfied with RN's policies. But I think RN would come out on top. Why?

RN could frankly ask for their vote -- something we Republicans rarely come out and say to Blacks. He would label as hogwash the notion that no movement is taking place for Blacks (see attached excellent article from Wall Street Journal). He would suggest that the Dems have had the Blacks in their back pockets since FDR and still they complain -- is it perhaps the Dems take them for granted? He would put to bed the notion of America being the most racist empire -- how about Hitler, Stalin and the Kulaks, the Ottoman Turks, etc. Why, then, do Blacks insist on America being racist? (Note: Blacks were dying in Vietnam in greater proportions under JFK & LBJ than they have under RN).

Most importantly, he should tell them that he wonders why his critics, especially the Dems, go around painting all Blacks as poor and slum-ridden, as poverty-stricken and alienated. That is pure condescension. That is why he, RN, will not indulge in that kind of rhetoric. It simply keeps current the stereotype of Blacks. If Blacks want to have the world thinking they're all poor, downtrodden ghetto-dwellers, then they ought to vote for the Democrats who show them no respect.

He could then reel off some statistics about Black progress under his Administration; the record's not all that bad. Action on drugs, welfare reform, law and order -- these are all things which click with Blacks, but the media rarely points them out to Blacks.

And here's the main point. RN will not have given an inch, but in the meantime, I think, will have won the grudging respect of Black voters -- and maintaining this posture throughout the campaign will do him no harm.

The media would play it up as a bold stroke by RN (hopefully), and at least not paint RN as a racist by implication.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS AMONG OUR OTHER SUPPORTERS?

I don't think such an approach would cause us to lose votes in the South or among blue-collar supporters. In fact, it is my belief that these people will also come away with more respect for RN, for standing up to standard ploy of giving the Blacks the moon. In all candor, many whites resent the fact that Blacks complain -- taking the attitude: "why are they so ungrateful?" After all, they say, it is their tax dollar which goes to many Black poverty programs and welfare, etc. At least RN has guts enough to say to them: wait a minute, you are not as bad off as everyone says you are. And most of all, whites resent the racist label, so it is logical for RN to put that issue into perspective.

In sum, I think the risks are minimal if this is done carefully and correctly. And in the South, I think it is important to note that we can gain votes from both races simply because RN has brought some calm into a difficult situation. Sure, he followed the Supreme Court mandate on desegregation, but he didn't bully around the South, and he didn't stomp the Black under his foot. And besides, look at racially segregated Northern schools. Emphasizing that Black and white in the South have reconciled their own problems in a largely calm manner should not do us much damage there. Obviously, there must be some hope that HEW doesn't give us too many more Austin-type decisions in the South, but by and large, it seems clear to me that RN has given a better shake to the South than it would have gotten under a Democrat -- and all this without rending the Nation apart.

Let's give this thing some thought -- I'm not sure myself on all the details. But there is every reason to approach the Black vote in a uniquely new way -- the old way doesn't work, and we might just pick up some unexpected support.

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Ken Khachigian

FROM: Pat Buchanan

Would hold onto the back-up materials. However, for HRH and the Attorney General, would prefer, only a page and a half. Which iterates the major anti-Muskie themes to which we have contributed. And mention each of our success in passing. We can now add the President's ripping of the "scab" off Muskie -- on the black VEEP -- a course of action we recommended in the briefing book. Can you draft 2 pages Item #1, Item #2, etc.

Buchanan

*Feld*

RUNNING WITH MUSKIE -- OR HOW TO SNATCH DEFEAT FROM THE  
JAWS ~~OF~~ OF VICTORY ~~AND~~

*W*  
*W*  
If Ed Muskie looks behind him, he's going to see the pack catching up, for just as sure as ~~George~~ George McGovern is a forlorn loser, Ed Muskie has deftly engineered ~~away~~ away his lead in the Democratic presidential sweepstakes. MONDAY's prediction of not ~~too~~ too long ago is ~~now~~ coming to pass:

~~Ed~~ Muskie looks like he ~~can~~ make it.

~~Item:~~

*W*  
Item: When Muskie pulled into California ~~last~~ Labor Day to kick off his campaign, he found the prestigious California Field poll waiting for him with the ~~bad~~ bad news that Ted Kennedy led ~~among~~ among Democratic voters in California by a margin of two to one.

Item: Muskie has frittered away his Gallup poll leads.

*NOTE*  
He now trails Ted Kennedy as the favorite of the Democratic voters and is being swamped by President Nixon in the latest Presidential ~~trial~~ trial heat.

Item: The trusty Christian Science Monitor poll of ~~local~~ local

Democratic leaders ~~shows~~ shows that Muskie has "dropped back" over the last few months from his early lead in the eyes of over 30% of those polled. Over half of the Democratic poll ~~was~~ questioned, said there was still a possibility of

a dark horse emerging. Bad news for the guy they said would walk away from the field in 1972.

Why the turnaround on Muskie?

Washington ~~columnists~~ columnists, Evans and Novak, have reported that Muskie has lost ground ~~through~~ "through a series of errors and misjudgments." The political miscues have made Democratic governors disenchanted with Big Ed and this is precisely the reason such big state governors as Ohio's John Gilligan are going to run as favorite sons to pre-empt Muskie's bumbling participation in their primaries.

Muskie's position on the central issues are causing him trouble. His down-the-line support of forced busing to achieve racial ~~balance~~ balance is simply bad policy. While he has tried to cover himself on this issue, Muskie nevertheless has maintained that busing is a "useful tool" to achieve ~~balance~~ balance - forgetting that forced busing

*Evans*

would rapidly bring the ~~destruction~~ destruction of the neighborhood school concept. ~~Being~~ Being a strong advocate of busing is not going to help Muskie with the millions of parents who prefer their children's education to be peaceful instead of disruptive, and if Muskie continues to abet the ~~the~~ systematic destruction of American education, the fat cats who are bankrolling Muskie better be advised that they have invested in a bear ~~market~~ market.

Muskie fares no better on other issues. His petulant rantings over President Nixon's economic initiatives have left him out in the cold during the freeze, and

of touch with union rank and file. It has been generally

acknowledged that his substitute suggestion of a consumer tax credit fell on its face -- a fact reported by liberal pundit, Joseph Kraft. Add these troubles to his

Victims are  
the tardy embrace of dove feathers, and you have

a presidential hopeful in deep trouble.

As if to hasten his demise, Ed Muskie made (as Republican Hugh Scott noted) a "voyage from foot to mouth" on the sensitive issue of whether black ~~the~~ citizens can play a role in Democratic ~~the~~ political circles. Big Ed, who maintains that he's in favor of civil rights as much ~~as~~ as anyone, enraged black leaders by telling them that although ~~because~~ they have broken their backs for the party, they ~~can~~ might as well forget about joining his ticket. The response of black leaders: ~~Guess who's coming to dinner, Ed?~~

Jet magazine, a prominent black publication promptly blasted Muskie: "How the party's 1968 vice presidential candidate, a member of the Polish minority, would feel free to 'explode' the political aspirations of millions of Black voters ~~at~~ at the start of his ~~1970s~~ intensive drive for the ~~1970~~ nomination was baffling." Jet suggested that Muskie ~~just~~ had killed "The Game for the Democratic Party's

most faithful Black followers."

Too bad for Muskie, but several Black leaders wouldn't accept his if-your-black-step-back attitude. Black Congresswoman, Shirley Chisholm, has now announced she will declare for the Presidency on New Years Day and enter at least three primaries -- fighting Muskie in North Carolina, Florida and California, where he hoped he could again take the black vote for granted. Jesse Jackson, of Operation Breadbasket and another prominent black leader, called Muskie a "racist" and opined: "Muskie is out. . . Muskie has no domestic plans, no economic programs, nor has he outlined programs for bringing people together. . . Muskie smells musty."

*Handwritten note:*  
 Muskie  
 is  
 a  
 racist

To sum up the insensitive and divisive Muskie position, political columnist John Roche said: "No one wants a barefoot innocent wandering around the White House."

What should really make ~~Mr.~~ Mr. Ed nervous is that

his rivals smell ~~the~~ blood and won't leave the nomination

to the amateurish antics of the Downeast hero. ~~They~~

~~Kennedy-Teddy~~ Teddy Kennedy has

seen what's happened and is clearly reappraising his

own coy position. Teddy is ~~is~~ disappointed with ~~the~~

Muskie because Ed's ~~is~~ left-liberalism does not

take in the satin between the pants radicals that make up

~~his~~ his own constituency. Seeing McGovern fumble around

like a fourth-string fullback ~~is~~ will soon convince Teddy

that he can't sit back and ~~just~~ watch the Kennedy torch passed

on to Ed Muskie.

Kennedy's stepped up interest was ~~is~~ confirmed recently

when Teddy and Joan visited ~~the~~ Israel, the de rigueur pilgrimage

for Democratic presidential candidates on the make. The only

thing that Kennedy is waiting for is to see what John (television

profile) Lindsay is going to do. John, who <sup>is</sup> at his heart

*Notes*

in Manhattan, has got to ~~to~~ get into the primaries to prove himself, and before he gets too far, Kennedy will enter, scoop up the old Kennedy hands who were wet-nursing George McGovern, and blitz the Democratic National Convention carrying "the burden my brothers dropped." At least, that is ~~how the Kennedy forces see it, and to get there, only Muskie stands slightly in the way.~~

As for Muskie, the scenario of the primaries are not hopeful for him. The first ~~and~~ symbolic test in New Hampshire

is not going to be the cotton candy that Muskie had hoped for.

New Hampshire is Muskie country, it is in Maine's back yard, and no one seriously expects Muskie to be ~~beaten~~ <sup>beat</sup> there. But Muskie ~~is aiming~~ <sup>is aiming</sup> at a high goal ~~with~~

~~next March: he~~ must match Richard

Nixon's 79% margin in the 1968 New Hampshire primary before ~~the can call it a victory.~~ If Muskie can't make 70% in

*Little to  
New  
Hamp. '70  
score*

*79%*

a state where he has everything going for him, then he is in deep trouble. Other Democrats are virtually conceding New Hampshire to Muskie and will show their faces only because of the tradition of the first ~~open~~ primary.

If Muskie gets less than ~~75~~ 75% of the New Hampshire vote, he is going to be limping into Florida where his refined Georgetown radicalism won't stand him in good stead.

All Democrats will be on the Florida primary ballot unless they sign an affidavit saying they won't run for President, and they will be gunning for Muskie ~~in~~ one way or the other.

Add to ~~the~~ the standard Democrat hopefuls the candidacies of George Wallace and Shirley Chisholm, and Muskie's going to want to swallow hard and cry for his mother. Scoop Jackson, who is aiming all his guns at Florida, will also be in Muskie's way and when the dust settles, Muskie will no longer be Mr. Clean.

Wisconsin follows Florida, and Muskie will take his

bleeding campaign in to face feisty George McGovern whose

sell-out-Vietnam views find favor among a great number

*Lead "Kids"*

of dovish Democrats in Wisconsin. Not only will McGovern

be sure to give Muskie trouble, but Wisconsin's popular

Senator, William Proxmire, is almost sure to make the run

to parlay his vast home state support into a bargaining

block he can take to Miami to broker the vice-

presidential nomination for himself. In short: Muskie

looks like he will be denied the Wisconsin victory that

he needs and must search for other

primaries to get the victory he needs.

But the other primaries include Tennessee and North

Carolina where George Wallace will again probably

make the race in the Democratic primaries. Asking

*Southern*

Democrats to swallow Ed Muskie over George

Wallace is like asking the Rabbi to deliver the Christmas

**WINNER**

sermon. Muskie's pro-busing stance won't help him in Dixie,

and he just might find it a good idea to get out to

~~the~~ Oregon and ~~the~~ California where Jackson, Lindsay and

Kennedy will be waiting to ambush him. Oregon is in

Henry Jackson's back yard, and his popularity in the

Northwest is going to make Muskie's recovery somewhat difficult.

McGovern will have stuck it out to Oregon, Lindsay will

be on the ballot, and Teddy will be waiting to pick up

the pieces in California.

enough

Having ~~some~~ victories ~~and~~ to get to the convention,

Muskie will enter Miami Beach having his outrageous temper

tested, his lightweight political positions aired, his

amateurish staff ~~now~~ overworked, his deficit budget

stretched, and a left wing howling after his marshmallow

positions. Ed Muskie's not out of the race yet; he's

got too much pride to pull out. But one thing is clear,

Muskie's ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~race~~ ~~is~~ ~~now~~ ~~a~~ ~~long~~ ~~back~~ ~~here~~, and the side

*NOTE*

to Miami will not be an easy one for the guy who just  
weeks ago everyone said had it made.