

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 12356, Section 1.1

By RP NARS, Date 6/2/82

cc: H. R. Haldeman

May 21, 1970

MEDIA MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Patrick J. Buchanan

Reflections from bedside after a fortnight of reading the Post and Times news summaries and watching the networks. How we have conducted ourselves and what we can expect.

1. The media, the left, the liberal academic community, the Senate doves -- whom we overran and routed in November -- in one of the most effective political offensives of recent ~~memory~~, have regained the initiative.

Apparently, there are still members of our own White House Staff here who do not realize that what these people want is not some modus vivendi with President Nixon, some consensual agreement on progress. Rather, they want to dominate, discredit and drive this Administration out of power two years hence -- and then write us off as a gang of ineffectual interim caretakers who failed dismally.

Our response to their renewed assault has not been in the November character; it has generally been in the disastrous Johnsonian tradition; too pleading, too conciliatory, gestures of virtual appeasement to our ideological enemies. Word goes forth from the environs of the White House that we will tone down the rhetoric of the Vice President if that will help; that we will promise to have American troops out of Cambodia by July 1, that we will move no further than 30 kilometers

within the country; we will never go back. We place stringent unilateral limits on our own freedom of action -- and to what avail?

What have all these gestures accomplished -- but to re-double the enthusiasm of those who despise us and who hope that the President's Cambodian venture will fail ignominously?

The only thing wrong with the President's move into Cambodia was that Johnson should have done it four years ago -- we have nothing to apologize for or be defensive about; it is something to be vocally aggressive about. Yet, many of our spokesmen one sees and hears seem defensive.

Again, was it not because they were massed and raucous here in D. C. that scores of students were invited in to see and talk with the White House Staff members? -- They were not all lovable children at the Monument grounds from what I heard from those with whom I spoke; many were close-minded, arrogant and intransigent and engaged in gutter obscenities against the President of the United States.

When we literally ignored the marchers in October and November and let them have their parades and speeches -- we won the support of the American people. Now, when we suddenly threw open all our doors to anyone who wanted to come in and vent his views here, we gain an appearance of openness but also of a lack of certainty, of being a bit panicked and we merited the increased contempt of those who can spot weakness and uncertainty a mile off. We also confused the millions of

Americans who believed deeply the President's strong stand is right.

There is merit in the President and staff making themselves available to students and other groups with differing points of view -- but the merit lies solely in the public impression conveyed; that we are listening. But, why must it be the most vocal and disorderly dissenters who are the ones given the publicity and the audience -- as though a loud mouth and a lot of violence is one measure of the justice of a cause.

Having said this, we must begin to take inventory of the country which the President now governs.

THE UNIVERSITIES. Under attack from their own student leaders and student bodies, many of these institutions have capitulated and allowed themselves to become politicalized. (See attached Evans-Novak.) Rather than risk the wrath of their students, rather than take unpopular positions, which would make daily life miserable for them, university leaders around the country -- with Kingman Brewster the quintessential example of the craven coward -- have decided to throw in with the students, to blame his inability to maintain a spirit of academic freedom on his campus on the war in Vietnam, on white racism, on the Black Panther trial, on anything but Kingman Brewster's lack of courage. Seeking desperately to curry favor with the radical majority, these men have taken political positions as institutions and endorsed strikes on campus, refused to punish violent disorders -- in effect abandoned the academic freedom and the

traditional neutrality of these bodies for students and teachers alike to hold and express publicly unpopular and heretical views. Some of these universities are now publicly taking what amounts to a party line -- and in that sense are ceasing to be universities as we knew them.

This is something the President inherited; something about which we can do little other than to search constantly and find those university presidents and teachers with the courage to stand up and provide them with all the moral and other backing and exposure we can muster. Let's bring the professors and administrators with guts in to see the President. To allow the politicalization of the universities means State Legislatures will react, dissenting views will be shouted and a new "McCarthyism" will prevail under the auspices of bankrupt liberalism.

THE MEDIA. Some of the television I have witnessed in the last two weeks -- conscious efforts to seek out soldiers who didn't want to go into Cambodia, the failure to give the maximum coverage to the tremendous success of our military operation -- have raised genuine questions in my mind whether we can seriously continue to let this sort of thing go on without concerted counterattacks. I recall, however, one splendid piece on ABC, showing American tanks and trucks carting off supplies; there have been some excellent stories on back pages of papers like the Star. But they have not been given the enormous treatment they deserve. Had this type of thing gone on during World War II -- with American cameramen night after night looking for soldiers naturally

frightened and concerned with the war, one wonders how well we could have sustained it.

The left now so dominates the media that they can very nearly neutralize a Presidential presentation or even a military operation as conspicuously successful as the Cambodian venture has been to date. (The national magazines are becoming an increasingly serious hostile and constant source of concern here. They almost acted in concert on the Carswell thing -- neutralizing the President's statement, The networks did the same.)

Vic Lasky make a suggestion which appeals to me. When this operation is over the President ought to take live time, five minutes to explain just what we captured and destroyed in there -- it ought to be tough and straight -- and maybe we ought to fly home the kind of things we captured -- rockets, mortars, etc to show them to the American people.

My feeling is that the media from our post-November efforts has been partially discredited in the eyes of the country; that we should not hesitate to attack and attack hard when it steps out of bounds; and we ought to give consideration to ways and means if necessary to acquire either a government or other network through which we can tell our story to the country.

The lens through which our message gets through is a distorted lens -- in the national press and the network media, with the exceptions mentioned

previously. (A night ago, 1000 N.Y. lawyers here in D.C. got equal time with 150,000 hard hats in N.Y. backing RN and the Veep.)

THE PRESIDENT. With the media, the articulate voices of the Senate, the bulk of the academic community, the great foundations, the men of prominence in law and those who have left government service all adamantly against us -- we must begin, I believe again elevate the people to use more fully and more often the great but few weapons we have, the President and the Vice President and the Cabinet in an aggressive manner. We have the majority of the people of this country with us yet I still believe. But they are men and women who do not understand sophisticated ideas and the workability of programs and plans -- they distrust in men and they trust in leaders and our presence is not visible or if we present to the nation any lack of certitude or a lack of conviction in what we are doing -- then with all the other pressures boring in, more assuredly they, too, will doubt that they are right. In this regard, it is a major and unnecessary concession to our enemies to attempt to muzzle the Vice President, who, even when his rhetoric veers off the mark, brings to these people that feeling of strength and conviction and certitude in values they have not heard defended in thirty years.

Neither the President nor the Vice President's statement which are tough are causes of any national problem here -- they are explicit response to outrages -- and by suggesting or hinting, as some of our aides do, that; yes; we'll quiet down; may be we are talking too loud -- we give

in effect tacit admission that somehow we are responsible.

THE HARD HATS -- Last week a group of construction workers came up Wall Street and beat the living hell out of some demonstrators who were desecrating the American flag in their little demonstration for "peace." Whether one condones this kind of violence or not, probably half the living rooms in America were in standing applause at the spectacle. Yesterday the hard hats marched down Broadway in support of Nixon and Agnew -- something no union man would have done for Vice President Richard Nixon for a weekend off ten years ago. There is a great ferment in American politics; these, quite candidly, are our people now -- just as the Republican suburbs are. The most insane suggestion I have heard about here in recent days was to the effect that we should somehow go prosecute the hard hats to win favor with the kiddies who are screaming about everything we are doing.

My suggestion was -- send the Vice President right up to New York, have him say in 200 words that our kids are wiping out sanctuaries that were killing their buddies, that we are marching peacefully, that we are protesting in their behalf, and this is going to be a peaceful demonstration. The message would have hit every blue collar worker in the country and these are our people now -- if we want them -- and frankly, they are better patriots and more pro-Nixon than the little knot of Riponers we have sought to cultivate since we came into office.

One point I would make here -- what have all our efforts and labors to win over the Fulbrights and the lefts, to show them we are resonable, accomplished? With one decision in Cambodia, it went out the window in a flash -- the virulence of the attacks on the President, the genuine brutality of the political assault, must by now tell us we have no converts there now worth the great investment we have made on that side of the fence.

It should be our focus to constantly speak to, to assure, to win, to aid, to promote the President's natural constituency -- which is now the working men and women of the country, the common man, the Roosevelt New Dealer. When in trouble, that is where we should turn, not try to find a common ground with our adversaries.

Let me add here -- I do not rule out; I strongly endorse symbolic gestures toward groups especially the blacks where symbols count for so much -- because the President is President of all the people and while they will never vote for us, we must never let them come to believe we don't give a damn about them -- or that they are outside our province of concern.

I argue only for a sense of realism, a recognition of who our friends are, where they are and that they being our base -- remain our constant course of attention.

THE GOVERNMENT -- In point of fact we failed to take control in depth

of the Federal Government which is ours by right of victory -- and we are paying a heavy price for it now, with State Department letters of protest, with Hickel publicly airing internal squabbles on the national networks, the civil rights revolt at Justice, with Finch and Veneman being called to account for their actions by their own employees, with Thrower refusing to use the political power of his office. We have neither been ruthless enough in eliminating those lower echelon employees who disagree with the President, in rooting out endemic disloyalty, in ridding ourselves of those who -- once the President has decided to act -- refuse to go out and fight for his position, whether they agreed with it to begin with or not.

The tragedy that has plagued us through this Administration is our well-motivated attempt to bring into positions of responsibility gentlemen like Dr. Allen -- who have never agreed with the President on anything. This was based on RN's idea of a "coalition" of point of view. But when there is a lack of discipline among our troops -- primarily in the Departments, but also even within the White House where we find types more than willing to cry on the shoulder of a Stu Loory just the way Bill Moyers used to tell the press the terrible time he was having convincing the President to do the right thing. So, they loved Moyers and loathed Johnson.

RECOMMENDATIONS -- Thus far, the Presidential posture has been that the Chief Executive, the master arbiter of contesting forces within Society -- a task performed with skill and brilliance. On occasions, like the November encounter, the President raised the silhouette assumed the

role of "leader of the people" and rallied the nation to his banner. This power of the Office in my opinion may have to be used with great regularity and intensity than it has in the past -- if the attacks against us stay at the same level. We cannot rely on the Kleins and Zieglers and even the Cabinet types to carry the battle; essentially, their function is less the attack than it is the defense, the rebuttal.

Secondly, we are paying a terrible price now for the appointment or retention in high, but more important, middle public office of men who have never supported the President, and for failing to remove, demote, transfer or fire those individuals who are not first and foremost Presidential loyalists. Dr. Allen has been nothing but a disaster; and the Administration is almost on a suicidal course when it hires at \$10,000 a year twerp like Moffett for our Youth Office over at HEW -- so that when he resigns, a slobbering and indulgent press puts him on Face the Nation to tell the country that the President does not give a damn about youth.

Third, we have kept the door open to everyone, etc., but keep constantly in mind that nothing will ever come of this other than a little refurbishing of image about "open administration," etc. The Youth Conference we are holding should gather and hail every "square" youth organization and solid kid we can find and keep out every hard anti-Nixon leftist -- and if we can't accomplish that, we ought to can the whole damn thing.

Fourth, hard evidence I think indicates clearly that by providing Cabinet officers with a full franchise, turning over the power of appointments

to any number of our Cabinet heads -- we have gotten some bad returns and now have a government not only hostile in segments to the President -- but openly defiant and rebellious. If it takes far-reaching removal of sub-Cabinet types to regain more WH control, I would recommend this kind of dramatic stroke, for if we cannot get greater control of this government, we can accomplish nothing. We can only expect further blow-ups of internal dissent by the media in future months.

Under normal times, the coalition concept of a Cabinet -- with everybody popping off -- is a fine thing, with different views. But we are an army under fire now -- and the actions of Secretary Hickel in publicly airing grievances about WH staffers of the innermost nature on a nationwide television show -- in effect scoring points for himself with the liberal press at the expense of his President -- is simply inexcusable.

The President and his Cabinet and his staff must present a greater posture of solid unanimity and strength and confidence than we have to date. There is too much weeping on the shoulders of the press, appearing all over. For Bob Finch to have allowed that slob from the Welfare Rights Organization to occupy his office for two hours was a disgrace -- and can only earn us the contempt of those who despise us and the utter bewilderment of those who still believe and respect the American government.

This is no argument for having National Guardsmen shooting 19-year-old girls in the head with an M-1 -- but we desperately have to present to the nation the impression of a strong government, led by tough people,

who know exactly where they are going, and who are not going to be deterred an inch by any crowd of idealistic mixed-up kids running around the streets. It seems that in most speeches one hears from a Cabinet officer, or report of a conversation by a White House staffer, we are pleading with somebody or apologizing for something.

In that evening with Irving Kristol, Henry Kissinger made a point that needs re-making. What we don't need is dialogue and consultation -- what the United States needs is a victory. I have read -- and it is my earnest hope that it is not true -- that the President had an operation ready against the North Vietnamese, which we have called off because because of the domestic turmoil. From experience, it seems we gain nothing by denying ourselves military opportunities to tone down a Senator Fulbright or one of the other -- who would be destroyed as politicians if Richard Nixon won this war.

So, with regard to our enemies, we need spokesmen -- more of them, younger, more aggressive, who will get up when Whitney Young says RN and Agnew were responsible for killing those students -- and call him a goddam liar.

Young's Urban League as I understand, feeds high on the Federal trough -- has any consideration been given to telling him to fire his fanny or look elsewhere for their fat contracts.

Finally, though this is a discursive and rambling memo, I see us as under very real attack from our enemies within the society, who have

many powerful and influential weapons, who are attempting to impose ground rules upon our political warfare they do not impose upon themselves -- that our future, if it is going to be successful, may lie in the FDR pattern of engaging them openly in heated political warfare, of not cooling off our supporters but of stirring the fires and passions often. It seems to me here that we are in a contest over the soul of the country now and the decision will not be some middle compromise -- it will be their kind of society or ours; we will prevail or they shall prevail. I know these incomplete thoughts and suggestions do not square at all with the calm, cool, dispassionate, orderly executive administration the President has conducted thus far, ably and well. But I think that clearly while the issue is not black and white, the decision is whether we shall be a fighting President in the mold of FDR or the presiding President in the manner of Ike.