

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	4	6/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Ken Khachigian RE: Requested plan between June 28, 1972 and the Democratic National Convention to "nail McGovern to the wall" on his welfare scheme." 3pgs
48	4	6/20/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Pat Buchanan From: Ken Khachigian RE: Letter in the NEW YORK TIMES from Social Michael Harrington and Irving Howe about how McGovern is not a socialist. 1pg
48	4	6/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H.R. Haldeman From: Pat Buchanan RE: Ideas in the Rose memorandum. 2pgs
48	4	6/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Pat Buchanan From: Ken Khachigian RE: Minor sample of the apprehension over the "McGovern Market." 2pgs
48	4	6/8/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H.R. Haldeman From: Pat Buchanan RE: McGovern's drop of fifteen points. 1pgs
48	4	5/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Ken Khachigian From: Pat Buchanan RE: McGovern's pro-abortion statements. 1pg

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

It was requested that we come up with a plan between now and the Democratic National Convention to nail McGovern to the wall on his welfare scheme. What follows is the outline of that plan -- specifics will come later.

The important point is that McGovern is going to change his plan right after the Democratic National Convention. We know he is planning it, and he has already laid the groundwork. Thus, our immediate strategy is to tar him every conceivable way on his \$1000 bonus so that his manner of rehabilitation is not in the least bit comfortable. Moreover, we should also predict that he is going to change his plan and that he will do so after the convention.

These points should be uppermost in the criticism of the McGovern proposal:

-- There is a \$1000 cash grant to every man, woman, and child in the country, regardless of need and with no work incentive at all.

-- This plan will expand the budget by \$210 billion.

-- This plan will put 210 ^M billion people on "welfare."

-- This plan is an assault on the work ethic and removes from the American culture the idea that people should work for a living, not live on the largesse of the taxpayer.

-- This plan will cost exorbitant sums, will require a massive increase in taxes (or cause confiscatory taxation), will directly harm middle income people and will harm the families where man and wife are each holding jobs to help make ends meet.

-- Finally, it should be pointed out that McGovern himself does not know what his program would cost, has been totally irresponsible in trying to sell this to the public, and if this is any indication of a McGovern presidency, then God help us all.

Suggest that Javits be asked to be one of those on the warpath regarding the McGovern welfare giveaway. He did a good job during the Joint Economic Committee hearings, and he might be willing to do so again in a public forum. If he does, we should make our P. R. facilities available to him at 1701. Javits is also ranking minority member on Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Rockefeller would also be a good one to attack the plan. He could stick in his speech a classic line: "Ladies and gentlemen, Nelson Rockefeller appreciates the offer, but I don't think I need a \$1000 bill from George McGovern."

Richardson would be a credible source as HEW secretary, but it is thought that he would not receive very much press. Nevertheless, he should have our materials and be primed for response at press conferences. A hard-hitting speech insert should be prepared for him.

Governor Reagan, who is known for his opposition to welfare waste, would also be a good source. He should have the information with a Lyn Nofziger speech.

Ehrlichman is supposed to be out on the hustings next week, and he can be briefed to get out the line. All surrogates should have this information with appropriate suggested inserts provided for them.

Finally, the Veep should be asked to focus a major section of one of his speeches on ridiculing the McGovern plan. Emphasis on the wage-earner being taken to the cleaners to give \$1000 to every breathing person in the country.

Beginning Monday, the whole week must be orchestrated towards one goal, and that goal is to totally discredit the McGovern welfare plan. We should not have all our wad shot on one day -- it should dribble out each day with each spokesman making some news. If done correctly, by the end of the week, there will have been widespread coverage on the plan.

The following points are the ones we have to target in order to get the press to focus on them:

-- The plan means higher taxes for hard-pressed wage-earners.

-- It is a giveaway which will discourage work and create greater class conflict.

-- McGovern doesn't know how much it will cost and is being irresponsible in presenting it as he has.

-- In one of the greatest acts of political expediency in our history, McGovern is going to make a wholesale revision of his plan to trick the American people into thinking it is some panacea for their ills. He will do it after the Dem convention as a cynical gesture to get him out from under a subject that was over his head to begin with.

Our entire effort next week must be well-coordinated. There has got to be a press release handed out for every spokesman we have speaking on the subject. Efforts should be made to get on network television; radio actualities should be made available; the wire services should get copies of everything; columns should be planted.

Other points which can be made. People on Social Security would get less money than they are getting now because McGovern has not said what he would do with the present system. McGovern is going to do away with tax exemptions -- \$3,000 for a family of four -- without proving how this helps the taxpayer. People with higher incomes are going to suffer confiscatory taxation.

A fact sheet which extracts all the various versions of the McGovern welfare giveaway is now being prepared and should be ready by Friday. This will go out as a supplement for this outline, and will become the basis for our charges. The idea will be to show that the McGovern plan is so totally confused and misshapen that it will be the biggest fiscal and social disaster of any program that has ever come down the chutes. The plan, alternately, should be held up to derision and alarm. Without doing it explicitly, McGovern ought to be portrayed as a decent humane, nut.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 20, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

You might not have seen this letter in the New York Times from the pre-eminent Socialist Michael Harrington and his fellow traveler Irving Howe. Though they make clear that McGovern is not a socialist, they go on to express great pleasure at "a significant extension of the welfare state." And, "That is where McGovern has taken a series of excellent, if sometimes not sufficiently precise, stands"

"That is why we, . . . support his candidacy."

Come this fall, it will be nice to send out the headlines -- "Socialist Leaders Endorse McGovern -- Believe his Plans for "Significant Extension" of Welfare State "Excellent." If McGovern is making the socialists happy, he must be doing something wrong.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN (Per Higby)
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some of the ideas in the Rose memorandum are good ones; others, in my judgment, are not.

First, Packard and his friends will be with us anyway. They have a "vested interest" in arms production; their group will be viewed in the press as the "Military-Industrial Complex -- West." Having millions in profits tied up in military spending, they are hardly the ones to make the case for us.

Second, the union folks should be gotten the message; and the ideas of the UCLA computers running out a print of jobs to be lost under the McGovern budget is excellent -- but keep the Captains of Industry away from it. We have them. We want the workers. As for the UCLA thing, Rose should get in touch with Ken, as we already have defense cranking out something -- and this could be used as the basis to be run through the computer.

Third, am not too concerned about the Post-Convention thing here -- as McGovern has already been hurt in Southern California. The arguments have already been made -- we can expand on them credibly since HHH did the spadework.

Fourth, any analysis should not be restricted to Southern California. But should include defense plants all over the United States, name them and the number of workers, etc. Rose should get together with Ken Khachigian on this -- this is one of the ideas we had in our original memorandum.

Fifth, am against the "transition colloquium" idea. All this says is that we agree with McGovern -- but he is going too far. Our case ought to be that "no jobs" are going to be lost under RN; we don't need any conferences to indicate that just a few will be changed. Our argument is

that McGovern is a madman on defense, would strip us naked, and throw thousands out on the street in the process -- and this chatter about us being against defense spending, too, at this point in time does not strengthen, but weaken, our presentation and makes George look less rather than more radical.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 13, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

PAT BUCHANAN

FROM:

KEN KHACHIGIAN 

Herewith a minor sample of the apprehension over the "McGovern Market." The stock market downturn of the week of the California primary has been attributed directly to McGovern in many quarters. It is likely that, should McGovern be nominated on July 12, the market is going to drop on July 13.

Your idea about getting Pierre Rinfret to allude to this in one of his newsletters is one approach. Also, as you suggested, the Kiplinger letter ought to pick this thing up. We should have 1701 watch for all these kinds of newsletters coming out of Wall Street, and at the appropriate time we should paste them up (with a classic Frank Leonard job) and get them out to the entire financial community in a direct mail operation. I would think that Maurice Stans would love to have this in his hand when he goes out looking for contributors.

The idea of stock market crash should McGovern be elected is something that should be freely talked about. Millions of voters are investors, directly or indirectly, and nothing would scare them more than the thought of a financial community collapse should George get in.

Attachment

6/13/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Herewith a minor sample of the ~~am~~ apprehension over the "McGovern Market." The stock market downturn of the week of the ~~California~~ California primary has been attributed directly to McGovern in many quarters. It is likely that should McGovern be nominated on July 12, the market is going to drop on July 13.

Your idea about getting Pierre ~~Rif~~ Rinfret to allude to this in one of his newsletters is one approach. Also, as you suggested, the Kiplinger letter ought to pick this thing up. We should have 1701 watch for all these kinds of newsletters coming out of Wall Street, and at the appropriate time we should paste them up (with a classic ~~FR~~ Frank Leonard job) and get them out to the entire financial community in a direct mail operation. I would think that Maurice Stans would love to have this in his ~~hand~~ hand when he ~~goes~~ goes out looking for contributors.

The idea of stock market crash should McGovern be elected is something that should be freely talked about. Millions of voters are investors, directly or indirectly, and nothing would scare them more than the thought of a financial community collapse ~~wh~~ should George get in.

June 8, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

From my knowledge only these can explain the precipitate McGovern drop of fifteen points:

a) The Field Poll was wrong; I discount this -- as I have it from a source that the Field Poll actually played down the McGovern spread, which was larger than twenty points.

b) Humphrey attacks begin to pay off -- his attacks primarily on defense cuts and jobs in California, on the welfare giveaways of McGovern, on Israel and POWs. Despite the Humphrey stridency, and panicky approach -- he must have sufficiently frightened many people to convince 300,000 to come his way. This I believe explains it coupled with:

1. The Jackson and Yorty endorsements of HHH, which tended to reinforce the Humphrey attacks on McGovern as a radical; and
2. The surfacing in the California press of increasing numbers of national Democrats calling GM and extremist, a guy who will sink the whole ticket, etc.

What needs to be remembered is that for most of the nation, George McGovern is someone they have become aware of for two weeks at least, two months at most. First impressions are favorable -- but they are not firm impressions.

What seems interesting is that McGovern who was 46-26 over Humphrey got just about that: 46%. But Humphrey was who went from 26% to 40% in a week -- So, did McGovern really lose any votes? Or did HHH simply pick up from all the other Democrats, and pick up all the undecideds as well -- by scaring the hell out of them.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 9, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: KEN KHACHIGIAN

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Thimmesch has the pro-abortion statements of McGovern-- and can we get that ad that was run in the Catholic papers of Nebraska on abortion, McGovern's position.

Further, I understand that in Nebraska McGovern indicated that he would name Ramsey Clark, the Berrigan Defender, as the FBI Chief: Can we check this out and get it -- if possible. Can you give my brother Bill a call and ask him where he heard it, if you can't get it from the Nebraska press.

Finally, understand from the News Summary that Alger Hiss has endorsed George McGovern. Can we get that one nailed down also.

Buchanan