

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	16	12/3/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: 1972 Democratic Primaries. 3 pgs.
48	16	11/19/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: 1972 State Primaries and Democrats. 14 pgs.
48	16		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	The 1972 Presidential Campaign in New York. 2 pgs.
48	16	9/10/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: Thoughts Toward 1972. 6 pgs.

<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	16	9/10/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: Thoughts Toward 1972. 6 pgs.
48	16	7/26/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From McWhorter to Flemming RE: Information and Comments from Recent Meetings of Western Governors, Midwestern Governors, GOP State Chairmen and Republican National Committee. 21 pgs.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102

December 3, 1971

By-----NARC, Date-----

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THE 1972 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARIES

While it's not possible to make a rock-hard prediction of the full primary route for the Democrats, I think we have enough information to look at the first four big ones and give some idea of the scenario through Wisconsin.

The New Hampshire primary falls on March 7 -- after the withdrawal deadlines for Illinois, Florida and Wisconsin. Thus, anyone going into New Hampshire will at least have to go into Wisconsin and Florida (where Secretary of States have discretion as to who goes on the ballot) and possibly into Illinois (where the primary is opening up this year).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire is Muskie's. Jackson has pulled out because the polls showed him with nothing. That leaves Yorty and McGovern who at this point will be Muskie's only opponents. The key here is to insist that Muskie must do better than RN's 1968 showing to call New Hampshire a victory. Yorty will get around 20% with Bill Loeb's endorsement and McGovern a hard-core 15% based on some polling recently reported.

FLORIDA

I believe at this point that Florida is going to be an indecisive primary -- but one that still benefits Muskie. The Florida ballot will probably include: Muskie, McGovern, Jackson, Shirley Chisholm, George Wallace, Sam Yorty, Hubert Humphrey, John Lindsay and Eugene McCarthy.

The big story in Florida will probably be the poor showing of Scoop Jackson. It's long been my feeling -- supported most recently by Evans-Novak and several polls -- that Jackson is going nowhere. In Florida, his appeal will be lost under Wallace's frank hard-line appeals in the northern part of the state.

Shirley Chisholm, McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will split the libs and blacks in Florida. Humphrey will probably have a small bloc by virtue of his endorsement by Miami mayor David Kennedy, Yorty a fringe, and Muskie picking up 25-35% -- enough for a close margin of victory. If there's no big victory there for Muskie, at least there's no great loss either.

ILLINOIS

Illinois is opening up its primary for the first time -- allowing presidential hopefuls to have their names alongside the candidates for convention delegates in each Congressional district. No one has yet planned to run anybody in opposition to the delegates in Chicago -- still Daley's. But both McGovern and Muskie plan to run delegates in other districts and conceivably could pick up about as many delegates as will Daley. Yet, I can't picture Daley giving up total control of his delegation and thus think that he will try to get a majority so he still has control in Miami. Nevertheless, Muskie has an excellent opportunity to get committed to him upwards of 35% of the Illinois delegation.

WISCONSIN

All early primaries eventually lead to Wisconsin on April 4 where the Secretary of State has discretion as to who goes on the ballot and affidavits of non-candidacy are required to get off the ballot.

It looks promising for Muskie right now. McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will all probably be on the ballot along with Humphrey, Jackson and Shirley Chisholm. The liberals will again divide the kids and the left. Humphrey has some residual strength in Wisconsin but surely not enough to win more than one or two districts. Jackson has no source of strength in Wisconsin and I call it a wash for Scoop.

So again, it looks like Muskie, with at least one article I read giving him as many as 8 out of 10 districts. He will, of course, have great strength in Milwaukee and wherever else large Polish enclaves exist. Plus, there is something about the solid Ed image that sells in Wisconsin.

A Wisconsin victory for Muskie, added to earlier leads in the first primaries makes a solid position for Big Ed going into the others. It will really almost go by default to the extent that his opponents will not be able to muster significant showings through Wisconsin. And if no large candidate emerges to oppose him, Muskie will reap enormous psychological victories in Wisconsin, probably loosen up some money, and be on his way to other primaries.

After Wisconsin, a brand new analysis will be necessary. Things will have changed sufficiently to let us make some final plans. More will then be known about EMK and we can start giving some thought to the Southern primaries as well as Oregon and California.

Please note, per Tab A, that the various dates of the primaries still makes them crowded and hopefully confused -- enough so that even though Muskie is winning, he won't have the nomination locked up via the primaries and that a bloody Miami is still possible. For example, the Florida primary comes after the withdrawal deadlines for Illinois, Rhode Island, Massachusetts (subject to change), Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Nebraska.

And by the Wisconsin primary, the withdrawal deadlines for Nebraska, Tennessee, Indiana, South Dakota, North Carolina and Maryland will have passed. Thus, every one of those primaries are likely to be littered with names -- even if candidates are withdrawing after Wisconsin. And it's to our benefit to keep those primaries crowded (even to the extent of asking Republican Secretaries of State to keep Democrats on the ballot) so as to make each of Muskie's victories indecisive.

My recommendation: Higher ups should give some immediate attention to this information and sanction our ongoing analysis here. No one really seems to be giving serious attention to what is happening in the other camp (at least in terms of slogging through all the state laws), yet what happens with the Dems is, for now, equally important as what happens to us.

A ROUGH OUTLINE OF THE PRIMARIES AFTER WISCONSIN

Rhode Island follows Wisconsin and is insignificant in size and impact. Massachusetts, for now, is scheduled next. Governor Sargent recently vetoed a bill which would have given EMK control over his delegation, and now it is winner take all, making the big delegation a valuable one. Our intelligence, however, shows that EMK's people are introducing new legislation which would push the filing deadline into March instead of February, thus giving Teddy maneuvering room should he want to run. If he does, he will go after Massachusetts first and have a good start towards the nomination.

Pennsylvania now is a district by district vote, but their law is in the legislature, and it still might change. It's hard to guess what will happen considering the expected fight between Shapp, Rizzo and the machine boys, and we still simply don't have enough information to make a prediction.

Indiana comes next on May 2 and is marginally important. Vance Hartke is talking about running, and if so, will cause the others problems. Lindsay has been there and he may get Gordon St. Angelo's support and try for a comeback after Wisconsin aiming at the constituency that made RFK popular in 1968. It's too early to call.

Ohio is also on May 2, but a Gilligan favorite son bid is predicted which will limit the impact. Look for Gilligan getting his fingers burned a la Jim Rhodes.

North Carolina is also on May 2, and that could be a most important primary vis 'a vis the South. Moreover, Tennessee follows North Carolina on May 4. Together, these two primaries will tell a great story for us and might be Scoop's last gasp.

North Carolina and Tennessee are important to those candidates who intend to take more of a centrist Dem line -- the old FDR coalition. Muskie, Jackson, Mills, Chisholm and Wallace will probably grace those ballots. Lindsay and McGovern have no choice but to go on the Tennessee ballot if they are in Wisconsin (secretary of state discretion). Humphrey may be there as well, and he needs a good showing to be credible.

Muskie's support is good in North Carolina, and Scoop is devoting great attention there. But Wallace will give them headaches as he will in Tennessee, and William Anderson might be in Tennessee to confuse things. I give North Carolina to Muskie -- the right being split by Wallace, Jackson and Mills if they are all there. Chisholm will take the blacks and some liberals and McGovern might get 10 votes.

If Muskie wins North Carolina after having won Wisconsin, he has a strong argument for saying he does well in all sections of the country -- it will help him immensely.

Tennessee's too hard to call right now. Muskie's organization and strength there is not legend, and Wallace will have strong support. Tennessee will most likely have on its ballot all those who were on the Florida ballot and maybe more. That makes it look more like Florida -- a toss-up with little national impact and no convincing delegate support picked up.

Note: Wallace should not be discouraged in these primaries because he will detract from the others. Keeping Muskie's margin down in the South is important.

Nebraska, West Virginia, and Maryland are the next three, but are hardly kingmaker in character. Nebraska will be the most contentious with a heavy ballot, but who will pay attention with Oregon two weeks away?

Finally, to Oregon, where everyone will be on the ballot. They can't get off. Even Teddy will probably be on that ballot. This could be a fun and games primary. Even if Teddy decides he wants in, he's not all that popular in Oregon (cf. McCarthy vs. RFK in '68), and he's way behind Muskie in the polls. In fact, Muskie is leading with an extremely comfortable margin in Oregon.

Now Oregon is supposed to be Scoop's back yard, but he's not doing too hot there, running last in recent poll. The vote will be split every which way, and right now I pick Muskie even if he only gets 40%. That won't hurt him, because he will have come into Oregon with a substantially successful primary record. Oregon can only be the saving grace for other candidates -- maybe Lindsay or Jackson, or even McCarthy again. But don't count on it. The final prize is in California.

If there is any hunger for the nomination by any Democrat, he will go into California with every thing he's got. California is "winner take all." That's why Humphrey has really made serious moves there, and why I think he is going to make California his make or break state. He has financial backing and old ties there. And while the cats are away, HHH just might make some headway stumping the Golden state.

But it's not that easy. Lindsay will probably make one last fling in California. Muskie will pour on the steam. Jackson, by now will have lost his taste. I predict he'll be out by California (remember, you saw it here first). McGovern can't pass up California if he's come this far (unless Teddy goes for it). McCarthy shouldn't be expected to do too much there. The real light is EMK. The filing deadline is March 24 -- enough to get off ballots in other states, but to get in California. If Wisconsin makes it look like the liberals have had it but that RN still might be beatable, then EMK might swoop up the Kennedy torch and run for daylight.

Without Kennedy, California becomes fair Muskie game. Humphrey could make a good showing, and Lindsay and McGovern will split the left. I would again pick Muskie. If Kennedy is in, I give the state and all its delegates to him.

The last three primaries, New Mexico, South Dakota and New Jersey are on the same day as California, June 6. All attention will be on California and those other three states will just be a matter of who splits the delegates.

What this all means is that Muskie goes into convention with the most primary delegates and the best showing in the primaries. But it will be the delegates not selected in the primaries and the delegates controlled by favorite sons that still hold the balance at the convention. At that time all the IOU's will come in.

The important thing for Muskie is his primary momentum and his ability to something decent in the South. If he showed this, I think he has the nomination. But I don't think he will get it on the first ballot. I think there will be hedging on the first ballot with a comfortable lead to Muskie. But even if it takes two or three ballots, it still comes out Muskie.

That's the scenario I see now, but it can change tomorrow. I repeat: On the morning of April 5, I think we can make more solid judgments on how things will look from there. But until then, we are going on gut instincts.

This information needs to be digested and periodically reviewed. Thought must be given to what we want our Republican Secretaries of State to do in the various states. And finally, an ongoing strategy to exacerbate Democratic differences has to be evolved out of what we know.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102 November 19, 1971

By _____ NARS, Date _____

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THE 1972 PRIMARIES AND THE DEMOCRATS

NEW HAMPSHIRE:

Candidates have a filing deadline of February 3 for a primary on March 7. To get out, the candidate must withdraw within 10 days of receipt of candidacy, i. e. by February 13 (assuming the filing is complete on February 3). This leaves enough time to also file an affidavit taking his name off the ballot in Florida (which has a withdrawal deadline of noon, February 15).

So, for example, if McGovern sputters and wants out after New Hampshire, he can do it in time to get his name off the Florida ballot and almost all the others as well.

New Hampshire Secretary of State -- Republican -- Robert L. Sturk

FLORIDA:

Candidates are placed on the ballot by a bipartisan committee -- selecting generally advocated and nationally recognized candidates for the office of President. February 10 is the filing deadline and noon, February 15 is the deadline for filing their withdrawal affidavit. The primary date is March 14.

Assume someone is on the ballot in Florida and sticks it out through election day on March 14. This will commit him to the Wisconsin, Nebraska and Oregon primaries for sure. It will also commit him to the Illinois, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania primaries if he had filed for them and possibly to the North Carolina primary (a strange primary which is outlined below).

What this means is that as early as Florida, candidates will be committing themselves weeks ahead, unable to avoid at least having their names on some more ballots.

Florida Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Richard B. Stone

ILLINOIS:

The information is sketchy right now, but in essence Illinois is now going to allow persons running for the Convention delegation to have listed next to their names the name of their favored Presidential candidate. The delegates are elected out of Congressional districts.

Daley will run his slate -- "uncommitted" delegates (though committed to him) in at least the seven districts in Chicago. As for now, only McGovern and Muskie have indicated running their people in other districts -- Muskie in perhaps 16 and McGovern in perhaps a dozen.

The Illinois primary is before Wisconsin and after Florida. The filing deadline is January 3 and the withdrawal of a candidate must come by January 8. So a candidate could pull out of Illinois without committing into the other primaries.

I can't imagine Daley giving up anything in Illinois if he can help it. I would guess that he will try to control at least a majority of the delegation, thus squeezing out some of the other candidates. It really all depends on Daley. If he doesn't try to pick up all the marbles, then Illinois becomes a fairly important primary. There will be too many delegates to pass up.

Illinois Secretary of State -- Republican -- John W. Lewis

WISCONSIN:

The filing deadline is January 31, and the candidates will be placed on the ballot by an 11-man bipartisan committee -- selecting all nationally recognized candidates. Then the candidates -- if they want out -- must file an affidavit of withdrawal by February 29 for the primary on April 4.

If a candidate sticks it out through the Wisconsin primary he is committed to having his name on the ballot in Tennessee, Nebraska, Maryland and Oregon (all states where names are put on the ballot at state's discretion), and in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Indiana if they have previously filed in those states. All these states have withdrawal deadlines before the Wisconsin primary.

My guess is that virtually all the hopefuls will stick it out through Wisconsin, hoping they will catch fire somewhere. This is perfect for us because then it commits them to at least being on the ballot in four more states -- Tennessee being the most important addition since Florida -- even if they no longer profess candidacy.

Wisconsin Secretary of State -- Republican -- Robert Zimmerman.

PENNSYLVANIA:

The primary is on April 25 with a filing deadline of February 15. The withdrawal deadline to get off the ballot is February 22.

A candidate may be nominated via petition in order to have his name placed on the ballot, and his consent is not required. Only some delegates are elected in the primary. I doubt that any candidate's name will be entered there without his consent. However, some candidates may choose to run there without publicly consenting. For example, I can envision Humphrey having his name entered in the Pennsylvania primary while publicly disavowing it. It would be a logical place for Humphrey because of the strong old-line machine which could get the vote out for him.

I have a gut feeling, however, that Humphrey will be in most of the primaries from Florida onward -- and if he does marginally well, he may pull out all the stops for the last primaries on June 6 -- California, South Dakota, New Jersey and New Mexico.

Pennsylvania Secretary of State -- Democrat -- C. Delores Tucker

INDIANA:

Primary is on May 2; the filing deadline is March 23. A person getting on the Indiana ballot must withdraw by March 27th to get off. Thus they can get off after the New Hampshire and Florida primaries, but not after the Wisconsin, Rhode Island, Massachusetts or Pennsylvania primaries.

Indiana Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Larry Conrad

OHIO:

The Ohio primary is May 2 and the filing deadline is February 2. A candidate must withdraw if he wishes "any reasonable time before the ballots are printed." That is subject to interpretation, and there is no telling how that withdrawal date would come down.

However, I don't consider Ohio crucial at this time. John Gilligan is going to play the James Rhodes game and run as a favorite son and control the delegation. I don't foresee him opening it up to the others. He obviously wants to broker what he can in Miami. Maybe he will learn what Rhodes did -- you can sometimes get your fingers burned doing this.

Secretary of State -- Republican -- Ted W. Brown

NORTH CAROLINA:

The North Carolina State Board of Elections will list the generally advocated individuals on the Presidential ballot by February 21. To get off the ballot in North Carolina does not require any action. To the contrary, in order to stay on, the candidate must file a notice of candidacy and \$1000. If the \$1000 is not given within 15 days of listing of candidacy, their name will be withdrawn.

The conclusion in North Carolina is simple; it really becomes like the other primaries to the extent that any candidate who does not want to get on the ballot there will not, even if he is a candidate in some other state. And by this reasoning, we simply cannot tell in advance with any degree of certainty who will be on the ballot. So scratch North Carolina as one of those primaries where certain candidates have to run.

North Carolina Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Thad Eure

TENNESSEE:

Another state where the names will go on the ballot at the discretion of the Secretary of State. This will be done by March 9 for a May 4 primary. To get out of the Tennessee primary, a non-candidacy affidavit must be filed 10 days after March 9 -- which would allow time to get off this ballot after the Florida primary.

Of interest in Tennessee is the possible candidacy of Congressman William Anderson (of Tiger Cage fame). Wilbur Mills might take a

crack, and old George will surely file in Tennessee. Note that Wallace is talking about going into both Dem and Republican primaries, and I have no doubt he will. It could be rough for us as well as for the Dems.

I consider Tennessee along with North Carolina as important Southern and border primaries -- for us as well as the Dems. The showings in those two states may well tell us what kind of strengths the eventual nominees are going to have in the South and border states.

Tennessee Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Joe C. Carr

OREGON:

Oregon is the next big primary, coming on May 23 with a filing deadline of 5:00 p.m. March 14. The names will be placed on the ballot by the Secretary of State at his discretion. The key thing about Oregon this time is that a candidate cannot withdraw his name from the ballot even with an affidavit.

My guess is that Oregon is going to be chock full of Democrats -- most of them having been committed there simply by having appeared on the Wisconsin and Florida ballots.

Note that a research firm in Oregon found Scoop Jackson running behind Muskie, McGovern, McCarthy, Kennedy and Humphrey. Jackson was getting 7.8% -- a poor last. That's interesting because Oregon is Scoop's back yard in the same way that New Hampshire is Muskie's back yard. It may cause us to reassess the Jackson strength. Moreover, Teddy Kennedy's weakness in Oregon may also urge us to get him on the ballot there where he can't get off.

Oregon Secretary of State -- Republican -- Clay Myers

CALIFORNIA:

The primary date is June 6 and the filing deadline for candidacy is April 7. Once a candidate gets on the ballot he cannot withdraw -- making two big primary states in a row where the candidate cannot withdraw.

California Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Edmund G. Brown, Jr.

OBSERVATIONS:

I think it is inadvisable to predict right now how the various primaries will boil down. I think by the time of the Florida primary, we should be able to make some better judgments. However, in the meantime, some logical scenarios can be drawn up.

New Hampshire will be a throwaway one way or the other. If Muskie wins big, it doesn't mean much. However, I don't think his margin will be too high, and that he will be bloodied up somewhat. Yorty will blast him from the right and McGovern from the left. Jackson's presence in New Hampshire likely will do little more than establish some name identity for him. Bill Loeb will support Yorty.

Florida might well be indecisive with the winner getting 25-35% of the vote and Wallace being right up there with a chunk of the Florida primary. Some of this might depend on a loyalty oath, but then such things never held back old Gawg. With McGovern, Chisholm, Jackson, Lindsay, Muskie, McCarthy and now probably Humphrey in the show, Florida will be a toss-up. No decisive victories in Florida, unless Wallace comes through with a win on the strength of Northern Florida.

Illinois will not be a crucial primary because I think Daley is smart enough to do what he can to control most of the voting for delegates. But Wisconsin is the next one, and that, I believe, becomes the first serious primary where we can start perceiving a trend. And right now, I think it looks promising for Muskie. McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will all probably be on the ballot. Throw in Shirley Chisholm and that just totally confuses the left. Jackson is nowhere in Wisconsin, and that leaves most of the chips for Big Ed (though it has been noted that HHH might start his big push in Wisconsin).

Muskie can concede Madison and some other areas to the left, but I see most of the rest going to him -- especially the ethnic rich Milwaukee area. Humphrey might be the main problem right now, but I don't think Hubert will make much of an effect in Wisconsin. If Muskie does well in Wisconsin, money will loosen up, and he may try to get a bandwagon psychology going for him.

Rhode Island is insignificant and Massachusetts primary law is now perfectly suited for Teddy to control the delegation. The Massachusetts primary is now moot.

Pennsylvania is next, and it is a district by district type of thing. It depends just how much Shapp can control his own show -- which I doubt very much because of Rizzo. With all the battling, no one is going to pick up anything of significance in Pennsylvania. No bets there.

That brings us to Indiana, which holds its primary on May 2nd. Indiana is of marginal importance. It could be the state where Lindsay tries to revive himself after a setback in Wisconsin. He may get the support of Gordon St. Angelo, and if he does, he'll aim for the same constituency that made RFK popular in Indiana. I expect that Jackson, Muskie and some others will also be in Indiana, but it just simply is not a central primary state.

Ohio is also on May 2, but I see a Gilligan favorite son bid, and thus no real action in Ohio -- i. e. , one with no psychological impact on the other races.

But North Carolina is also on May 2, and that could be a very important primary vis 'a vis the South. Moreover, Tennessee follows North Carolina on May 4. Together, these two primaries will tell a great story for us. It may be one of the last gasps for our friend Scoop.

North Carolina and Tennessee are important to those candidates who intend to take more of a centrist Democrat line -- the old Roosevelt coalition and maybe the Kefauver rhetoric. Muskie, Jackson, Mills, Chisholm, and Wallace will almost certainly be on these ballots. Lindsay and McGovern will have to be on the Tennessee ballot if they go through Wisconsin -- they have no choice. Humphrey, I would guess, should try to make some showing in one of these states to prove he has some appeal to the South.

Muskie has good support in North Carolina, and Scoop has been spending a great deal of time there. But George Wallace is going to be there to give them all headaches as he will in Tennessee. And William Anderson might be in Tennessee to confuse things -- especially in his home district.

I think Muskie would win North Carolina -- the right will be split by Jackson, Wallace, and Mills, if he's there. Shirley Chisholm will take the Blacks and some liberals and McGovern may get 10 votes there if he sticks with it. If Muskie wins North Carolina after having won Wisconsin, he has a strong argument for saying that he can do well in all sections of the country. This helps his road to the nomination immensely. It's too hard to call Tennessee right now. But Muskie's

organization and strength there is not legend, and George Wallace might be the big story there. The trouble with Tennessee is that every soul on the Wisconsin ballot goes on the Tennessee ballot and that makes it start looking more like Florida -- a toss-up with little national impact and no one picking up convincing delegate strength.

Nebraska, West Virginia, and Maryland are hardly kingmaker states. Those are the next three primaries, and I don't expect they will titillate Eric Sevareid. Anyway, Mandel will probably call the shots in the Maryland primary -- at least he's trying.

Finally, to Oregon, where everyone will be on the ballot. They can't get off. Even Teddy will probably be on that ballot. This could be a fun and games primary. Even if Teddy decides he wants in, he's not all that popular in Oregon (cf. McCarthy vs. RFK in '68), and he's way behind Muskie in the polls. In fact, Muskie is leading with an extremely comfortable margin in Oregon.

Now Oregon is supposed to be Scoop's back yard, but he's not doing too hot there. The vote will be split every which way, and right now I pick Muskie even if he only gets 40%. That won't hurt him, because he will have come into Oregon with a substantially successful primary record. Oregon can only be the saving grace for other candidates -- maybe Lindsay or Jackson, or even McCarthy again. But don't count on it. The real prize is in California.

If there is any hunger for the nomination by any Democrat, he will go into California with every thing he's got. That's why Humphrey has really made serious moves there, and why I think he is going to make California his make or break state. He has financial backing and old ties there. And while the cats are away, HHH just might make some headway stumping the Golden state.

But it's not that easy. Lindsay will probably make one last fling in California. Muskie will pour on the steam. Jackson, by now will have lost his taste. I think he'll be out by California. McGovern can't pass up California if he's come this far (unless Teddy goes for it). McCarthy shouldn't be expected to do too much there. The real light is EMK. The filing deadline is April 7 -- three days after Wisconsin. If Wisconsin makes it look like the liberals have had it but that RN still might be beatable, then EMK might swoop up the Kennedy torch and run for daylight.

Without Kennedy, California becomes fair Muskie game. Humphrey could make a good showing, and Lindsay and McGovern will split the left. I would again pick Muskie. If Kennedy is in, I give the state and all its delegates to him.

The last three primaries, New Mexico, South Dakota and New Jersey are on the same day as California, June 6. All attention will be on California and those other three states will just be a matter of who splits the delegates.

What this all means is that Muskie goes into convention with the most primary delegates and the best showing in the primaries. But it will be the delegates not selected in the primaries and the delegates controlled by favorite sons that still hold the balance at the convention. At that time all the IOU's will come in.

The important thing for Muskie is his primary momentum and his ability to something decent in the South. If he showed this, I think he has the nomination. But I don't think he will get it on the first ballot. I think there will be hedging on the first ballot with a comfortable lead to Muskie. But even if it takes two or three ballots, it still comes out Muskie.

That's the scenario I see now, but it can change tomorrow. I repeat: On the morning of April 5, I think we can make some solid judgments on how things will look from there. But until then, we are going on gut instincts.

This information needs to be digested and periodically reviewed. Thought must be given to what we want our Republican Secretaries of State to do in the various states. And finally, an ongoing strategy to exacerbate Democratic differences has to be evolved out of what we know.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 13023 Section 6-102

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OHIO: Withdrawal- "Any reasonable time before the ballots are printed."
Secretary of State-Ted W. Brown (R)

NORTH CAROLINA: Withdrawal-must give \$1,000 within 15 days of notice of candidacy, otherwise is withdrawn.
Secretary of State-Thad Eure (D)

TENNESSEE: Withdrawal-affidavit filed by the 10th day after receipt of notice.
Secretary of State-Joe C. Carr (D)

NEBRASKA: Withdrawal-affidavit filed by March 10.
Secretary of State-Allan J. Beermann (R)

WEST VIRGINIA: Withdrawal-by the 5th day prior to the primary.
Secretary of State-John D. Rockefeller IV (D)

MARYLAND: Withdrawal-affidavit filed 45 days before primary.
Secretary of State-Fred Wineland (D)

OREGON: Withdrawal-cannot withdraw
Secretary of State-Clay Myers (R)

CALIFORNIA: Withdrawal-cannot withdraw
Secretary of State-Edmund G. Brown, Jr. (D)

NEW MEXICO: Withdrawal-must give \$500 within 15 days after receipt of notice.
Secretary of State-Mrs. Betty Fiorina (D)

SOUTH DAKOTA: Withdrawal-April 27.
Secretary of State-Alma Larson (R)

NEW JERSEY: Withdrawal-by the 34th day before primary.
Secretary of State-Paul J. Sherwin (R)

THE 1972 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN IN NEW YORK STATE

The following comments might merit consideration by those people organizing the New York State Citizens Committee for Reelection of the President:

GOP Machinery in Manhattan

Vince Albano, Chairman of the New York Republican County Committee, joined the GOP in the late 1950's as a convert from the Democratic Party. He tends to side with people who win and uses a divide and conquer strategy to maintain his position as Chairman. He is not in a position to get a real working majority of the Manhattan district leaders and their clubs which would be truly effective for the President in 1972. The GOP in Manhattan is old and tired, has only several district leaders in their 20's or 30's and consequently doesn't seem to have the horsepower necessary for canvassing operations in N.Y.C. apartments. The typical N.Y.C. resident does not react well to campaign literature received in the mail. To succeed in Manhattan the GOP needs to revert to the discarded building captain or election district captain concept. There is no ouster in sight for Albano when he is up for reelection in '73. After the 1969 mayoralty primary Albano allegedly contributed GOP county funds to the Lindsay campaign instead of Senator Marchi's campaign. Albano's previous affection for Mayor Lindsay might well dampen his enthusiasm for the President's campaign if the Mayor should become the Democratic nominee. However, in 1968 Albano did muster all the forces he could for the Nixon/Javits movement.

The only elected GOP official in the New York State Legislature or U.S. House of Representatives from Manhattan is Roy M. Goodman (State Senator 26th District in the heart of the East Side). Goodman is a liberal (recently voted "for" the \$2.5MM Transportation Bond Issue in the State Senate) and has never really faced a tough opponent. There seems to be a possibility that the son of former Mayor Wagner might run against Goodman in 1972. Goodman will certainly get all of the manpower commitments he can; this will include Albano's concerted efforts since Goodman has to win if Albano is to save face. Consequently this effort will probably detract from the President's campaign in Manhattan. This supposition is reinforced by the defeat of the Bond Issue in Goodman's home district by a margin of 5 to 4.

New York State Young Republicans Clubs (Association of)

There is no state-wide monolithic youth machinery in the GOP. Each YR club deals through local contacts. Apparently the New York Republican State Committee funds the State YR organization, which as a single unit was not active in 1968. The current doctrine of the State YR's is to develop leaders not bodies. The president of the State YR's, Douglas G. North, apparently owes his allegiance to Charles H. Lanigan, Chairman of the New York Republican State Committee. There are two strong YR clubs in Manhattan: 1) Eastside

Young Republican Club and 2) New York Young Republican Club. If approached early enough the former club might be swayed to put all of its effort behind the President. This club has several hundred members and a mailing list approaching 2000. Most of the club leadership is extremely pro-Nixon. Their political forte is literature distribution at subway stops and to a lesser degree door-to-door canvassing. N.Y. State Senator Goodman probably will try to get his club to commit its time to him. The club put its efforts behind Governor Rockefeller's most recent gubernatorial campaign. A realistic estimate of the number of active bodies that might be mustered from this club for evening work during the week is probably 150 at the culmination of the campaign.

Governor Rockefeller

The principal causes for the defeat of the recent \$2.5MM Transportation Bond Issue (1,600,000 "for" and 2,500,000 "against") seem to be: 1) An immediate distrust of a joint Rockefeller/Lindsay effort to get the issue passed, and 2) New Yorkers are tired of paying higher taxes, which will result anyway since the state now has a budget deficit of \$770,000,000. The Governor's reputation appears to have been tarnished. How much his credibility with the voters has decreased is hard to determine, but it's a good guess that his future campaign efforts will not be as effective as they have been in the past. There are rumors that the Governor will not run again and that he might resign and go to Washington in a Cabinet position in an attempt to save the family name in politics.

National, State and Local Issues of Current Interest to College Graduates in their 20's and 30's Living in Manhattan

Ranked in apparent order of importance:

- 1) Cost-of-living (including taxes)
- 2) Environment
- 3) Law and Order
- 4) Mass transit (band-aid approach)
- 5) Unemployment
- 6) China (disappointment about Taiwan)
- 7) Vietnam (no longer a concern)
- 8) Bussing
- 9) Public Education

Sentiments of College Graduates in their 20's and 30's (living in Manhattan) toward the President

There seems to be a trend toward viewing the President more favorably and with less suspicion than at any time since his election, although a straw vote among this group today would probably not result in a majority for the President vis-a-vis any reasonable opponent.

Can the GOP win the New York State in 1972?

The existing GOP state organization would appear inadequate for the job, particularly due to the recent defeat of the Transportation Bond Issue. However, the one individual who might be a unifying force is Senator Buckley. So far he doesn't appear to have alienated his electorate, but this is countered by his lack of exposure in the day-to-day press. If the Senator's oratory can be brought to the

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.

file: Campaign '72

Send to Ken Khachigian

July 26, 1971

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Memorandum

For: Harry S. Flemming

From: ^{CKW}Charlie McWhorter

Re: Information and comments from recent meetings of Western Governors, Midwestern Governors, GOP State Chairmen and Republican National Committee.

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>		<u>Page</u>
<u>General Areas</u>			
1. Economic	2		
2. Foreign Policy	2		
3. Civil Rights	3		
4. Vice President	3		
5. George Wallace	3		
6. McCloskey	4		
<u>State by State Comments</u>			
Alabama	12	Montana	20
Alaska	18	Nebraska	17
Arizona	19	Nevada	19
Arkansas	12	New Hampshire	5
California	18	New Jersey	8
Colorado	20	New Mexico	19
Connecticut	7	New York	7
Delaware	9	North Carolina	10
Dist. of Columbia	10	North Dakota	16
Florida	11	Ohio	13
Georgia	10	Oklahoma	17
Hawaii	18	Oregon	18
Idaho	21	Pennsylvania	8
Illinois	14	Rhode Island	6
Indiana	13	South Carolina	10
Iowa	16	South Dakota	15
Kansas	17	Tennessee	11
Kentucky	11	Texas	13
Louisiana	12	Utah	20
Maine	5	Vermont	5
Maryland	9	Virginia	10
Massachusetts	6	Washington	19
Michigan	14	West Virginia	9
Minnesota	15	Wisconsin	15
Mississippi	12	Wyoming	20
Missouri	16		

General Areas

1. Economic

There is almost unanimous agreement among Republican Governors and officials that the principle difficulties facing the Administration are in the economic area. This "conventional wisdom" is often not well documented or supported by specific information. For instance, a state chairman would frequently cite unemployment as a factor but not really be familiar with the level of unemployment in his own state. Others would refer to the fact that business was pretty good in their own areas but that this was still a problem. I believe that a large and difficult area of the political problem with our national economy lies in the fact that it is reported nationally by the media in a way which exaggerates the bad news and makes everyone conscious of difficulties. This creates worry and concern in areas which have relatively few economic problems. As a result, it will be highly important to get the media talking about any general trends which indicate we are making progress in moving the economy forward.

In terms of immediate political impact there is a definite problem for the group of people who are presently unemployed. In addition, there are a large number of people whose take home pay has been reduced or limited because of the reduction of overtime. Then there is the consumer, which means everyone, who is pinched by the inflationary increase in the cost of living. Political leaders rarely make any distinction among these groups in discussing the adverse political impact of the economy but, of course, all must be examined and dealt with separately. There is wide spread agreement, however, that if the President loses the election next year it will be primarily a result of dissatisfaction with the Administration's economic policy. There is general agreement that not enough people really understand the President's economic "game plan" resulting in a high level of frustration and irritation.

A special word needs to be said about agriculture and farm problems. No administration seems able to be successful in handling these matters from a political standpoint, but it is imperative that this Administration move quickly to correct the impression that many farm people have to the effect that the President is really not very much concerned about agricultural problems and that there is nobody close to him that is in a position to speak for the farmer. I know this must sound a little discouraging to those who have worked so hard to improve this situation. However, it is clear to me that it would be extremely beneficial if a change could be made in the Secretary of Agriculture between now and the end of this year. Those planning the President's schedule should give more urgent attention to invitations which would bring him close to farming and to rural areas such as the National Plowing Contest or a convention of REA groups.

Note

2. Foreign Policy

There was wide spread agreement that the President had pre-empted the Indochina issue by his dramatic announcement of a visit to Red China.

2. Foreign Policy (Cont'd)

Apart from Vietnam, there is little ground for complaint with the President's handling of foreign policy. In fact, the President's expertise in foreign policy is regarded as his strongest asset, but there was considerable doubt among GOP leaders whether this would be enough to offset the adverse impact of inflation, unemployment, lack of economic growth and specific difficulties with agriculture.

3. Civil Rights

Note
There was wide spread agreement among GOP officials from the border and southern states that over zealous efforts by HEW officials in devising various desegregation schemes for public schools can be politically disastrous. Interestingly enough, the deep south is already so thoroughly integrated that not much more can be done there. Politically speaking, however, efforts by HEW to come up with massive bussing schemes in order to achieve school integration on a rigid formula basis in the rest of the south and border states would be a political disaster and would create deep bitterness and racial animosities which would also be counter productive in achieving overall racial reconciliation.

4. Vice President

There is wide spread recognition that a choice of a Vice President is a decision which must be made by the President and accepted by the Party. At the present time, Governors and Party officials are most reluctant to express any public views which are critical of Vice President Agnew. It is equally clear that there is a considerable body of opinion among Governors and officials that the President's cause would be better served if there were a change in his running mate for 1972. Nobody seems to be insisting on an early decision about this matter and I think that most GOP officials would welcome anything which tends to strengthen Vice President Agnew's standing with the voters. I believe it important for everyone to keep in mind that whether or not Agnew runs for reelection, he still will be Vice President during 1972. For this reason alone his effectiveness should not be undermined by any Republican comment or activity. There is wide spread recognition that part of the Vice President's problem is with the media but by this time it is almost impossible to make any drastic change in his public image.

Some state chairmen are frank enough to state that if Vice President Agnew remains on the ticket they hope that he will not campaign in their states. Others have questioned his effectiveness in being able to provide additional strength to the President or on behalf of local and state candidates in their states. At this point in time I would summarize the situation by saying that the Party is very nervous about the President's decision on a running mate and that there is very little affirmative support for the Vice President.

5. George Wallace - 1972

There was a general consensus among southern Party officials that Wallace was weaker now than in 1963. For example, Clarke Reed of Mississippi

5. George Wallace - 1972 (Cont'd)

reported that the President was now ahead in a private 3-way poll in his state. A recent poll in Tennessee showed the President leading with Wallace a poor third in a 3-way race which included Humphrey as the Democrat. Jim Martin of Alabama said that Wallace is having a great deal of difficulty with his Legislature and is losing popular support. This was confirmed by Tommy Thomas of Florida who is originally from Alabama and now lives in North Florida. Thomas reports that the weakening of the Wallace position in Alabama has had the effect of reducing his appeal in North Florida. Thomas mentioned increasing public annoyance with Wallace's efforts to emphasize a Populist role and in the changes in his personal appearance which have apparently resulted from his new marriage. In other words, the orange shirts are not going over too well. Never the less, it must be recognized that Wallace does have a strong base of support in the south and that it must be assumed that he wants to run again next year if he has any chance at all.

Anything which can be done to undermine his position in the deep south should be given high priority and every effort must be made to avoid unnecessary activity which help the Wallace cause in the perimeter south and border states. Wallace thrives on the volatile nature of southern politics where Republican traditions are weak. Loyalty to the National Democratic Party is increasing through the infusion of new and moderate Democratic leadership in many southern states.

6. McCloskey

There was general agreement that the President's initiatives with Red China had effectively undermined McCloskey's position on Indochina and would reduce his appeal among Republican primary voters. GOP leaders in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Minnesota, and California reported some signs of organized activity in behalf of McCloskey, but none of them indicated that this represented a serious threat to the President at this time. There was complete agreement that nothing should be done by party officials at the national, state or local levels which would make McCloskey a "martyr" or develop sympathy for him as an underdog candidate.

State by State Comments

Northeast

Maine

At the present time GOP chances turn on whether Muskie gets the Democratic nomination. If he does, then it is unrealistic to expect the President to make a strong showing in Maine. Senator Smith can expect a tough race from Congressman Hathaway. She will run an independent campaign and probably not become personally involved in the campaign for President if Muskie is the Democratic nominee. The GOP organization is solvent and is building a staff. Ned Harding would be a good Nixon chairman. There is no race for Governor in 1972 and the GOP will concentrate on trying to find two decent Congressional candidates and to hold on to control of both houses of the State Legislature.

New Hampshire

Note
We can expect McCloskey to make a major effort in New Hampshire. Party officials believe that the President's initiative on Red China has substantially determined McCloskey's position. It is recommended that our people immediately start a program of contact with various Party leaders who might be likely to support a McCloskey effort for the purpose of assuring them that the President believes in a broad based Party and that their support for the President would be welcomed.

It is important to get a slate of Nixon delegates who will have broad appeal and the delegate selection process must be carried out in a way which minimizes personal resentments. Mildred Perkins has recommended that we follow the same general plan of organization for the Nixon campaign which was followed in 1960. This involved setting up a "Plans Board" of five co-equal chairmen who met weekly with a campaign staff. Mildred said that she had obtained favorable approval for this plan in 1972 from Senator Cotton and from former Governor Lane Dwinell. Economic conditions are not favorable in New Hampshire at present with pockets of high unemployment and concern with foreign imports in such industries as shoes and textiles.

The race for Governor is wide open with a lot of resentment against the incumbent Governor Peterson. Bill Loeb and the Manchester paper are attacking the President's visit to China although it is unlikely he would do anything to help McCloskey. The state GOP has no serious problems of indebtedness but has a very limited staff operation.

Vermont

The President's standing is still strong and economic conditions are not as serious as elsewhere. Uncertainty remains about the race for Governor next year and there is no Senate contest. An eye should be kept on the activities of Tom Hayes, a former Lt. Governor, who might be a possible leader of any McCloskey activity in the state. Douglas Cairns, the 1968 Nixon chairman, has not been well for several months but would like to be of help in setting up the 1972 organization.

Vermont (Cont'd)

He is semi-retired from his business and might still be the best man for next year.

Massachusetts

The President's popularity is not high and economic conditions are bad in many places. The Massachusetts primary could be dangerous. A key factor could be whether Governor Sargent and Senator Brooke would be willing to identify themselves with the President's campaign in Massachusetts during the primary. Senator Brooke will not face any serious opposition within the GOP or from the Democrats. It would make sense to try to get both Governor Sargent and Senator Brooke to campaign in the primary for the President together with all of the GOP Congressmen. At the very least, an effort should be made to avoid unnecessary controversy or arguments with the Governor and Senator since they could be quite helpful campaigning for the national ticket in New England and elsewhere. NAG

A visit by the President to Plymouth Rock for the 350th anniversary during this Thanksgiving might be worth considering. The current State GOP Chairman, Herbert Waite, is a former Goldwater supporter and is pro-RN. His relations with Governor Sargent are good and he should be able to identify all elements of Nixon's support in the state. Former state Senator William D. Weeks might make a good Nixon chairman if provided with some campaign staff. Weeks may make another primary race against Congressman Keith next year which would make him unavailable.

The present State Committee is quite weak although the debt is only \$50,000. Reapportionment is likely to hurt GOP Congressmen but this is not yet settled.

Rhode Island

Economic conditions are close to the national average but it is possible to blame the Democratic Governor for many state problems. The GOP expects a strong campaign for both Governor and Senate next year with former Attorney General Herbert DeSimone making another race for Governor and John Chafee running against Senator Pell. COP resources will be concentrated in these two campaigns. A possible Nixon chairman would be George Vetter who has assisted RN activities in the past or Jim Nugent from Barrington. Olef Anderson would be a good Nixon finance chairman. The media in Rhode Island has been very much opposed to the Nixon Administration. Fred Lipsett, the GOP National Committeeman and Minority Leader in the State House of Representatives, is very lukewarm about the President. John Chafee can provide the best help to the President particularly if there is a Presidential primary on April 12.

Guidance is needed from the Nixon Headquarters in Washington about the necessary strategy for this primary. Fuorac Wright, the State GOP

Rhode Island (Cont'd)

Chairman who is pro-Nixon, recommends that a prominent GOP slate of delegates run on an uncommitted basis as the best way of minimizing McCloskey's showing. At the same time every effort must be made to turn out a good vote for the President in the popularity contest. Wright said that there would be opposition to the designation of George Vetter as the Nixon chairman if this gives him an advantage for consideration for appointment to the coming vacancy on the U.S. District Court for Rhode Island.

Connecticut

Economic conditions are still adverse in Connecticut. Governor Meskill is a strong supporter of the President and his organization from 1970 would be a good starting point although it is important that Senator Weicker and others be included. The major statewide race in Connecticut next year will be for President. Since Connecticut still has the straight ticket lever, it is most important that a strong campaign for the President be organized.

There are still difficulties with reapportionment and much dissatisfaction with the new income tax. There is a debt of \$114,000 from 1966 which is owed to Gingras their candidate for Governor that year. Connecticut is a state where we have a much better starting point for 1972 than we did in 1968, and the state GOP did well in 1970 inspite of extremely adverse economic conditions. Brian Gaffney, the new state GOP Chairman, is close to Governor Meskill and is pro-RN.

New York

Party leaders believe that the President has a good opportunity in New York in 1972 but there are still many uncertainties. Several GOP County Chairmen in such strategic areas as Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Monroe and Rockland are strongly opposed to any cooperation with the Conservative Party on a local basis and are insisting that there be no joint electors for the GOP and Conservative Party in 1972. State GOP officials reflect this same point of view. Senator Buckley seems to be popular with both Republicans and Conservatives but GOP officials take the view that sooner or later he must drop any official ties with the Conservative Party if he wants to be regarded as a Republican.

The President may be hurt by this infighting between the Republicans and Conservative Parties. While it is difficult to demonstrate that the President would lose any votes if Republican electors did not also run on the Conservative Party ticket, it is clear that the President's showing will be weakened if the campaign in New York in 1972 is characterized by a bitter struggle at the state and local level between Republican and Conservative officials. For this reason, it is recommended that a high priority be given towards resolving this inter-party dispute. At least it must be clear to all concerned that the individuals running the Nixon campaign in New York intend to work in cooperation with all groups and individuals who support the President even though there may be differences with regard to candidates for other office. A natural compromise might be to have the GOP agree to

New York (Cont'd)

a cooperative arrangement between Republicans and Conservatives in the Presidential campaign in return for giving up efforts for joint electors.

New Jersey

Economic conditions are probably not much worse than the national average but Newark is in an extremely difficult plight. In November, 1971 there will be critical elections for the State Legislature and local office. The GOP organization is out of debt but reapportionment questions remain unresolved. This is most unfortunate since the GOP could gain substantially next year in the races for Congress if a decision could be reached in the overwhelming Republican Legislature and the Governor. If reapportionment is put off until next year, the new Legislature elected in November will make the decision and this could be more difficult. Governor Cahill is doing a good job and can be very helpful to the President's campaign next year.

At this time there is no logical choice for a Nixon chairman according to John Dimon, the state GOP Chairman. New Jersey has a primary on June 6 which must be given careful consideration since there is some basis for McCloskey to get support. Senator Case will be running for reelection and will have a broad based campaign. Every effort should be made to get his cooperation and assistance in New Jersey on behalf of the President. There is strong feeling against Vice President Agnew in New Jersey and it is questionable whether he could campaign effectively in the state at this time.

Pennsylvania

Economic conditions in Pennsylvania are not aggravated although there seems to be genuine concern about the future. Governor Shapp is not popular and is causing many internal party problems. His leadership can be blamed for some of the economic problems facing Pennsylvania. Cliff Jones plans to remain as state GOP Chairman. He seems to have good relations with Senator Schweiker but he recognizes that both Senator Scott and Schweiker must play a role in any Nixon campaign in Pennsylvania.

Note
The race for Mayor in Philadelphia this November could affect our campaign next year. There is an outside chance that Thatcher Longstreth might win over Rizzo and this would be a great boost for the GOP in Pennsylvania. High priority must be given by the President and the Administration to develop a better political and personal rapport with Billy Meehan the GOP leader in Philadelphia. This has been botched up badly in the past and must be straightened out. The state GOP is carrying a debt of \$300,000 currently and owes another \$500,000.

The Democratic Party has been superseded by organized labor in many parts of the state. Any personal attention which the President can give to Pennsylvania in terms of a visit or identification would be most helpful. There is no race for Governor or Senate in Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania (Cont'd)

next year and the race for President will be critical for the GOP in the state. Cliff Jones feels that Bill Scranton may be over used as a campaign chairman and mentioned Arlen Spector as a person who might be considered for a Nixon chairman. Elsie Hillman is so violently opposed to Vice President Agnew that she should not be considered for any role at this stage.

Delaware

The President's standing is still fairly high in Delaware according to Gene Bunting the state GOP Chairman. Governor Peterson and Senator Boggs will be running for reelection next year and both will support the President. Other Party leaders such as Senator Roth, former Senator Williams and Wilmington Mayor Haskell should be included in any discussion of a Nixon chairman. The Party finances are in good shape and there seems to be no interest in McCloskey. John Rollins will be heading up the GOP dinner on November 9 and can be of help in Delaware.

Maryland

There is an opportunity to put together a much better organization for the President in 1972 than we had in 1968. Economic conditions are not good but Democratic leadership is somewhat divided. The GOP still owes \$100,000 from 1968 but this is manageable. Senators Beall and Mathias would be good co-chairmen for the Nixon campaign, with a full-time campaign manager in charge. Secretary Rogers Norton is extremely popular in Maryland and can provide a great deal of help.

Vice President Agnew's interest and involvement in Maryland is unknown at the present time but this will be critical. Alexander Lankler, the state GOP Chairman, is strongly pro-Nixon and caused the Maryland State GOP Committee to become the first in the nation to endorse the reelection of the President. The Maryland Presidential primary would result in a strong showing for the President if all Party leaders can be brought into the effort. We are still weak in the Baltimore area, both county and city.

West Virginia

The President is relatively weak in West Virginia although he may make a better showing next year than in 1968. Governor Moore has not decided whether to run for reelection or for the seat now held by Senator Randolph. Governor Moore is quite popular at this time and his control over the Party is firm. The state GOP is out of debt and doing well in building a staff for next year. The Nixon chairman must be someone who can work closely with Arch Moore and it definitely should not be former Governor Cecil Underwood, a bitter opponent of Arch Moore. State Chairman Tom Potter strongly recommends that Judge John Field be named to the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals to replace

West Virginia (Cont'd)

retiring Judge Herbert Boreman and that John T. Copenhaver, Jr. be named to replace Judge Field on the U.S. District Court. Jay Rockefeller is the probably Democratic candidate for Governor and will be quite strong. Randolph has not indicated whether he plans to run again for the Senate seat.

District of Columbia

The President should make a strong race in the GOP primary based on primary results in past elections. However, this could be a tricky situation and every effort should be made to prevent any mishap. In discussions with Bob Carter who represented State GOP Chairman Ned Pendelton, he recommended that Perkins McGuire serve as Nixon chairman in 1972. An alternate suggestion was Bill McManus who is a retired official of the C. & P. Telephone Company and a member of the GOP State Committee.

South

Virginia

Party officials at the Denver meeting were generally optimistic and reported no particular voter enthusiasm for any of the leading Democratic candidates. I did not discuss organization matters with them on the assumption that Harry Flemming will take care of this.

North Carolina

Both Ed Broyhill and Thelma Rogers were optimistic about the President's chances in North Carolina next year. However, I did not discuss organization matters with them since the state GOP Chairman, Jim Holshouser, was not present. I would hope that we can get an early start in putting together a strong organization for the President in North Carolina which can make an excellent showing in their new primary.

South Carolina

Nothing new to report except that Senator Thurmond seems to be getting off to a good start in his bid for reelection.

Georgia

Jean Perot represented Bob Shaw the new state GOP Chairman at the Denver meetings. She strongly recommended Paul Jones as the Nixon chairman for Georgia. The GOP in Georgia does have a great many internal difficulties involving key Party leaders, but all can be expected to give strong support to the President next year. The GOP nominee for the Senate is still uncertain and David Cambrell who was appointed to replace Senator Russell is gaining strength.

Florida

The President's strength in Florida still holds up well according to Tommy Thomas the state GOP Chairman. The Democrats should be helped in Florida by having their convention in Miami. Governor Askew is expected to give strong support to the Democratic Presidential ticket but his current popularity is not too good. Tom recommended that Lawrence Lee of Jacksonville might make a good Nixon chairman or at least a finance chairman.

Florida has a primary on March 14. It is important to get a strong and broad based delegation. McCloskey has no particular strength in Florida. Senator Gurney is working hard to improve his relations with the GOP and is making progress. There are no races for Senate or Governor. Reapportionment is unresolved at this point. Bill Cramer is expected to run for Congress in 1972. The GOP decision to have it's convention in San Diego instead of Miami might create a problem but all Party leaders in Denver promised to do everything they could to be of help in this regard.

Kentucky

Kentucky elects a new Governor this fall and no real decisions can be made about the campaign for 1972 until after November. Governor Louie Nunn will work hard to elect a Republican Governor but it looks like an uphill fight at this point. Nunn is expected to run for Senator Cooper's seat next year. The GOP problems in Louisville remains unresolved and a lot of work needs to be done there. John Kerr, the GOP State Chairman, reports no particular enthusiasm in Kentucky for any of the Democratic Presidential hopefuls.

Kerr expressed the view that it was important to get Congressman Snyder's support for Tom Emberton in his race for Governor. It may be that Snyder wants to run for the Senate seat in 1972 and believes that Emberton would give his support to Nunn if elected Governor.

Tennessee

Nixon's strength in Tennessee is still very strong. In a 3-way race for President taken this month, the President had 46% to 31% for Humphrey and 20% for Wallace (3% undecided). This compares with the 1968 percentage of Nixon 38%, Humphrey 28% and Wallace 34%. Economic conditions are not too bad at this time in Tennessee but the school bussing issue could be extremely serious if aggravated. So far no Democratic candidate has any strong appeal in Tennessee.

Senator Baker is running for reelection and will be of help to President Nixon. Governor Dunn and Senator Brock both are in a position to help. Any Nixon chairman must be cleared by all of these principals.

Alabama

Jim Martin confirms the local problems facing Wallace. It is going to be important to get a good committee in Alabama as early as possible which will create additional pressure on Wallace not to run by helping to mobilize opposition at home. If Wallace does not run, the President should be able to carry Alabama.

Mississippi

Clarke Reed reports that the President is leading in Mississippi in all 3-way combinations but this is an extremely volatile situation. If Wallace does not run, then Nixon should carry Mississippi with no difficulty.

Arkansas

Charles Bernard is the new GOP State Chairman and a strong supporter of the President. He is convinced that Nixon can carry Arkansas and is giving this his top statewide priority. There will be no strong opposition to Senator McClellan next year. Governor Bumpers is probably going to get a second term with only token opposition by the GOP.

The recent statement by Vice President Agnew about black leadership in America was harmful to Bernard's efforts to get support from black leaders. Of course, if Congressman Mills is on the Democratic ticket, that would guarantee him state support. President Nixon is more popular in Arkansas now than in 1968 and Wallace has definitely slipped in popularity. No polls are available at this time for the Presidential race in Arkansas.

Economic conditions are not too bad and the GOP organization is out of debt and has a budget of \$80,000 for this year. It will be important to have a harmonious working relationship between the GOP organization and former Governor Winthrop Rockefeller. In 1968, Governor Rockefeller concentrated on his own campaign for reelection and gave very little assistance to the national ticket. He could be of great help in developing support for President Nixon among black voters in Arkansas. Participation by blacks in the Arkansas GOP is very wide spread and it is important to maintain and expand this base of support.

Louisiana

Louisiana will elect a new Governor on February 1, 1972. The GOP candidate is David Treen of New Orleans who nearly defeated Hale Boggs in two different Congressional campaigns. The Nixon campaign in Louisiana will have to follow a "citizens" approach if it is to succeed and Treen is following this strategy. Treen's organization would provide a good base on which to build the President's campaign in Louisiana since it will be broadly based and include many Democrats.

Louisiana (Cont'd)

Charlton Lyons is finance chairman for David Treen. Economic conditions are not too good and the HEW activities have been disastrous. The key factor is whether Wallace is a candidate again. His strength is less now than in 1968 but it could grow if he can take advantage of certain issues.

Texas

GOP internal problems are much improved and the President has a strong chance to carry Texas in 1972. Economic conditions are somewhat adverse and the HEW activities have been extremely damaging to the President and Administration. A major effort will be made to reelect Senator Tower who stands a good chance since Lt. Governor Ben Barnes will be running for Governor. I did not discuss details of Nixon organization with any Texas GOP officials in Denver.

Midwest

Ohio

After the setback suffered in 1970, the GOP is regaining its morale and this is extremely important. They have recently held eight fund-raising dinners attended by over 5,500 people which is an increase over last year. The Party is now out of debt although Roger Cloud still owes \$30,000 from his race for Governor. Governor Gilligan's popularity is not good at this point stemming from tax and fiscal problems. Gilligan is building a strong Democratic organization working with union officials.

Bob Taft's announcement as a favorite son surprised people in Ohio as well as in Washington but it has been accepted. On reapportionment, the GOP sponsored bill will be enacted but vetoed by Gilligan. It will then be decided by the courts. The result could turn on whether it goes to the State court or the Federal court. It is clear that Ohio will be a major battle ground in 1972 and every effort must be made to carry this state.

There are no major statewide races in 1972 except for President and an early start should be made in putting together the strongest possible organization on behalf of Nixon in Ohio. This will require cooperation from the Administration as well as with elected and Party officials in Ohio. Economic conditions remain as a major difficulty but it now seems that Party people in Ohio believe that the job can be done if everyone works together.

Indiana

I did not discuss the details of a Nixon campaign organization with Indiana GOP officials in Denver. The incumbent administration of

Indiana (Cont'd)

Governor Whitcomb is not popular with the voters or a large segment of the GOP. The internal Party problems remain unresolved but this should not prevent a unified campaign for President Nixon. Economic conditions are adverse in many parts of the state. The race for Governor could be of extreme importance and it is necessary to get a unified base of Party support behind a strong candidate for Governor.

There will be a Presidential primary campaign where McCloskey should not run well but where GOP efforts might fail because of internal problems. Major emphasis in Indiana will be centered on the various local races this November. After these are out of the way, it will be important to start work immediately on the President's campaign throughout the state.

Michigan

Economic conditions in the state are very bad with unemployment up to 16% in Detroit. HUD is most unpopular in the suburbs where the GOP has to get its major support. There will have to be close coordination between the campaign for Nixon and with Senator Griffin who will be running for reelection in a tough race. Any visits by the President before the election would be a big help. The Party has a debt of some \$800,000 from 1968 and 1970 and is operating on the basis of a skeleton organization.

NOTE
A critical problem which must be resolved soon is the relationship of the conservative element of the Party led by State Senator Huber and the Republican State Administration of Governor Milliken. If Huber sets up a formal 3rd party it could endanger both Griffin and the President. Somebody should have a pointed conversation with Governor Milliken in order to get his cooperation in resolving this problem as soon as possible.

A good Nixon chairman for Michigan might be Lt. Governor Brickley. He is a former prosecutor from Wayne County and is a progressive Republican. The Nixon campaign in Michigan will be uphill but it should be as strong as possible if only to help Senator Griffin, the State Legislature and GOP Congressional candidates. Governor Milliken has reiterated his willingness to be of assistance to the President in every way possible and he should be encouraged to become actively involved in Michigan and elsewhere.

Illinois

This is an extremely critical state for the President in 1972. Senator Percy and Attorney General Scott both seem to be assured of reelection next year. Governor Ogilvie is recovering his standing with the voters and plans to run a tough and well financed campaign. There is general agreement by all principals on Tom Houser as the man to run the President's campaign in Illinois once he leaves the FCC on October 1.

Illinois (Cont'd)

Economic conditions and inflation are major difficulties for the President in Illinois. Governor Ogilvie and State Chairman Vic Smith both urge the President to visit Illinois, particularly Downstate, as much as possible during the balance of this year and next.

A Muskie/Stevenson ticket would create serious problems for President Nixon in Illinois and efforts must be taken to develop support for the President with ethnic voters. It would be hoped that Senator Percy could help increase support for the President among minority voters.

Wisconsin

Wisconsin may be the most difficult of the midwest states for the President to repeat his victory of 1968. Much of the GOP Party organization is new and this might be an advantage. John Hough, the GOP State Chairman seemed quite pleased with the selection of John MacIver and Bob Knowles as temporary chairmen for Nixon. Because of the importance of the Wisconsin primary and the absence of major statewide races, it will be important to start the President's campaign as soon as possible.

The Party is seriously in debt (\$800,000) but this must not hamper efforts for the President. Ody Fish, who is now National Committeeman, would like to play an active part where he can.

Minnesota

The GOP in Minnesota is digging out from under a Democratic landslide in 1970. The new State GOP Chairman, David Krogseng was a former aide of Clark MacGregor and is a strong supporter of President Nixon. The GOP will have difficulty getting a strong candidate against Senator Mondale next year. The GOP is carrying a debt of some \$170,000 of which \$60,000 is to be paid next year. Congressman McCloskey has been in the state and has some kind of a following. This will require a strong organization effort by the Nixon forces from the precincts on up to the district and state conventions where delegates are chosen. Of course, if Humphrey is the Democratic nominee for President, we would face the same problems of 1968. Without Humphrey or Mondale on the Democratic ticket, the GOP in Minnesota hopes to make a strong comeback in 1972. The new Democratic Governor, Wendell Anderson, has not been particularly popular although he is an attractive leader.

South Dakota

The GOP in South Dakota was nearly wiped out in 1970. Next year it must find candidates for U.S. Senate (Mundt), Governor and other statewide offices, and two Congressional candidates. The Party has been reorganized with Bob Burns as the new State Chairman. Jack Gibson has been trying to put together a group of candidates for the key races.

South Dakota (Cont'd)

There is agreement between Gibson and Burns that the Nixon campaign in South Dakota should be run under the co-chairmanship of former Congressman Berry and Reifel with "Obie" O'Brien of Madison as the campaign manager. Farm discontent is aggravated in South Dakota with additional problems from the ICC ruling on minors driving farm vehicles across state lines and the enforcement by Secretary Volpe of the highway program penalties for failure to remove billboards.

North Dakota

Agricultural problems still are the key issue. Both Ben Clayburgh, GOP National Committeeman, and Jack Huss, GOP State Chairman, strongly urge the President to appear before a farm group and deal specifically with agricultural issues. They were particularly concerned that any White House staff member speaking for agriculture be someone who can be identified as a "real farmer". This definitely should not be somebody from the area of "Agro-business."

In both North Dakota and South Dakota the Democrats are effectively attacking the President for a "do nothing" policy on the economy. Senator Milton Young could be the most helpful to the President in North Dakota but he is quite unhappy over Administration farm policy and leadership.

Missouri

Economic conditions are probably not as bad in Missouri as in other states. Missouri must elect a new Governor next year and the Democrats will have at least a 6-way primary fight. In the GOP, State Representative Buzz King has announced for Governor, but the likely GOP nominee will be State Auditor Kit Bond who won by a smashing plurality of 200,000 votes in 1970. It will be important to keep a close tab on the selection of delegates in Missouri. The state GOP is out of debt. The reapportionment issues are still open. Both Gene Taylor, National Committeeman, and Nick Gray, State GOP Chairman, strongly recommend that Larry Roos, St. Louis County Executive, be the Nixon chairman for Missouri. Attorney General Jack Daniorth will be running for reelection. GOP Congressman Hall will probably not run for reelection and it will be important to get a good candidate there with a minimum of Party struggle.

Iowa

Farm issues are paramount in Iowa although the general economy is fairly good. The President's image on farm issues is one of aloofness but the foreign policy issues are still important in Iowa. Governor Ray plans to run for reelection but faces a bitter primary fight from Lt. Governor Roger Gibson. This will have an adverse impact on GOP fund-raising in Iowa and might lead to a Democratic Governor. Democratic Congressman John Culver is expected to run against Senator Jack Miller. This could be a close race.

Iowa (Cont'd)

State Chairman John McDonald recommended consideration of Ray Murphy, Tom Stoner or Bob Brinton as Nixon Chairman for Iowa with Dick Bergland and Sue Reed as possibilities for campaign managers.

Nebraska

The new State Chairman, Milan Bush, stressed both farming issues and the problems of rural areas. Secretary Hardin is handicapped in his efforts for the Administration even though he is from Nebraska. Bush seemed to have no particular objection to the choice of George Cook as Nixon chairman in Nebraska next year.

It is recognized that every effort must be given to Senator Curtis in his reelection effort next year. The Nebraska primary can be turned into a strong plus for the President and there seems to be little support for McCloskey.

Kansas

Economic conditions in Kansas are still difficult for the GOP. The Democratic Governor, following the lead of Senator McGovern and other midwest Democrats, maintains a steady barrage of criticism about the President and Administration economic policies. The race for Governor next year is open with Bob Wells, now on the FCC, as a good GOP possibility. Governor Darking has not yet indicated whether he will run against Senator Jim Pearson next year. There are several possibilities for Nixon chairman, but no firm recommendation as yet from Bill Falstad, the new State Chairman.

Oklahoma

The President is still popular in Oklahoma in spite of economic problems. None of the major Democratic candidates seems to have any particular strength. The new Democratic Governor, David Hall, will be working hard against President Nixon and is a strong partisan Democrat. The race for Senate could be quite tough since Oklahoma voters might not really want to have two GOP Senators (like the Bush situation in Texas in 1970).

Congressman Edmondson will make a strong Senate candidate for the Democrats. There is a definite split in GOP leaders with State Chairman Clarence Warner reflecting a different position from the Bellmon group. Doug McKeever of Enid is recommended by Dorothy Stanislaus as Nixon chairman. The GOP Senate possibilities include former Governor Dewey Bartlett (the favorite), astronaut Tom Stafford, and Bud Stewart. Bartlett hopes to develop enough strength to avoid an open fight.

West

Alaska

The Nixon Administration is not popular in Alaska at the present time. The Alaska pipeline is the key issue and a decision is expected this fall. It is most important that this announcement should be made by Secretary Morton and Senator Stevens in Fairbanks and not let the announcement come from Governor Egan or Senator Cravel. The State Chairman for Alaska, Al Bramstedt, was active in the 1968 campaign for Nixon. He reports that GOP morale with regard to the President's campaign is not good. State Senator Jack Coghill is a possible Nixon chairman. Former Secretary Hickel may run an independent slate of delegates. Hickel is quite frustrated and is spending a great deal of time in Alaska. At this point, Senator Stevens faces an uphill fight unless the pipeline issue is settled the right way. The state GOP has no debt and is trying to develop programs to reach the new people coming in because of the oil industry and the native population.

A real help would be if the Jones Act could be changed to permit foreign vessels to carry cargo from the mainland to Alaska. Unemployment is now at 13%. The shipping strike has been a disaster and will cause even more damage in the long run as business concerns are unable to reopen.

Hawaii

Hawaii has a woman as their new State Chairman. Carla Coray said the state organization is out of debt but there are many organizational problems. Bill Quinn, now President of the Dole Corporation, might be a good Nixon chairman. John Bellinger, a Honolulu banker, is also a possibility. The shipping strike is most serious and must be ended soon. Modification of the Jones Act and the release of Federal land would be of greatest benefit to the President's campaign in Hawaii.

California

Put Livermore, the GOP State Chairman, is doing a first rate job in trying to keep everything together. The economy is the key issue in California. Put has been concentrating his effort on reapportionment. He stressed that the 1972 delegation should be broadly based and selected on the basis of helping the President carry California in November. The President's proposed trip to China has done a lot to weaken McCloskey's position in California.

Oregon

There was approval by GOP officials in Denver of the choice of Congressman Wendall Wyatt as Nixon chairman for Oregon. Currently the Party faces a bitter fight between Governor McCall and Senator Hatfield for the Senate nomination next year. Governor McCall plans to make support for the President a major issue between himself and

Oregon (Cont'd)

Senator Hatfield and his activities at the Western Governors Conference in Jackson reflected this strategy. If Governor McCall is elected to the Senate, Oregon would have a Democrat as Governor since the State Senate President would move up to that spot. The new GOP State Chairman, Hank Hart, expects Senator Hatfield to do much better in a primary contest against Governor McCall than the polls now indicate. McCloskey would have some support in his campaign against the President in Oregon.

Washington

Senator Jackson's strength is very strong at the present time. Economic conditions are quite bad and help the Democrats. Governor Evans has not decided whether he will run for a third term. State Chairman Earl Davenport strongly urged a visit by the President to Washington State. Davenport suggested Luke Williams as the Nixon chairman. Williams is a conservative from Spokane who has good relations with Governor Evans.

Joel Pritchard of Seattle might also be a good Nixon chairman provided he does not make another primary fight against Congressman Pelly. The state GOP is out of debt and expects to pick up the 4th Congressional District lost by Catherine May in 1970. The GOP candidate will be Stewart Bledsoe who is a Republican leader in the State Legislature.

Arizona

The President is still quite popular in Arizona and economic conditions are not particularly bad. The GOP finances are in good shape. Reapportionment has a key priority with Arizona GOP which hopes to pick up the new House seat. Harry Rosenswaig, GOP State Chairman, recommends Jim O'Connor as Nixon chairman. O'Connor is a friend of Herb Kalmbach and is a Democrat who supports the President.

New Mexico

The state has serious economic problems. Senator Montoya is quite popular with Spanish-American voters and is strongly anti-GOP. The state GOP is only \$6,000 in debt but extensive fund-raising is difficult in New Mexico. Tom McKenna will soon replace Bob Davidson as GOP State Chairman. Davidson recommends former Lt. Governor Bohack as a possibility for Nixon chairman.

Both parties are expecting primary contests for Senator Anderson's seat. If Anderson runs again it could change that situation. Senator Jackson is quite strong in New Mexico since his wife is from there and worked for Senator Anderson.

Nevada

None of the National Democrats are very popular in Nevada and the President should have a good chance to carry the state in 1972 according to George Abbott, the State GOP Chairman. Senator Jackson

Nevada (Cont'd)

would be the strongest Democratic nominee in Nevada. Abbott recommends Bob Wordman, a banker from Las Vegas, as Nixon chairman. He also had high praise for Attorney General Bob List. ~~Former Governor Paul Laxalt has received some criticism since the 1970 election and would not be the best man to head up the Nixon campaign.~~ The State GOP is \$30,000 in debt mostly from the Senate race in 1970. There are no races for Governor or Senate in Nevada next year.

Colorado

Nixon's popularity is still very good in Colorado and the GOP is well organized. Congressman Evans is the likely candidate against Senator Allott. The GOP is out of debt. Bill Armstrong, the Nixon chairman in 1968, may be a Congressional candidate next year. Reapportionment problems are still not yet settled. Governor Love might be the strongest man to head up the campaign for President Nixon in Colorado in 1972. The Governor is quite popular with all groups at this point.

Wyoming

The President is still strong in Wyoming although there are some economic difficulties in the state. Senator Hansen should win his campaign for reelection. The GOP still is unsettled on its candidate for Congressman-at-Large. There is no race for Governor. The new State GOP Chairman, David Kennedy, is close to Governor Hathaway and there seem to be no internal Party problems of significance.

Utah

Economic conditions are still causing problems and inflation hurts the GOP. The recent copper strikes have been extremely serious in Utah. The new state GOP Chairman is Kent Shearer, who was Utah chairman for Reagan in 1968. Ken Garff, the National Committeeman, thinks that the President can carry Utah again but that it will require a strong campaign effort. Governor Rampton has not indicated whether he will seek reelection. The GOP candidate for Governor is uncertain although it is most important that they obtain a strong person to run for this office.

Montana

The new GOP State Chairman, Bill Holter, from Great Falls, is a political amateur and very inexperienced. He seems to be well motivated and determined to spend a lot of time and effort in building an organization. Economic conditions are critical in Montana. The Democratic Governor, Forrest Anderson, will be working for the national ticket and Senator Mansfield may be of some help. Senator Jackson would have strong support. ~~The GOP is out of debt and building an organization.~~ There is no likely GOP nominee against Senator Metcalf next year.

Montana (Cont'd)

Holter expects a lot of good impact from the President's visit to Glacier National Park next month. Bill Holter suggested Frank Whetstone of Cut Bank as Nixon chairman for Montana, but he will look for additional prospects.

Idaho

The President should carry Idaho next year but with a reduced plurality. The Democrats, under Governor Andrus, are concentrating their efforts next year almost exclusively on the State Legislature. This means that they will not do much to help the national ticket. Roland Wilber, GOP State Chairman, suggests that Jack Murphy may be the best man to head up the Nixon campaign with Bill Campbell helping on organization. Senator Jordan seems to be in good shape for reelection. Wilber did express the view that Secretary Connally would not be a good choice for Vice President insofar as Idaho was concerned.