

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	40	6/27/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Newsletter	From Mazo RE: Israel Newspaper MAARIV Editorial. 2 pgs.
48	40	6/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: McGovern Welfare Plan. 3 pgs.
48	40	6/27/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Newsletter	From Mazo RE: Israel Newspaper MAARIV editorial. 2 pg.
48	40		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Handwritten note RE: Abortion Quote. 1 pg.

EARL MAZO

5915 NEBRASKA AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20015

Leading Israeli paper Maariv says

6-27-72

June 19, 1972

★
MCG
E.H.

(Note: "MAARIV", the largest and by far the most influential newspaper in Israel, had a lead editorial 15 June '72 that (1) upheld Ambassador Rabin's praise of President Nixon; (2) condemned Senator McGovern as a foe of Israel, except in campaign "talk"; (3) noted that many Jews who traditionally voted Democratic are realizing "the situation has changed" and a vote against Nixon this year "might be a vote against the existence of Israel"; and (4) in effect, urged Israelis to "enlighten" -- that is, write to -- their friends and relatives in the United States about which candidate is "good for the Jews" and which is a portent of danger.)

The "MAARIV" editorial, as translated from Hebrew by a friend of mine, follows:

THE AMBASSADOR AND THE ELECTIONS

Even if correct (according to the New York Post) that those close to Senator McGovern complained to Golda Meir that Rabin is complimentary to Nixon, and even if incorrect (this complaint was not received in Jerusalem), one thing is certain: there was never an American president who showed such understanding of the needs of Israel's security as Nixon. And there was never a candidate who aroused fears, from the Israeli viewpoint, as McGovern.

And if we turn away for the moment from the question of what is proper and improper for the Ambassador to say in an election year, it is still a fact that Israel has a vital interest in Nixon's victory; and that of all the Democratic candidates who aspire to their party's nomination, McGovern has, in the past, taken the worst anti-Israel positions.

Now, understandably, he makes campaign promises like all the other politicians who want Jewish votes. Now he complains that everything attributed to him a year ago was not heard correctly. Now he is not a standard-bearer for Israeli withdrawal from all territories. Now he does not say that Israel should be provided with Phantoms provided they are not used. Now he does not maintain any more that the Arab refugees join in the solution of the Middle East conflict.

But even what he says now is enough to arouse fears. McGovern is one of the chief fighters for the withdrawal of American forces from Europe. He is of the mind that there is no Soviet threat and, as a result, there is no need for NATO; and because there is no need for NATO, there is no need to strengthen America's navy in the Mediterranean. It is possible -- it is safe -- to leave the Mediterranean in the hands of the Soviet fleet.

These are not, of course, the substance of his speeches when he appears before Jewish voters. But they are the things for which he votes consistently and stubbornly in the Senate. It is for this that he wants the votes of the electors: to withdraw from Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia; to withdraw from Europe and from all places where the U.S. has military obligations. This is his belief and hope.

There is no need to say that diplomacy of this kind is isolationism; it would permit the world to be placed in the hands of the conquering Communists -- and it imperils the very existence of Israel. Notwithstanding this, the Senator has found a number of supporters among American Jews; the liberal philanthropic sector especially comes up with support. But there are other Jews who are more dedicated to Israel. They have a tradition of going along with the Democrats; but they silently feel this time that the situation has changed. This time they know their vote for the Democrats might be a vote against the existence of Israel.

It is only natural, given the dilemma that they find themselves in, to look for some direction, some indication from Israel. But it is also natural that Israel, as a sovereign state, cannot extend "official" direction.

Still, every Jewish ear is turned to utterances from Ambassador Yitzak Rabin. He, of course, will not say that this candidate is better for Jews than this other candidate. But he does speak of the relationship between Israel and the U.S. which can enlighten perplexed Jews concerned for Israel's welfare. He is not saying things that he did not say in the past when the American elections were still far off. But now they are receiving additional significance.

When Ambassador Rabin, last Saturday in a radio interview, said that "No American president made such a public declaration for Israel as Nixon"-- and added that one must be grateful to those who do for Israel, as (compared with) those who only "speak" for Israel -- he was not, in the formal sense, taking a position with respect to the elections in the U.S.

(The complaints expressed by the McGovern supporters could have been seen beforehand.....)

But it is proper for the Ambassador to be more careful of his public words in this emotional period and not give cause to have Israel's enemies charge that Israel is meddling in the elections of another country. At the same time it is also necessary for every person who has the opportunity (and is not an official representative of Israel) to do what he can to enlighten his friends and family in the U.S. as to which candidate is "good for the Jews" and which is a portent for danger.

Pat - In our "code" of
Melinks - WRITE letters to
AMERICANS!!

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Leading Israeli paper Maariv says

6-27-72

June 19, 1972

McGovern
Q/Tr

(Note: "MAARIV", the largest and by far the most influential newspaper in Israel, had a lead editorial 15 June '72 that (1) upheld Ambassador Rabin's praise of President Nixon; (2) condemned Senator McGovern as a foe of Israel, except in campaign "talk"; (3) noted that many Jews who traditionally voted Democratic are realizing "the situation has changed" and a vote against Nixon this year "might be a vote against the existence of Israel"; and (4) in effect, urged Israelis to "enlighten" -- that is, write to -- their friends and relatives in the United States about which candidate is "good for the Jews" and which is a portent of danger.)

The "MAARIV" editorial, as translated from Hebrew by a friend of mine, follows:

THE AMBASSADOR AND THE ELECTIONS

Even if correct (according to the New York Post) that those close to Senator McGovern complained to Golda Meir that Rabin is complimentary to Nixon, and even if incorrect (this complaint was not received in Jerusalem), one thing is certain: there was never an American president who showed such understanding of the needs of Israel's security as Nixon. And there was never a candidate who aroused fears, from the Israeli viewpoint, as McGovern.

And if we turn away for the moment from the question of what is proper and improper for the Ambassador to say in an election year, it is still a fact that Israel has a vital interest in Nixon's victory; and that of all the Democratic candidates who aspire to their party's nomination, McGovern has, in the past, taken the worst anti-Israel positions.

Now, understandably, he makes campaign promises like all the other politicians who want Jewish votes. Now he complains that everything attributed to him a year ago was not heard correctly. Now he is not a standard-bearer for Israeli withdrawal from all territories. Now he does not say that Israel should be provided with Phantoms provided they are not used. Now he does not maintain any more that the Arab refugees join in the solution of the Middle East conflict.

But even what he says now is enough to arouse fears. McGovern is one of the chief fighters for the withdrawal of American forces from Europe. He is of the mind that there is no Soviet threat and, as a result, there is no need for NATO; and because there is no need for NATO, there is no need to strengthen America's navy in the Mediterranean. It is possible -- it is safe -- to leave the Mediterranean in the hands of the Soviet fleet.

These are not, of course, the substance of his speeches when he appears before Jewish voters. But they are the things for which he votes consistently and stubbornly in the Senate. It is for this that he wants the votes of the electors: to withdraw from Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia; to withdraw from Europe and from all places where the U.S. has military obligations. This is his belief and hope.

There is no need to say that diplomacy of this kind is isolationism; it would permit the world to be placed in the hands of the conquering Communists -- and it imperils the very existence of Israel. Notwithstanding this, the Senator has found a number of supporters among American Jews; the liberal philanthropic sector especially comes up with support. But there are other Jews who are more dedicated to Israel. They have a tradition of going along with the Democrats; but they silently feel this time that the situation has changed. This time they know their vote for the Democrats might be a vote against the existence of Israel.

It is only natural, given the dilemma that they find themselves in, to look for some direction, some indication from Israel. But it is also natural that Israel, as a sovereign state, cannot extend "official" direction.

Still, every Jewish ear is turned to utterances from Ambassador Yitzak Rabin. He, of course, will not say that this candidate is better for Jews than this other candidate. But he does speak of the relationship between Israel and the U.S. which can enlighten perplexed Jews concerned for Israel's welfare. He is not saying things that he did not say in the past when the American elections were still far off. But now they are receiving additional significance.

When Ambassador Rabin, last Saturday in a radio interview, said that "No American president made such a public declaration for Israel as Nixon"-- and added that one must be grateful to those who do for Israel, as (compared with) those who only "speak" for Israel -- he was not, in the formal sense, taking a position with respect to the elections in the U.S.

(The complaints expressed by the McGovern supporters could have been seen beforehand.....)

But it is proper for the Ambassador to be more careful of his public words in this emotional period and not give cause to have Israel's enemies charge that Israel is meddling in the elections of another country. At the same time it is also necessary for every person who has the opportunity (and is not an official representative of Israel) to do what he can to enlighten his friends and family in the U.S. as to which candidate is "good for the Jews" and which is a portent for danger.

Pat - In our "Code" of
Morals - WRITE letters TO
AMERICANS!!

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

McC. Hgbs. called
Fasten about abortion
quote - they were
worried about it.

McC admitted:

- 1) matter for states
- 2) N.Y.'s law was too
liberal.

Bonnie Sobel

255-2721

~~SECRET~~