

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	5	3/23/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	Draft of Memo: "ON STRATEGY BETWEEN NOW AND WISCONSIN." Author and recipient unknown. 2pgs
48	5	3/29/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: The President From: Patrick J. Buchanan RE: "McGovern's Private Polls." 2pgs
48	5		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Talking Points (Democratic Siutation) - The New Hampshire Democratic Primary. 1pg
48	5	3/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Patrick J. Buchanan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: Two attached columns on the mood of the electorate on election day. 1pg
48	5	2/10/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Gordon Strachan From: Kenneth L. Khachigian RE: John Lindsay on Meet the Press. Questions to ask Lindsay attached. 5pgs

3/23/72

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM ON STRATEGY BETWEEN NOW AND WISCONSIN

Because of unavailable data and because Wisconsin itself holds the keys for developing further strategy, it is somewhat difficult to plan effectively for the period between now and Wisconsin.

On the surface, it would be in our distinct interest for George Wallace to once again upset the field -- or at least pull as many delegates away as he can. Continued success by Wallace simply drives him deeper into the Democratic National Convention and sets the stage even more clearly for the assertion that the national Democrats are out of step with their rank and file.

Our impression is that Muskie will not do spectacularly well in Wisconsin. If he loses to Humphrey, Hubert will have many reasons to claim he's on his way again. If Muskie scores a poor third, Humphrey will be even stronger and the money will probably start falling in (with a drop-off to Muskie). Unless someone knows something we don't, there isn't enough good information to recommend continued targeted attacks on Muskie. Just leave him alone -- we don't want to elevate him now. Besides, the other Dems are beginning to smell the blood and they will be all over one another. And we shouldn't attack HHH yet because it's too early to know if he's on the way up.

Thus, our recommendation, strange as it may seem, is to sit back and wait until the Wisconsin primary is over when we can assess with more directness where our attention ought to lie. If anything be done, it is to help George Wallace.

At the risk of repeating ourselves, opposition attack activities must serve a purpose which meshes with our own campaign strategy, which furthers RN's chances of winning and which strikes heavy blows with effectiveness. Lacking these aims, we should just sit back and wait. That is about where we are now, and our reluctance to go on the offensive is guided by our best judgment of the road to Miami at this point in time.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 29, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

McGovern's Deputy Campaign Manager, a friend from my Soviet trip, a level-headed fellow, called me today to say that McGovern will win in Wisconsin. He gave me the following polls:

MCGOVERN'S PRIVATE POLLS		AFL-CIO QUAYLE POLL	
Humphrey	23	McGovern	24
McGovern	19	Humphrey	18
Muskie	14	Muskie	15
Jackson	13	Jackson	13
Wallace	9	Wallace	10
Lindsay	4	Lindsay	1
Other	3	Undecided	19
Undecided	14		

My friend tells me that in the McGovern Poll, McGovern is carried much lower than normal -- since it does not include the Second District (Madison) where McGovern is conceded to be immensely strong, compared with the other Democrats. Further, he says that those polled were those who intended to vote in the Democratic Primary, including Republicans.

This is hard to believe. Seems to me, even if these figures are accurate, however, that George Wallace will pick up some of the undecided -- he surely did in Florida.

But the McGovern fellow contends that Muskie could come in fourth or even fifth in the race -- which would be a climactic disaster for Big Ed.

Again, if these figures are accurate -- McGovern would be greatly enhanced; the liberal press would fall all over him for the next two weeks. Humphrey would be set back. Muskie would sustain a near fatal blow. Big John Lindsay would be finished. The situation would be more confused than ever. The likelihood of a first ballot nomination for the Democrats would be increasingly remote. In short, if this is the outcome, it would seem that the pressures on Kennedy would be substantial to move.

Buchanan

NOTE: If we have some hard poll information, and this is a possibility, then we should have Republicans cross over and vote for George McGovern. Word should go forth today.

PJB

TALKING POINTS (DEMOCRATIC SITUATION) -- THE NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

-- If Muskie gets less than 50% of the vote, the outcome is "astonishing." Coming in a state whose border is 25 miles from the place where Muskie was born and raised; a state to which Muskie is regarded as a "neighbor;" Muskie's back yard; and a state where Muskie visits every year -- the results must be considered a setback to his candidacy.

-- Muskie had virtually no opposition, especially considering his opponents insignificance ratings in national public opinion polls. Such an outcome indicates Muskie's support is soft and that Muskie was less than a heavyweight.

-- Frankly, we had considered Muskie to have the nomination virtually sewed up. To win by such a narrow margin indicates that Muskie, as of now, might not make the distance and that Hubert Humphrey must be considered a very real challenge to the Muskie candidacy. Humphrey is a much better campaigner, and as the titular head of the Democratic party has a great deal of broad-based support throughout the country. The big winner of the N.H. Primary was the man who didn't even appear on the ballot -- Hubert Humphrey.

-- If Muskie scores between 50% and 60%, much of the same above applies. It should be considered the most minimal of victories for Muskie and a pyrrhic victory. Anything less than 60% in his political back yard indicates a great weakening of Muskie's support.

-- If he gets around 65%, it should be noted that this was very much expected -- that we thought he would get at least 65%, especially considering his lack of major opposition and his geographic proximity. Only a Muskie victory of 70% could be considered anything near the proportions of a candidate who is supposed to be so clearly a "frontrunner."

-- In light of Muskie's small margin of victory, Republicans will surely reassess Muskie's strength. He certainly is no longer the formidable "Lincolnesque" figure that he might have been considered.

-- Asked about the crying incident, we have no comment on how it affected the election. The public should be the judge of a presidential candidate's loss of composure over one or two isolated news articles. There is some question on how Muskie would hold up against the pressures of a full-blown presidential campaign and the pressures of the Oval Office. After all, it is just starting. Most likely, Muskie's indecisiveness and the uncertainty on where he stands probably hurt Muskie more than anything else.

-- In general, the primary shows the disarray that pervades Democratic party ranks. They have no true leadership -- nothing like the FDR--Truman--Kennedy--Johnson tradition. They are confused, disunited, and leaderless and must do better to merit the public's support in November over a strong President.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 7, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN 

The two attached columns touch on the same theme, and I think Reston and Bartlett make some interesting points. Even if things are going good, there is a lot of talk about the "mood" of the electorate on election day. This is another way of putting the "what have you done for me lately?" question. Issues may be transcended.

If RN goes on the stump solely on the record, the election of 1972 will possibly be a replay of the election campaign of 1960 -- the Democrats saying they can do better versus RN defending the record. That's o.k. as far as it goes, but I think we can go a little further.

RN should be dissatisfied with his first term -- e.g., sure, we've made a lot of progress in X area, but I plan to do more. Give me four more years to do it. Generally, the theme ought to be one of RN wanting to keep moving ahead, going into new areas, with new thrusts. He cannot go into this campaign as being the sole defender of the status quo.

But just as he says we have not done enough, he should also attack, in general, the people who think America is not capable of doing better, that we are sick, racist, imperialist, immoral, etc. We can make progress without beating ourselves over the head.

Finally, any theme we have should be developed now. I.e., Price and his staff ought to have some general outline of a central thematic proposition which should begin turning up in all of RN's major addresses and messages. If we start now, the theme will have been established and all prepared for the time when RN takes the stump himself. Impressions will have been created and RN need only drive those impressions home. In a sense, RN will be campaigning "for America," while the opposition will be campaigning for the Democratic party.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 10, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN *Ke*

John Lindsay is to be on Meet the Press this Sunday, and the attached queries, drawn up by me, were given to Al Snyder and Dick Howard for Nick Timmesch who is going to be on the panel.

I have suggested that other members of the panel also see the questions, for the obvious reason that Nick cannot use all of them.

cc: Mr. Buchanan

Attachment

## QUESTIONS FOR JOHN LINDSAY

Mr. Mayor: You have been campaigning throughout the country citing your record on air pollution in New York and telling audiences you have been doing well in this area. Last week, a report found that the air in New York was 7% dirtier today than it was in 1969. Will you tell your audiences this fact about air pollution in New York?

Mr. Mayor: You have repeatedly said that the only way to get back American POW's is to set a date and get out of Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have expressly rejected this, countering that the U.S. must overthrow the Thieu regime before progress can be made to end the war. Are you in favor of overthrowing the government in Saigon and in favor of the communist government that the enemy seems to be demanding?

Mr. Mayor: Senator McGovern's representatives complained that your supporters, for example during the Arizona precinct elections, were "rude, pushy and arrogant." Do you condone this activity by your workers?

Mr. Mayor: In Florida two weeks ago, you told a Cuban audience that "the ultimate goal is normalization of relations between the two countries." Does that mean if elected President you will recognize the government of Fidel Castro?

Mr. Mayor: You have said busing is "an extremely appropriate tool for integration, among other tools." Yet your children go to private schools. Don't you feel strange calling for millions of Americans to have their children bussed to different schools while your children go to private schools?

Mr. Mayor: The police force in New York City is larger than the army of Denmark. Why do people of New York not feel safe to walk its streets at night?

Mr. Mayor: Police corruption has become quite an issue in New York City. There is strong evidence that you knew about widespread police corruption in 1967, your assistant, Jay Kriegal having been told about it by two policemen. Even Time magazine wondered why you were "so tardy in exercising control" when you received word of corruption. Why did you wait four years to do something?

Mr. Mayor: How would you characterize Senator Muskie's ruling a black man off his presidential ticket?

Mr. Mayor: On April 30, 1970 at the University of Pennsylvania, you said that you felt "unending admiration" for those who refused to serve in Vietnam? You also called men who would not serve, "heroic." Why do you feel that way about draft-dodgers?

Mr. Mayor: Bruce Llewellyn, president of the FEDCO Foods Corporation, the country's largest minority-owned supermarket chain, said of your actions: "I think Harlem is a disaster area compared with five years ago." Other blacks in New York have been quite critical of you. Yet you continue to say that you have strong black support. How do you square this contradiction?

Mr. Mayor: Your fellow Democrat in New York, Matthew Troy, called your administration: "inefficient, extravagant and in some instances incompetent." Does this indicate lack of support in your own back yard?

Mr. Mayor: Why do you think that George Meany feels, as he says, "completely negative" about you, and that if you are the Democratic nominee, he will vote for Mr. Nixon? He said you were not doing a good job as Mayor.

Mr. Mayor: A prominent Democratic leader in New York, Edward Costikyan, said: "it is irresponsible for New Yorkers to mislead the American people into believing that Mayor Lindsay is capable of performing the duties of the Presidency. Certainly his stewardship of the city gives no evidence of such capacity." Just why do literally dozens of people give you such poor marks as Mayor?