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MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: Bryce Harlow

If RN's political Sanhedrin concludes that HHH's attached plea needs a reply that will dispose finally of both three-way and two-way debates, old Harlow herewith submits a suggestion which, I fondly believe, will softly caroom the whole bit in the side pocket.
TELEGRAM TO HHH

Your offer not only to debate on October 20 with me and Mr. Wallace but also to pay its cost is most considerate. It is distressing to have to decline.

I have frequently voiced objections to three-way debates together with my hope that you would take the same position in the interest of our two-party system in America, and that remains my view. Two-way debates between Presidential candidates, I have consistently favored in the past. However, I have since had occasion carefully to measure my long-time willingness to engage in such debates as against your considered vote not to have such debates four years ago. It now seems to me that your 1964 vote was the wiser one for responsible campaigning for the nation's highest office, and I commend you for it. Let us therefore follow your example, and let each of us carry forward his individual campaign, each presenting his own views in his own way about America's critical need for decisive new leadership that can reunite our country and restore peace at home and in the world.

Richard M. Nixon
AS YOU KNOW, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HAS APPROVED LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD PERMIT THE TV NETWORKS TO GRANT FREE TIME FOR A THREE-WAY DEBATE BUT A PARLIAMENTARY MANEUVER IN THE SENATE HAS BLOCKED FINAL ACTION ON THIS TO DATE. I HOPE THE SENATE WILL CONTINUE TO CONSIDER FAVORABLE ACTION ON THIS MATTER.

HOWEVER, TO INSURE THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MAY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR AND SEE EACH OF US DEBATE THE ISSUES IN THIS CAMPAIGN AND INFORM THE PUBLIC ABOUT WHAT WE WOULD DO AS PRESIDENT, I HAVE RESERVED AN HOUR OF TELEVISION TIME ON CBS SUNDAY NIGHT, OCTOBER 20, FROM 10:00 TO 11:00 P.M., EASTERN DAYLIGHT TIME FOR THE FIRST THREE-WAY DEBATE AS PRESCRIBED BY THE LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND PENDING IN THE SENATE.

THE COST OF PRESENTING THIS DEBATE SHOULD BE SHARED AMONG US BUT IF YOU ARE NOT WILLING TO SHARE THE COST, I WILL SECURE FUNDS TO PAY FOR THE TIME MYSELF PROVIDING THAT YOU AND MR. WALLACE BOTH ACCEPT MY INVITATION.

BECAUSE WE MUST MAKE FINAL DECISION ON PROGRAMMING, I ASK FOR AN EARLY DECISION SO MAY I PLEASE HAVE YOUR REPLY NO LATER THAN 5:00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15 SO APPROPRIATE ARRANGEMENTS CAN BE MADE.

HUBERT H HUMPHREY.
TO: HRH
FROM: PETER FLANIGAN

IN CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE STATEMENTS RE AN HRH OFFER OF TV TIME FOR A TWO-MAN DEBATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

QUOTE:

IT IS CLEAR THAT IN THE MIDDLE OF A THREE-MAN RACE THERE CAN BE NO SUCH THING AS A TWO-MAN DEBATE. WHATEVER HUBERT HUMPHREY AND I MIGHT AGREE TO DO, THE THIRD PARTY CANDIDATE IS LEGALLY ENTITLED TO EQUAL OR EQUIVALENT TIME. THE RESULT WOULD BE NOT A THREE-WAY DEBATE BUT A THREE-RING CIRCUS WITH THOSE WHO HAVE THE MOST TO GAIN BY CONFUSION LEAST RESTRAINED BY THE RULES OF ORDERLY DISCUSSION.

THE PURPOSE OF A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN IS TO LET THE PEOPLE KNOW WHERE THE CANDIDATES STAND, NOT TO SATISFY THE DEMANDS FOR SPECTACULAR PROGRAMS. I HAVE SPOKEN AND WILL CONTINUE TO SPEAK ON EVERY IMPORTANT ISSUE. I HAVE APPEARED IN LIVE CONFRONTATIONS WITH CITIZENS IN VARIOUS STATES, NEWS MEDIA (PRESS CONFERENCES) TV SHOWS ETC, AND ANSWERED THEIR QUESTIONS. I WILL CONTINUE TO PRESENT MY CASE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. THE OTHER CANDIDATES ARE FREE TO DO THE SAME.

AS I HAVE PREVIOUSLY STATED, THIS IS A TWO PARTY SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT AND I SEE NO REASON FOR HELPING TO BUILD THE PROSPECTS OF A THIRD PARTY, WHICH COULD RESULT IN GOVERNMENT BY A MINORITY VOICE. UNQUOTE

(THE BASIC IDEA, HOWEVER IT IS PUT, IS THAT WALLACE, PROGRAMMED RIGHT AFTER A NIXON-HUMPHREY DEBATE WOULD IN FACT, DEBATING (RAPPING) THEM, GETTING EXTRA MILEAGE OUT OF BEING EXCLUDED AND OTHERWISE CREATING A THREE-WAY "DEBATE" SITUATION).

END
ELEVEN DAYS HAVE GONE BY SINCE VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY NAMED ME AS HIS REPRESENTATIVE IN NEGOTIATING ARRANGEMENTS FOR TELEVISED DEBATES BETWEEN HIM AND YOU. WE STILL HAVE NOT RECEIVED A REPLY FROM YOU, DESIGNATING YOUR OWN REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS REGARD.

IN VIEW OF THE SCHEDULED HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACTION TUESDAY ON LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND THE EQUAL TIME REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT AND THUS TO ENABLE THE MAJOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES TO DEBATE ON TELEVISION, I STRONGLY URGE YOU TO APPOINT A REPRESENTATIVE IMMEDIATELY SO THAT WE CAN MEET AS SOON AS THE HOUSE COMPLETES ITS ACTION.

YOU HAVE SAID REPEATEDLY THAT YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO DEBATE THE VICE PRESIDENT IF AND WHEN CONGRESS SUSPENDS THE EQUAL TIME PROVISION. MR. HUMPHREY HAS CHALLENGED YOU REPEATEDLY TO A DEBATE--WITH OR WITHOUT WALLACE PARTICIPATION.

I CANNOT STRESS TOO STRONGLY THE URGENCY OF PROMPT ACTION IF WE ARE TO GET NETWORK DEBATES UNDER WAY--DEBATES WHICH, AS YOU KNOW, ARE VITAL IF THE PUBLIC IS TO HAVE A FULL OPPORTUNITY TO COMPARE THE CANDIDATES AND TO JUDGE THEIR STANDS ON THE ISSUES.

MAY I ALSO EXPRESS HOPE THAT YOU WILL ACCEPT THE VICE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST TO JOIN HIM IN URGING HOUSE APPROVAL OF THE REQUIRED LEGISLATION. SHOULD THIS FAIL, I REMIND YOU OF OUR SUGGESTION OF SEPTEMBER 27 THAT WE PURCHASE TIME FROM THE NETWORKS, HOPEFULLY AT REDUCED RATES, AND SHARE THE COST OF TELEVISION DEBATES. I STILL HAVE RECEIVED NO REPLY FROM YOU ON THIS SUGGESTION, EITHER.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN
I have noted your call for Vice President Humphrey to clarify his position on Vietnam.

Vice President Humphrey already has devoted a half hour of paid television time to a detailed discussion of his policy on this crucial issue.

You have not given the American people a position of your own on this issue, although you have claimed you have a plan.

If there is real doubt in your mind concerning Vice President Humphrey’s position, I urge you to accept our repeated invitations to you to debate with the Vice President at any time, any place, on televiewision or elsewhere.

There is no better way for you to clear up any doubts in your mind than to pose questions to the Vice President, face to face, in the free give and take of debate. Of course, you would be subject to questioning about your own stand as well, as I stated...
Previously, the Vice President will debate you separately if you are unwilling to also confront George Wallace.

It has become even more important for you to accept this invitation because Governor Agnew has stated that he will debate Senator Muskie only after you and the Vice President have done so. A Muskie-Agnew debate would be of great benefit to the voters and this is being prevented by your failure to accept.

Vice President Humphrey has received no reply.

To his telegram of September 25 to you, asking you to name a negotiator to meet with me to arrange details for a debate, nor have I received a reply to my wire of September 26 suggesting that if you are concerned about Section 315 the Republican and Democratic parties should share costs for a Humphrey-Nixon debate. The Vice President stands ready to debate with you and with Mr. Wallace or with you separately.

Lawrence F. O'Brien Chairman Democratic National Committee.
TODAY'S ACTION BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAKES IT LIKELY THAT SOME FORM OF SUSPENSION OF THE EQUAL TIME REQUIREMENT OF SECTION 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE WITHIN THE NEXT FEW DAYS. SINCE THE ELECTION IS JUST FOUR WEEKS AWAY, NBC WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN DISCUSSIONS NOW WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF EACH OF THE THREE CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AS DEFINED IN THE HOUSE BILL.

THE COMMITTEE REPORT SUGGESTED THAT "WHATEVER IS DONE, SHOULD BE DONE AS A RESULT OF DISCUSSION, NEGOTIATION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE CANDIDATES AND THE BROADCASTERS." WE WOULD LIKE TO MEET WITH YOUR REPRESENTATIVES IN THAT SPIRIT TO DETERMINE WHETHER A FORMAT FOR JOINT APPEARANCES CAN BE DEVELOPED THAT WILL BE AGREEABLE TO ALL. WE ARE CONFIDENT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL BE WELL SERVED BY SUCH PRESENTATIONS OF THE CANDIDATES AND THAT FULL ADVANTAGE CAN BE TAKEN OF THE RELAXATION OF THE LAW. IF YOU ARE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN SUCH DISCUSSIONS, WE WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR PROMPT RESPONSE SO WE CAN BEGIN IMMEDIATELY TO WORK OUT A MUTUALLY AGREEABLE PLAN AND SCHEDULE.

JULIAN GOODMAN PRESIDENT NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO
As you know, the House of Representatives is scheduled to act Tuesday on suspension of equal time provision of the Communications Act so that the television networks can provide opportunities for us to appear in televised debates. You know of my strong desire for us to go before the American people together -- and/or with Mr. Wallace -- to present our views on the issues and permit the voters to decide on the basis of this comparison which candidate they will choose. I have made it clear that if Congress does not act to approve the legislation I would be willing to debate with you under whatever circumstances and financing could be arranged.

I ask you to join with me in urging the members of the House of Representatives to approve appropriate legislation. It is urgent that such action be taken if the voters are to be given a full understanding of the issues and the candidates before they go to the polls one month from now.

I stand ready to move immediately towards the first of what I hope will be a series of debates, the moment Congress acts. As I wired you on September 26, I have designated Lawrence S. O'Brien to act as my representative in negotiating arrangements for a series of televised debates. I hope that you will designate representative immediately, as well, so that they can begin their discussions as soon as the suspension of 315 of the Communications Act is enacted.

Will you join me in a strong appeal Monday for the House of Representatives to approve equal time suspension legislation? Or,
if you prefer, will you issue an independent appeal for the Congress to act? Both of us, as candidates for our nation's highest office, owe it to the American people to give our voices to support of this vital action.

Hubert H. Humphrey
MEMORANDUM

TO: DICK KLEINDIENST (RNC) CC: BOB HALDEMAN
FROM: MURRAY CHOTINER
DATE: NOVEMBER 1, 1968

CONFIRMING OUR PHONE CONVERSATION, PLEASE FILE A COMPLAINT WITH THE FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE ON THE BASIS THAT:

HUMPHREY STATES THAT RN OPPOSES SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE. THE TRUTH IS, THAT NIXON SUPPORTS BOTH PROGRAMS.

EVIDENCE IS, HUMPHREY SAID ON OCTOBER 28, 1968, AS REPORTED IN THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, "NIXON SAYS HE SUPPORTS THESE PROGRAMS (INCLUDING MEDICARE) BUT DON'T YOU BELIEVE HIM. HE WOULD OPPOSE THEM IF HE WAS IN THE WHITE HOUSE."

THE WASHINGTON POST ON OCTOBER 29, 1968, REPORTED THAT HHH SAID, "THE REPUBLICANS USED TO BE AGAINST SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE, UNTIL JUST BEFORE THE ELECTION WHEN NIXON DISCOVERED THEY ARE POPULAR, SO HE SLIPS AROUND THE BACK DOOR AND WHISPERS THAT HE IS FOR THEM NOW."

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES ON SEPTEMBER 25, 1968, REPORTED HHH AS SAYING, "THE NIXON REPUBLICANS FOUGHT MEDICARE FOR 16 YEARS AND DENIED THESE BENEFITS TO MILLIONS OF OUR OLDER CITIZENS."

THE TV SPOT ANNOUNCEMENTS OF HHH TATES, "MR. NIXON WANTS TO OFFER SECURITY TO OLDER CITIZENS, BUT MR. NIXON OPPOSES MEDICARE."
THIS SPOT ANNOUNCEMENT WCS RUN ON OCTOBER 6, 1968, CHANNEL 4, NBC AT 4:26 P.M. IT HAS BEEN RUNNING NATIONWIDE.

THE HHH TV AND RADIO SPOT ANNOUNCEMENT PROGRAM IS FLOODING THE NATION WITH THE FALSE CHARGE THAT NIXON IS OPPOSED TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE. THE TRUTH IS, AS STATED BY RN:

"AMERICANS OVER 65 GET LESS ADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE THAN YOUNGER AMERICANS EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE SICK MORE OFTEN AND ILLNESS IS STILL A MAJOR ECONOMIC BURDEN FOR OLDER PEOPLE AS MANY OF YOU KNOW ONLY TOO WELL, AND THE ANSWER IS THAT MEDICARE SIMPLY HAS NOT WORKED AS EFFECTIVELY AS IT OUGHT TO BE WORKING. OFTEN IT DOES NOT GET TO THE PEOPLE WHO NEED IT MOST. DELAYS IN PAYMENT OFTEN SEEM ENDLESS. THE PROGRAM IS HOPELESSLY TANGLED IN RED TAPE. THAT IS WHY I PROMISE TO MAKE MEDICARE WORK BETTER BY SIMPLIFYING THE PROGRAM AND BY IMPROVING ITS EFFICIENCY. IN ADDITION, I HAVE PROPOSED A 100% INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR DRUG AND MEDICAL EXPENSES WHICH OLDER PEOPLE STILL HAVE TO PAY FOR OUT OF THEIR OWN POCKETS."

"I AM NOT ONLY FOR THE BENEFITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY, I WANT TO IMPROVE AND EXTEND THEM AND I HAVE PROPOSED AN AUTOMATIC COST OF LIVING INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS SO THAT WHEN PRICES DO GO UP, BENEFITS GO UP AUTOMATICALLY. BUT THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION ACTUALLY OPPOSED IT AND KEPT IT FROM BECOMING LAW. I HAVE URGED AN INCREASE IN WIDOW'S BENEFITS, NEW PERMISSION FOR THOSE WHO WORKED PAST THE AGE OF 65 TO BUILD THEIR BENEFITS TO HIGHER LEVELS, EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO COVER ALL OLDER CITIZENS AND A RELAXATION OF THE EXISTING LIMITS ON HOW MUCH SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS CAN EARN."
"I appreciate your giving me this moment of your television time so that I can send this message to a group in our society that are truly in need. Referring to the 20 million over 65 years of age and who are trying to eke out a living on a little pension, life insurance or Social Security over the past eight years they have seen 20% percent of their life savings destroyed because of rises in the cost of living. That is why as one who has always supported Social Security, I say we need a new provision whereby those on Social Security will have an automatic increase in their payments whenever prices go up. That is why I say in our administration, we will stop the rise in prices, stop the rise in taxes, and have prosperity without inflation.

It is my understanding you will take care of issuing the press release from Washington.

Regards and thanks.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dick Kleindienst
    Jeff Kimball
    Hank Berliner

FROM: Murray Chotiner

Please have the Truth Squad and various speakers continue to point out the following:

1. The credibility gap of Humphrey.

2. Full story of HHH speaking on all sides of Vietnam issue.

3. LBJ should be needled on the fact that HHH is making a "Lame Duck" President out of him.

MMC: bh

cc: Bob Haldeman
    John Mitchell
    Pete Flanigan
MEMORANDUM

TO: Herb Klein
FROM: Murray Chotiner

I suggest that a story go out, as soon as possible, to counteract the charge by HHHH that Dick Nixon attacked John Kennedy. It is based on the endorsement by Cardinal Cushing of Dick as "Good Will Man Of The Year."

Attached is suggested story prepared by Murray Snyder. I have taken the liberty of making a few changes.

MMC: bh
Enclosure

cc: John Mitchell
     Pete Flanigan
     Bob Haldeman
It is interesting to note, that a week before the inauguration of President Kennedy, on January 13, 1961, Cardinal Cushing, in Baltimore, nominated Richard Nixon for "Good-Will Man of The Year."

Cardinal Cushing said:

"During the recent campaign, which tested and taxed all his powers, physical and mental, he never exploited the religious or any other issue that would tend to divide the American people."

This assessment of Mr. Nixon reflects the principle, the adherence to truth and patriotism that characterize the man. This is the answer to the charge by Mr. Humphrey that Dick Nixon attacked Jack Kennedy.

Significant in the Presidential campaign has been the repeated criticism by Richard Nixon, in his speeches, of organized hecklers who have harrassed his opponent, Hubert Humphrey, from coast to coast.

Richard Nixon and Republican political leaders do not subscribe to the tactics of hate and disruption for two reasons: First, Mr. Nixon believes the occupants of the offices of President and Vice President are entitled to respect wherever they go, whoever they may be. Second, Mr. Nixon wants to lead a united country, one in which dissenters have been promised a respected hearing, and he believes that intemperate oratory, name-calling and the related tactics of thoughtless men undermine the prospect for post-election unity and cooperation.
RE: YOUR REQUEST FOR SUMMARY REMARKS ON BALL'S RESIGNATION.

THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY PREPARED BY RNC PUBLIC RELATIONS DIVISION OF ALL SUCH STATEMENTS TO COME THROUGH THEIR HANDS.

CHAIRMAN BLISS: "SUCH A STATEMENT... IS A COME DOWN FROM THE HIGH LEVELS OF DIPLOMACY TO A WILLING INVOLVEMENT IN GUTTER POLITICS." (9/27/68)

RICHARD KLEINDIENST: "BALL HAS FLAGRANTLY VIOLATED THE PRINCIPLES OF DECENTY, HONESTY AND FAIR PLAY..." (10/1/68)

REP. FRANCES BOLTON (OHIO): "MR. BALL HAS CHOSEN TO PLACE THE INTEREST OF PARTISAN DOMESTIC POLITICS ABOVE THE SOLEMN RESPONSIBILITIES HE SO RECENTLY UNDERTOOK ON BEHALF OF THE INTERESTS OF HIS COUNTRY AND THE FREE WORLD." (10/1/68)

REP. GEORGE BUSH (TEX.): (COMMENTS ON BALL'S FORECAST OF AN END TO THE WAR): "IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IN MAKING ANOTHER ROSY PREDICTION OF IMMINENT END TO THE WAR GEORGE BALL WILL REMIND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OF SO MANY SIMILAR STATEMENTS MADE JUST A FEW DAYS BEFORE THE 1966 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS." (10/1/68)

REP. DUWARD HALL (MISSOURI): (CONSPECTING STATEMENTS BY BALL WITH THOSE OF HUMPHREY): "WHILE MR. HUMPHREY PROPOSES TO HALT BOMBING OF THE NORTH, MR. BALL ONLY THIS WEEK SHARPLY DISAGREED WITH A SIMILAR COMMENT BY U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT." (10/1/68)

WE ARE CHECKING WITH NY TO SEE IF OTHER STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE AND THEY WILL BE FORTHCOMING. END.

TO: LARRY HIGBY

JOHN MITCHELL:

GEORGE BALL'S VICIOUS AND INTEMPERATE PERSONAL ATTACKS ON RR AND STA OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY CONSTITUTE AN ADMISSION OF THE BANKRUPTCY OF THE HHH CAMPAIGN. IT IS FORTUNATE THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE NO LONGER REPRESENTED AT THE U.N. BY A PERSON WITH THE STANDARDS THAT BALL HAS DISPLAYED.
September 22, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: Murray Chotiner

The attached went out as Vic Lasky's column. He came over and discussed the contents and material before writing it.

MMC: bh

cc: John Mitchell
    Herb Klein
September 22, 1968

Mr. Victor Lasky
116 Central Park South
New York, New York

Dear Vic:

Thanks for the column "Frightened Humphrey Hits Below The Belt."

I took the liberty of sending a copy to Dick.

Sincerely,

Murray Chotiner

MMC: bh

bcc: Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Herb Klein
FROM: Murray Chotiner

I have arranged for the following questions to be asked HHH at his next press conference, which is slated soon; if not held, the questions will be submitted in writing.

Think it advisable that you have someone ask similar questions to be sure the points are covered.

1. On what issues do you differ from LBJ?
2. What present cabinet officers will you retain, if elected?
3. How do you justify lauding Governor Maddox on September 14, 1967?
4. How do you justify downgrading southern voters when you accepted support from the South to insure your nomination?
5. Do you approve of the personal attacks by Mr. O'Brien on Mr. Nixon?

MMC: bh

cc: Dick Nixon
    John Mitchell
    Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Herb Klein
FROM: Murray Chotiner

September 22, 1968

I need right away a draft of a letter that could come from Dick to all police chiefs and sheriffs in the U.S. pointing out:

1. That the peace forces must be strengthened against the criminal forces.

2. He will back strong law enforcement.

3. Any other material on the subject. (See Source Book, pages 482, 482-1, 482-2, 482-3, 482-5, 482-5a, 482-6)

4. Either Dick or HHH will be elected; and real and constructive action will come from Dick. Please assign someone to do this and have the party give me the draft within the next 2 days as it takes time to produce and mail the letter.

Thank you.

MCC: bh

cc: Dick Nixon
    Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Herb Klein

FROM: Murray Chotiner

It will be appreciated if you will personally handle this or see to it that it is done. Please don't let someone second-guess or mastermind it out the window.

It is extremely important that we keep these items alive.

1. HHH embraced Governor Lester Maddox of Georgia on September 14, 1967, saying "the Governor of Georgia is a good Democrat. I am happy to be in the presence of a good Democrat."

2. HHH tries to downgrade southern support, but HHH had no hesitancy in accepting support from the south to get the nomination. Without it he would have failed. 620 of his 1720 1/4 votes came from 11 southern states and 5 border states. Only 130 votes in those 16 states went against him including 12 abstentions.

Without those 620 votes, he would have flopped.

3. HHH should name the issues on which he disagrees with LBJ.

4. HHH should tell what present cabinet officials he would retain, if elected.

5. Does HHH ratify or condemn the unwarranted personal attacks by O'Brien?

6. The colossal nerve of HHH trying to hoodwink the people by saying Dick's position is like a bowl of jello when HHH is all over the lot on most issues.
Please have a composite piece issued to all press, covering these points. Hang it on John Mitchell or anyone at the top of our campaign so it will be used.

In particular, to inspire Sunday pieces, please send copies to:

Bob Donovan - for the L.A. Times - Washington Post Service;
Don Irwin - L.A. Times;
R. W. Apple - N. Y. Times;
Meg Greenfield - Washington Post.

Please let me have a copy as soon as it is ready.

MMC: bh

cc: Dick Nixon
    John Mitchell
    Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dick Kleindienst
    Jeff Kimball
    Hank Berliner

FROM: Murray Chotiner

At the risk of repeating something you have already heard, may I emphasize that the Truth Squad and all other speakers ask HHH every day to say specifically what policies of the LBJ Administration he has disagreed with during the last 4 years; what changes in policies he would make and what members of the Cabinet he will retain.

It is not necessary for us to criticize the LBJ Administration in this regard.

At the moment what we want is HHH to declare himself.

MG: bh

cc: Bob Haldeman
    Herb Klein
TO: Herb Klein
FROM: Murray Chotiner
DATE: September 27, 1968

Dick has stated that HH is one of the biggest spenders of all time. That hit the newspapers.

It struck paydirt, and the shoe pinched Humphrey. He tried to answer in California by saying that he, Humphrey, was a piker compared to RN.

Humphrey's theory was that 175 billion dollars was lost in idle plants and stultified the Gross National Product during the Eisenhower years.

How about another story, hung on John Mitchell or Charlie Rhyme, giving the specifics of "spendthrift" Humphrey, since RN did not use figures.

Attached is a copy of a memo sent to our speakers, dealing with this subject.

I think we should get the idea across that "people of America cannot afford HH."

MCC: jsz
cc: John Mitchell
    Pete Flanigan
    Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dick Kleindienst
    Jeff Kimball
    Hank Berliner

FROM: Murray Chotiner

You may want the Truth Squad and other speakers to make a special emphasis of the high cost of Hubert Humphrey.

HUM entered the Senate (61st Congress) in January, 1949.

During the time he served as a Senator, he sponsored or co-sponsored bills which did NOT become law that totalled $79,228,617,257. In addition to that amount, he voted in favor of spending increases or against reductions during the period from 1961 through 1964, which votes were not upheld by the majority of Congress, and which totalled $8,129,330,599.

The votes of HUM in favor of spending increases or against reductions from 1948 to 1961 are not included in the above figures. If they were included, the grand total would amount to over $100 billion.

All duplicate bills have been eliminated.

All programs that became law are not included in the total.

You are justified in charging that if HUM had his way, he would have cost the taxpayers an additional $100 billion during the time he served as Senator.

THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD HUBERT HUMPHREY.

END: bb

cc: John Mitchell
    Pete Flanigan
    Bob Haldeman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Herb Klein
FROM: Murray Chotiner
DATE: September 27, 1963

The attached story should be released to show the "Me, too" character of the Humphrey campaign.

Suggest that you hang it on John Mitchell, Charlie Byrne or whomever you believe appropriate.

MNC:jc
cc: John Mitchell
    Pete Flanigan
    Bob Haldeman
Day by day the Humphrey campaign takes on more of a "me, too" flavor.

He told Canisius College students in Buffalo he was planning to set up a "National University Forum" to bring campus-developed ideas on public affairs to his attention.

Prior to that time, Richard Nixon announced the inauguration of a Student Coalition to give students a "piece of the action;" to provide means "to involve educational institutions more heavily and directly in development of solutions to local problems of jobs and housing and education."

This was another of Mr. Humphrey's "me, too" promises. After weeks of attacking Mr. Nixon for citing rising national crime as a first-priority domestic crisis, Mr. Humphrey issued a set of recommendations for a Federal campaign against crime.

Peculiarly, Mr. Humphrey's "me, too" prescription for dealing with crime was issued without a diagnosis of the ailment it was designed to cure, without a single reference to the frightening statistics of the F. B. I., which show crime to be increasing almost 9 times as rapidly as the population.
TO:        Herb Klein
FROM:    Murray Chotiner
DATE:  September 27, 1968

Our challenge that Humphrey tell the American people specifically of policies of the LBJ Administration he has disagreed with during the last 4 years, what changes in policies he would make and what members of the cabinet he will retain seems to have become lost in the type-setting rooms of the newspapers.

How about doing a re-write, pinning the story on John Mitchell, in which he challenges Humphrey to state unequivocally his answers to those questions.

He has an obligation to the American people to make a clear statement on those subjects.

MCC:jsz
cc: John Mitchell
    Pete Flanigan
Bob Haldeman
October 4, 1968
From Murray Chotiner
We are in the process of preparing a release and are endeavoring to get Governor Agnew to issue the statement answering O'Brien -- will send it to you as soon as it is ready.

O'Brien Challenges Nixon on Thurmond-LeMay War Views
Washington, D. C. -- October 4 -- Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien asked Richard Nixon today whether he agrees with Senator Strom Thurmond's description of Curtis E. LeMay, the Third party Vice Presidential candidate, as "one of the best generals" in American history.

"In view of General LeMay's statements about use of nuclear weapons and his desire to bomb North Vietnam 'back to the stone age' Mr. Nixon should tell the voters whether he shares the views about General LeMay that have been expressed by Mr. Nixon's campaign confidant, Strom Thurmond," Mr. O'Brien said.

Mr. O'Brien noted that on January 31, 1967, after General LeMay's retirement from the Air Force, the South Carolina Senator was quoted in the Congressional Record as saying: "General LeMay is one of the best Generals this country has produced. He is more free to speak out, now that he is retired."

"Here, perhaps, is Dick Nixon's chance finally to take a stand on the Vietnam war, by stating whether he agrees with the ultra-hard line approach of General LeMay and Thurmond," Mr. O'Brien said. "Does Mr. Nixon insist upon a no-holds-barred "military victory' as LeMay does, or does he favor a political solution which will bring the war to a swift conclusion as Vice President Humphrey has proposed?"
Mr. O'Brien said this was the first wartime campaign in history where a presidential candidate -- Nixon -- had failed to take a position about the conflict.

"While his Republican friends in the Senate do his sniping for him, Dick Nixon stays safely behind the lines and loftily above the battle," Mr. O'Brien declared. "It is time for him to come into the open and speak for himself, or we will be forced to conclude that Senator Thurmond is his advisor on military affairs as well as civil rights."

The Democratic Chairman asserted: "Within hours of George Wallace's one man 'open convention' in which he commissioned LeMay as his running mate, Vice President Humphrey warned of the dangers implied in the General's approach to the Vietnam war and to nuclear warfare as a whole.

"Where was Dick Nixon? Marchiing through Georgia firing blanks on the campaign issues.

"It is not surprise that Nixon is silent about LeMay's nuclear answer for Vietnam. Mr. Nixon has yet to reverse his own call for delay in Senate ratification of a treaty which 80 other nations have signed to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

"Now, thanks to George Wallace, another question needs to be raised of the Republican cold war warrior: Do you, Richard Nixon, share Strom Thurmond's admiration of Curtis LeMay as you shared Strom Thurmond's admiration of Spiro T. Agnew in Miami? And do you share the hard line approach of all of them?"
MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Hugh Scott

FROM: Murray Chotiner

DATE: September 16, 1968

It is suggested that HHH be challenged on the hypocrisy of his remarks concerning Senator Strom Thurmond and other people in the South supporting the Nixon-Agnew ticket.

HHH had no hesitancy in accepting the support of the South to get the nomination. 620 of his 1760 votes came from 11 southern states and 5 border states. Only 130 votes in those 16 states went against him, including 12 abstentions.

On 9-14-67, HHH put his arm around Governor Maddox of Georgia, saying, "The Governor of Georgia is a good Democrat. I am happy to be in the presence of a good Democrat."
MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Hugh Scott
FROM: Murray Chotiner
DATE: September 16, 1968

It is suggested that HHH should be challenged to name the issues on which he disagrees with LBJ.
We don't attack LBJ; we merely ask on what issues does HHH differ from him.

[Signature]

MMC: jsz

CC: John Mitchell
     Bob Haldeman
     Pat Mills
1. A large proportion of present Wallace voters are potential Nixon voters.

Regardless of strength of commitment to Wallace, in a two-way trial heat Wallace voters favor Nixon strongly over Humphrey in the North as well as in the Southern states. Dissatisfaction with Wallace for whatever reason, therefore, would result in increasing pluralities for Nixon. Table 1 shows the breakdown by strength of commitment to Wallace and section of the country, and how Wallace voters would divide in a two-way race.

2. The idea that "Wallace can't win" can be a powerful force for splitting away some of the present Wallace strength.

There are two aspects to this:

a. A large proportion of present Wallace voters feel Nixon will be the ultimate victor. As shown in Table 2 as many as 43% of those who lean toward Wallace in the North and 38% of those who lean toward him in the South think Nixon will win.

b. The second aspect is that these same Wallace voters (those who lean toward and favor Wallace) are less strong in their commitment to Wallace. This is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 also shows that among Wallace voters who think Nixon will win an even larger proportion would favor Nixon on a two-way trial heat over Humphrey -- three-to-one in the North and by even wider margins in Southern states. In other words, should those weakly committed Wallace voters decide to change, they will move heavily into the Nixon ranks.

3. Stressing issues with Wallace voters does not seem to be a very promising way to get them to change.

Table 4 shows that only on "improving U. S. relations with the rest of the world" is there a substantial edge for Nixon over Wallace among Wallace voters. On most other issues, Wallace voters think their man is better. (An exception to this is the Wallace leaner in the North who sees Nixon as better able to handle the fiscal side -- keeping the country prosperous and keeping taxes down.)
1. Many voters still feel they may change their minds before the election.

As shown in Table 5, 27% in the North and an equal number in the South report they may change their minds. Among those who are not strongly committed to Wallace, these figures are as high as 81% of leaners-to-Wallace in the North and 55% of leaners-to-Wallace in the South. Two-thirds of those who "favor" Wallace in both the North and the South say they may change their minds by election day.

NOTE: In the 1948 election, with Henry Wallace running on a third party ticket, the August and September polls all greatly exaggerated his strength as compared to the actual vote on election day. In other words, a sizeable percentage felt he could not win and ended up voting for one of the two major party candidates.

2. The semantic differential analysis has uncovered the weak points in Wallace as seen by the Wallace voter.

These include rashness, inexperience, coldness, arrogance, rigidity and an image as a "politician" rather than a "statesman." This is covered in a memorandum from John Maddox.

3. A personal attack on George Wallace might produce a hardening of support for him and considerable resentment.

Wallace has gained in favorability among his own supporters more than either Humphrey or Nixon have gained in favorability among their supporters. Table 6 shows the spectacular increase in Wallace favorability among Wallace voters. Note also that all Wallace supporters now consider Nixon more favorably than they did a few weeks ago. Their decision to back Wallace, thus, does not stem from a deteriorating attitude toward Nixon. Wave III, presently in the field, goes into this in more detail and will provide more clarification.
7. A good way to demonstrate that "Wallace can't win" might be
to stress the large electoral vote lead that Nixon now enjoys.

Electoral vote projections from a number of sources have al­
ready indicated the wide lead, and a continuing flow of such
releases can help lend authenticity to the futility of voting
for George Wallace.* It is particularly crucial that a Wallace
"winning psychology" not be allowed to develop since this could
retain for him many voters who will otherwise eventually vote
for Nixon.

David R. Derge

*Time, Newsweek, and CBS TV News all have given Nixon well over 300
electoral votes.
# TABLE 1

DIVISION OF WALLACE VOTE
IN A TWO-WAY RACE

WALLACE VOTER
WOULD VOTE FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lean Wallace</th>
<th>Favor Wallace</th>
<th>Strong Commitment to Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Northern States</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Southern States</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48% to Nixon, 30% to Humphrey.
"Regardless of your choice for President, which candidate do you think will win the election?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All voters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wallace Voters:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean toward</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly committed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Commitment to Wallace Related to Predicted Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wallace Voters</th>
<th>Strongly Credited</th>
<th>&quot;Favor&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Lean&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9 States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Nixon will win (44%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Wallace will win (16%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(On 2-way trial heat, Wallace voters who think Nixon will win split 61% Nixon, 26% Humphrey, 13% no opinion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wallace Voters</th>
<th>Strongly Credited</th>
<th>&quot;Favor&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Lean&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4 States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Nixon will win (32)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Wallace will win (37%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(On 2-way trial heat, Wallace voters who think Nixon will win split 83% Nixon, 6% Humphrey, 11% no opinion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wallace Voters</th>
<th>Strongly Credited</th>
<th>&quot;Favor&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Lean&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Texas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Nixon will win (41%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Wallace will win (23%)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(On 2-way trial heat, Wallace voters who think Nixon will win split 72% Nixon, 13% Humphrey, 11% no opinion)
"Now I'm going to read you a list of issues. For each one I'd like you to tell me who you think would do the best job -- Nixon, Humphrey, or Wallace?"

### Nixon vs. Wallace Among Wallace Voters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Lean Toward Wallace</th>
<th>Favor Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving U.S. relations with the rest of the world</td>
<td>+22     +21</td>
<td>+7           +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the country prosperous</td>
<td>+10     -13</td>
<td>-11          -21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding down taxes</td>
<td>+9      -26</td>
<td>-20          -40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniting the country</td>
<td>+7      -2</td>
<td>-12          -15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding down government spending</td>
<td>+1      -22</td>
<td>-27          -51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving the problem of Vietnam</td>
<td>-2      -6</td>
<td>-20          -33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding down cost of living</td>
<td>-4      +11</td>
<td>-15          -41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sure our military power is greater than the Communist world</td>
<td>-4      -1</td>
<td>-19          -15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing and controlling riots</td>
<td>-60     -54</td>
<td>-78          -75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the problem of crime and violence</td>
<td>-61     -37</td>
<td>-71          -72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among Northern Wallace voters, Humphrey is judged better able than either Nixon or Wallace to handle poverty, helping minority groups to achieve human dignity, and improving conditions in slums and ghettos. Wallace is seen by Southern Wallace voters as best able to handle these issues.

*Score (±) is percent who said Nixon could handle best, minus percent who said Wallace could handle best.
"Have you definitely made up your mind which candidate you prefer for President, or is there a possibility that you may change your mind during the campaign?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mind Made Up</th>
<th>May Change</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Voters</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Voters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean toward</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly committed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mind Made Up</th>
<th>May Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Republican</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very strong Republican</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent leaning Republican</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent leaning Democratic</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very strong Democrat</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Democrat</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Within the past few weeks, has your opinion of... become more favorable or less favorable than it was before?"

**TABLE 6**

**CHANGE OF FAVORABILITY**

**AMONG WALLACE VOTERS ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorability toward:</th>
<th>Lean Wallace</th>
<th>Favor Wallace</th>
<th>Strongly Committed to Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>+55</td>
<td>+54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Score is percent who said "more favorable" minus percent who said "Less favorable". In the cases of Nixon and Humphrey one-half or more reported no change in favorability or no opinion.