

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
35	14	10/03/1968	Memo	Memo from Franklin B. Lincoln to RN, RE: Governmental Transfer. 1pg
35	14	N.D.	Newspaper	Article from Harold Gal regarding smooth presidential transition from Johnson to Nixon. 1pg. "Not Scanned"
35	14	10/03/1968	Newsletter	Washington Post editorial regarding candidate Nixon's selectiveness when addressing special interest groups. 1pg
35	14	10/04/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellsworth to DC (cc: Finch, Haldeman) regarding poll status of Nixon in Texas and Illinois. 6pgs.
35	14	10/05/1968	Memo	Memo from Buchanan to RN regarding accelerated Press attacks on RN and Agnew. 2pgs.
35	14	10/07/1968	Memo	Memo from Richard Allen to Bob Haldeman regarding attached "Bully Pulpit" (Thornton Read) essay. 12pgs.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
35	14	10/07/1968	Memo	Memo from Bob Ellsworth to DC (cc: Bob Haldeman & Bob Finch) regarding Nixon's poll figures in Pennsylvania and Ohio. 2pgs.
35	14	10/08/1968	Memo	Memo (no author) regarding telephone call Jimmie Stewart hearing again from Onasis' man - needing to talk with RN on telephone. 1pg.
35	14	10/09/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellsworth to Keogh (cc: DC, Haldeman) suggesting RN should use "pocketbook" effect on 1966 Congressional evidence as tool against Democrats. 1pg.
35	14	10/01/1968	Memo	Memo from Bryce Harlow to DC regarding RN's comment to meet with Congressman Brownie Ried of New York concerning foreign policy. 2pgs.
35	14	10/10/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellworth to DC regarding HHH's TV commercials on the Non-Proliferation Treaty. 1pg.
35	14	10/10/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellsworth to DC regarding (head of National Babtist Convention) Dr. JH Jackson's desire to meet RN in person before endorsing him. 2pgs.
35	14	10/10/1968	Report	AP press release (Moline Daily Dispatch) regarding meeting U.S. and N. Korean negotiators over the release of the crew of the USS Pueblo. 1pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
35	14	10/11/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellsworth to DC regarding TV "Debate" issue. 4pgs.
35	14	10/11/1968	Other Document	Note (typed) from Ellsworth regarding debate challenges. 1pg.
35	14	10/13/1968	Memo	Memo from Ellsworth to DC regarding poll statistics. 1pg.
35	14	10/14/1968	Memo	Memo (no author) regarding New York Daily News editorial supporting RN and STA. 1pg.
35	14	10/15/1968	Memo	Memo from Manly Molpus to Fred LaRue regarding southern and Border States speaker schedule Labor Day through Election Day. 3pgs.
35	14	n.d.	Newspaper	Newspaper ad from Nixon-Agnew Committee promoting Nixon campaign. Not scanned.

MEMORANDUM
PERSONAL and CONFIDENTIAL

FOR Richard M. Nixon
FROM Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr.

October 3, 1968

Re: Governmental Transfer

Pursuant to your instructions, I spent three hours with Clark Clifford yesterday reviewing the governmental transfer procedures and discussing DOD. He will collect his files in connection with the Kennedy transfer in 1961 and will make them available to me.

We talked to the White House while in Clark's office. Charles Murphy, whom I know, has been designated by President Johnson to represent him. Murphy expressed some concern that the President had not had a reply to his letter addressed to you several weeks ago.

He has received replies from both Wallace and Humphrey.

To remove any sensitiveness which the President may have, it would be constructive if you would write acknowledging the President's letter and designating me (if that is still your wish) as your representative. This will enable Murphy to deal directly with me. It will also enable me to deal directly with the other Executive Departments and Agencies.

At your convenience, I would like to report to you on yesterday's meeting, outline the steps which are contemplated, and receive your further instructions.

I might add that Nixon, Mudge feels that I should serve if this is your desire, and have agreed to release me for the next three months.

Frank

cc: John N. Mitchell, Esq.
John H. Alexander, Esq.

News Summary -- Thursday, October 3, 1968

RN

File

*What do our
guys say
about this?*

Washington Post Editorial 10/3 -- "when a Presidential candidate seeks to satisfy a special interest group at the expense of the rest of us, there are several ways he can do it. If the candidate is a candid man, sure of his position and unafraid of public reaction, he can make a speech or release a statement detailing whatever proposal it is he has in mind. If the operation is a little more sinister, he can hang back, say very little, and from time to time toss a note over the transom saying, in effect, don't worry. I'm with you. This last appears to be exactly what RN has done in assuring leaders of the securities business that if elected President he would end 'heavy-handed bureaucratic regulatory schemes' of LBJ administration... Mr. Nixon's letter to 'several thousand' securities men ... appeared to give particular solace to the proprietors of mutual funds whose activities have come under increasing scrutiny by SEC ...

We are fascinated with the explanation letter not made public because it covers only a 'narrow policy area'.... He does not talk about Vietnam because of 'very important' Paris talks ... Refused to elucidate objection to Fortas on grounds that the nomination was before the Senate. Vietnam and Fortas are apparently too big; the securities business is too small ...

Odder still ... (an) avalanche of trivia that is instantly made available to anyone who wants it. The state of the David-Julie romance ... color, style, design of Mrs. Nixon's wearing apparel. Yet the securities business is being assured RN will be friendly to it, in several thousand private letters which are not released.

October 4, 1968

File

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC
cc: Finch, Haldeman ✓

FROM: Ellsworth

RE: Texas and Illinois

(1) Talked to O'Donnell, Fay and Hurd in Texas.
Their latest poll shows Nixon 34, Humphrey 27,
Wallace 22.

Wallace is holding steady -- very strong in east Texas, west central Texas and panhandle. They are having Thurmond, Tower and Reagan campaign in the state to win Wallace votes for Nixon. Also, in the last 2 weeks they will focus all their media on selling the Nixon answers to the problems Wallace poses (not directed against Wallace, directed on the issues).

NB: O'Donnell shrewdly points out that Wallace is actually creating the issues for Nixon -- what a mess the country is in, in specified areas -- and in the final analysis people who are stimulated to want to vote against Humphrey by Wallace's talk will end up voting for Nixon because he is perceived as actually having the capability to handle the problems.

LeMay. Seems at first blush to have given Wallace added prestige, but LeMay can be pictured as a man who is irresponsible about the use of nuclear weapons and also as the nation's number one advocate of the first-strike or preemptive strike strategy for America.

Ellsworth called Mitchell and Mitchell will attempt to activate several military people who can get press to say on their own that LeMay's suggestion about the use of atomic bombs is irresponsible and bad policy and also that LeMay's advocacy (in his book) of a first-strike nuclear strategy for the United States is irresponsible and bad policy.

Humphrey's Vietnam maneuver seems to be losing him ground in Texas. Despite the fact that he will solidify some of the left wing of the Democratic Party in that state, which he probably already had, he will lose the center of the Democratic Party entirely. Congressman Olin (Tiger) Teague (who I know supported Stevenson in the 1950's and of course Kennedy) stated yesterday that he cannot support Humphrey for President this year. This has received wide play in the Texas press including a big story in the Dallas paper this morning. There have also been good editorial attacks against Humphrey for his stop-the-bombing maneuver.

John Hurd is going to have Ben Carpenter check with his great friend John Connally as to Connally's feeling on this and report back to me.

The Texans think Humphrey ought to be put over with the Hippies and Yippies on the ultra-left. He is too far to the left to be President.

O'Donnell is immediately undertaking to procure as many RN endorsements in the smaller dailies and weeklies as well as the large dailies as he possible can.

Everybody in Texas is worried about the press speculation on the Cabinet. They have all issued statements on it and they appreciate that some of the rest of us have, too, but they would like it if the Candidate would say:

"I am fortunate in that I have no obligation to anyone with regard to the Cabinet, and I am now running hard for the office of President. After I am elected, I will have time to sit down and think and talk with my advisors and pick the best men and women in America for my Cabinet. Right now let's all concentrate on getting a great victory so we can put this nation on the right track."

Also, the Texans feel (they had 50,000 people out in a house-to-house canvass about a week ago) that Humphrey's flicks on recession - Social Security - the economic issue - are getting to people. The Texans wish

RN would come back with some pocketbook issues daily. Not let a day go by without talking about taxes and how bad they are, Social Security and how good it is except for the fact the Democrats have ruined it with inflation and Nixon will strengthen it with cost of living increases.

The Texans also are concerned over an item which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Star to the effect that "Nixon says privately he is in trouble in Texas." They wish Nixon would quite saying things to Tower and others that permit gossip items like this to appear.

(2) Talked to Rentschler and Rumsfeld in Illinois.

Page was out of town.

Rumsfeld's pollster advises him that Nixon will carry Illinois by 450,000 -- this is an upward revision from his earlier estimate of a 300,000 margin. Also it is now definitely safe to say that Nixon will carry Cook County.

In the 21st District in southern Illinois:

	President	U.S. Senate	Governor	Congress
Republican	37	49	38	31
Democrat	32	30	41	52
Wallace	19			

Wallace. Wallace is strong downstate and in the blue collar backlash suburbs in Cook County but he hurts Humphrey much more than Nixon.

Wallace seems to be moving up.

Humphrey's stop-the-bombing maneuver will get him

some doves. Newton Minow, Humphrey's statewide chairman in Illinois, will announce a bunch of McCarthy people for Humphrey tomorrow.

Bruce Ladd, of Rumsfeld's staff, formerly a weekly publisher in Illinois, has taken responsibility for calling all the weekly editors in the state in an effort to get immediate and strong Nixon editorials.

Haldeman: Rentschler says the November 2 shopping center tour would be a perfect wind up for the Illinois campaign, especially as it would top Daley's torchlight parade the previous night.

Haldeman: One of our TV spots apparently shows a ballot with a "check" by Nixon's name rather than an "X". In Illinois, and in most other states with paper ballots, a "check" is grounds for disqualifying the entire ballot.

Lindsay is campaigning in Chicago today, spending most of the day with Ogilvie in Negro and Jewish wards -- then he will speak to the United Republican Fund tonight where they are having a 4500-person, \$100-a-plate dinner. Lindsay is cutting Wallace, praising Nixon as a moderate advocate of constructive change. He is saying that there are no racist overtones in Nixon's talk of law and order and is pointing out that Nixon has been scrupulous in that regard.

Lindsay also shrugged off the "Polack" and "Fat Jap" gaffs of Agnew as being insignificant and as having been clarified by Agnew himself.

The Illinois people have a number of things planned to pop in the next week or two. They have 250 Illinois mayors coming out next week. Also next week they have the offensive and defensive captains of the Chicago Bears coming out. Also next week they have the Democrats for Nixon being announced with the chairman being Lee Stern, a prominent Democrat and a leader in the structure of the Grain Exchange and a big leader in the Jewish community. Also next week they are having a big statewide press forum for John Mitchell.

MEMO TO RN

From Buchanan

October 5, 1968



The attacks on RN and Agnew have accelerated in recent days---they have become incredibly irresponsible; RN has been accused of being part of an Administration that let people starve in West Virginia. And we continue along our merry way. With no one responding to this thing. I realize that Laird and X surrogate said this and that, and that we have a transcript to ~~prove~~ ^{prove} it said it---but it doesn't make a damn bit of difference if he replied or not---because it sure as hell is not turning up in the News column.

~~As~~ ^{As} for Agnew, he is spending his time these days clearing up the record, or getting chopped up by the Press. He is getting this because he is ~~not~~ ^{not} making enough hard and tough news to make these bastards sit up and write it as the lead. Now, I don't know about Hess but from meeting him, I just doubt that he is the kind of nut-cutter RN needs right now.

I don't agree with Finch, ~~is~~ that the answer for Agnew is to get positive. Our job is not to make the New York Times happy. I think someone needs to kick the living hell out of Humphrey and if goes personally after us---then let's go right after him. I think Agnew has got to be that guy. We are letting Hubert off the defensive---he is on the attack every day---this for the most vulnerable candidate and the most vulnerable administration in history.

Neither Mitchell nor Ellsworth gets the kind of play that O'Brien does. They have Muskie and O'Brien and WHumphrey kicking the hell out of RN and who do we have that is kicking them and getting a headline worth talking about?

Maybd the decision has been made for RN to ignore this stuff and perhaps that is right. But my own personal view is that we can't not only for political, but for simply the morale of our troops, let them get away with the type of irresponsibility they have been getting away with.

My suggestion is that Buchanan go with Agnew for a while, and try to write two attacks a day for him---and have RN call Agnew and tell him this is what he wants done. We don't have any other guns than Agnew--and I think the experience of the campaign shows this. To do the job that needs doing I would need some weight with Agnew, some way to get through his staff if there is resistance there----some press people, just two or so, ~~and~~ that would be all we need. The objective is to get Agnew in the headlines every day hammering these people----and let the editorial writers squeal.

BUCHANAN

Richard V. Allen



Nixon for President Committee
450 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022
(212) 661-6400

Foreign Policy
Research Coordinator

7 October 68

Memo:

Bob Haldeman

Bob--

As soon as--and if--RN gets
a chance to read, would you please
put this in front of him?

Ordinarily, I never send papers
out to him, but I think he would
be interested in this one.

It would take about ten minutes
to run through, and is underlined.

Rich

7 Oct 68

To: RN
From: Dick Allen
Re: Attached - The "Bully Pulpit"

Among the numerous position and "idea" papers which we receive, those of Thornton Read are among the most stimulating and interesting.

Read is a physicist by training, but his help to us has been principally in the field of foreign affairs and military strategy. He is employed by Bell Telephone Laboratories, and is also affiliated with the Center for Advanced Studies at Princeton.

He has just submitted the attached paper on the "Bully Pulpit."

I recommend that you read if time is available.

THE RISE OF IDEOLOGICAL POLITICS AND
THE ROLE OF THE "BULLY PULPIT"

by

Thornton Read

October 2, 1968

As Richard Nixon pointed out in his radio address of September 29, "The sources of moral and civic order are in the family, the church, the school and the community" and he went on to question whether these institutions have "been doing the best they can to preserve the old and valued standards in this country?"

The fact is that the "old and valued standards" as well as the moral authority of family, church, school and community as value-sustaining institutions rested on a certain set of basic convictions and attitudes which in our day have become seriously eroded. As the intellectual-ideological foundations of moral and civic order grow weaker, civic order can no longer be sustained by a social discipline internalized in the individual citizen. Consequently external forcible coercion increasingly becomes the basis of order, the alternative to anarchy. The current demand for "law and order" is the inevitable consequence of the erosion of the attitudes and beliefs that are the foundations of moral and civic order.

As Irving Kristol puts it: "what every society needs is a moral authority.... The authority suitable for a liberal democracy is the authority of opinion, and this is itself the creation of the educated classes who, in such a society, are the opinion-makers. When these classes announce their unwillingness to create such an authoritative opinion - when they even deny the possibility of such opinion - society suffers a loss of equilibrium." Since these words were written [New York Times Magazine, December 20, 1964], the "loss of equilibrium" has reached alarming proportions.

Mr. Kristol goes on to say that "the overwhelming strength of the argument for free popular education in the early decades of the republic derived from the premise that a democracy, if it is to govern itself properly, needs men of good character, and that it is in the schools that good character receives its shape. Obviously such a point of view only makes sense if one presumes to recognize a 'good character' when one sees it.... But we have, in our time, no such presumption. Into the void left by traditional moral authority we have imparted nothing but psychiatry and 'mental hygiene'."

Later (Fortune, July 1968) Mr. Kristol wrote that what is now happening is "the slow draining away of legitimacy from existing institutions and prevailing traditions." Specifically "the civic-bourgeois culture is not being overwhelmed from without, but is rather being casually and almost contemptuously subverted from within." He goes right to the heart of the matter when he says that this development "almost surely...has something to do with the tremendous expansion of higher education in our times." And he asks: "how can a bourgeois society survive in a cultural ambience that derides every traditional bourgeois virtue and celebrates anything - from promiscuity to homosexuality to drugs to political terrorism - that is, in bourgeois eyes, perverse?"

*Note

To summarize: (1) The basis of the current crisis lies not in external conditions (such as the state of the economy, or lack of social justice) but in attitudes and beliefs. (2) The fault lies to a very large extent with a failure of the educated classes, in particular with the intelligensia defined as those who set the prevailing fashions in ideas. As our society has become increasingly secular, the intelligensia has taken over the role once played by the clergy; and the educated classes have become, in effect, the parishoners.

The ideas of the modern "secular religion" are as suitable for clever repartee in coffee house and faculty lounge as the traditional ideas were for sustaining a healthy, progressive democratic society - and vice versa.

The result is that, in this election year, the older bread-and-butter issues and interest-group politics have been overtaken by ideological issues (a crisis of values, legitimacy and moral authority), and a politics characterized by a massive schism within American society. On one side are the liberal intellectual classes and on the other what Joseph Kraft calls Middle America. Wallace's appeal is that he speaks to the alienated in Middle America; he articulates, however crudely, their (quite valid, if vaguely sensed) fear that American society is becoming unraveled; and he identifies (correctly, I think) the main source of the trouble - the "psuedo-intellectuals."

What is so alarming about Wallace is that he is saying in a crude form essentially what our best minds (as distinct from the intelligensia as a whole) are saying in a highly sophisticated form.

Richard Scammon writes that "Wallace is not really preaching revolution. He's calling for a return to those middle-class values that are prized by millions of Americans." As Norman Miller (Wall Street Journal, September 27) puts it: "George Wallace has conveyed to his followers a sense of enlistment in a common man's crusade against the Establishment. His astonishing appeal is no longer limited to the Deep South" - or, we might add, to the race issue.

In short what we now face is an old phenomenon: a populist demagogue exploiting (however illegitimately) the perfectly legitimate grievances of a population that feels (correctly) that the governing elites have failed, have betrayed the responsibilities implicit in the influence they wield (indirectly in the case of the intelligensia).

Daniel Elazar (The Public Interest, Summer 1966) illuminates the historical and geographical sources of the now alarming schism in American society: "The postwar growth of industrial and governmental power in the Northeastern megalopolis reinforced an already great concentration of cultural and intellectual power in the same area." Although "this concentration was actually greater a generation ago, and continues to be proportionately reduced in a number of ways, its effects became more profound after the war.... In an earlier age, most Americans were little influenced" by intellectual or cultural activities centered in the Northeast. This was changed after the war, partly because scholarship became an important agent of economic growth but even more because television emerged "as the great national dispenser of ideas. The television industry...not only projected the Easterners' image of contemporary American society on screens in an overwhelming majority of American homes, but did so with an impact that none of the other instruments of mass communication could match." The academics, intellectuals, opinion leaders, and those who dominate the communications field "have

viewed America through the most provincial eyes, even as they have attempted to express the most cosmopolitan ideas."

"At best this has led to the neglect of whole dimensions of American civilization or their distortion through lack of knowledge, sympathy, and perception. At worst, it is leading to a growing alienation of large segments of the American public from the values of intellectual freedom which, to them, have come to symbolize 'godlessness,' decadence, and immorality."

There we have it: the intelligensia, the vocal minority, is an ingrown group; its outlook is parochial; its members are in close touch with one another but not with much else. The intelligensia has a great impact on the rest of society, but - being given more to talking than to listening - it doesn't pick up much feedback. So now we're getting feedback in the form of the Wallace revolt, as we got it earlier in (Joe) McCarthyism.

Professor Elazar points out that the McCarthyism of the 1950's affected "large numbers of solid, sober people who would not normally be considered potential recruits for radicalism of any kind, but who...identified themselves with conservative anti-Communism" in part at least because of "a feeling of alienation from an 'establishment' which had itself become...alienated from the 'true' American way of life."

Later and in the "wake of...Supreme Court decisions on censorship, morals, religion, and criminal law, and particularly after President Kennedy's accession to office, the gap between the megalopolis and the rest of the country became publicly apparent. More and more people outside of the megalopolis were attracted to movements which appeared to challenge the Establishment. For most of these people, the radical right was much too radical, attacking as it did not only those Eastern ideas which were foreign to residents of the other sections, but also many national ideals held in common by residents of all sections. They sought a more moderate approach - and, for a while, seemed to find it in the person of Barry Goldwater."

James Reston wrote (July 16, 1964) of Goldwater's nomination that "A wholly new alignment of political forces in America is now

forming.... The story of San Francisco is much more complicated and interesting than the battle between the single-minded, industrious Goldwater pros and the tardy sophisticated, disorganized liberals.... There are deep historical and psychological tides running here.... Mr. Goldwater may attract all the ultras, and the antis...but he also attracts something that is precisely the opposite of these vicious and negative forces.... Mr. Goldwater touches the deep feeling of regret in American life: regret over the loss of religious faith; regret over the loss of simplicity and fidelity; regret, in short, over the loss of America's innocent and ideolistic youth."

Reston called attention to "a deep feeling that is seldom reported: That the nation...has drifted into attitudes and policies that debase and weaken the American character, and threaten the security of the nation."

Thus the Wallace phenomenon is not really very new. It is the latest manifestation of something that has been building up for a long time, and has, in fact, been pretty well recognized and analyzed by at least a few of our most perceptive observers, although even many of these have not fully appreciated the implications of their own observations.

Note

To recapitulate: What we now have is a deep division between (1) an educated articulate minority which is wrong on the most fundamental issues and (2) an inarticulate majority which realizes something is seriously amiss and reacts - often in disturbing and even dangerous ways. This basic split is a consequence of the self-isolation of the intelligensia - of the one-way interaction between the vocal minority and the inarticulate majority. The latter, the "forgotten" people in "Middle America" are aware of - indeed, through television, they are constantly assaulted by - the views and attitudes of the unrepresentative articulate minority. Their reaction is threefold:

Note

First, they don't like the new secular religion, the new morality, the new anti-bourgeois culture, the new ideas about child-rearing, patriotism, Communism, pornography, law-enforcement, student discipline, and civil disobedience.

Second, they don't like the new breakdown in civic order. And, in contrast to most of the articulate minority, they have the wit to recognize the obvious, namely the connection between ideas and consequences.

The cognoscenti, who have read DeTocqueville, Lyford Edwards, Crane Brinton, and Harry Eckstein, understand the role of intellectuals and ideas in causing revolutions and lesser civil disorders. The illiterate may get the same message by observing that some of our most dramatic examples of civil disorder have occurred on university campuses.

What we are now seeing is the Berkeley-plus-Watts-equals-Reagan formula on a larger scale.

Third, the majority of Americans do not like what the vocal minority has told them about themselves and their motives. As Vermont Royster said, if ordinary Americans "spoke their fears about slum riots, they were told they were racists. If they complained about taxes, they were selfish. If they wept for their children in Haight-Ashbury, they were old fogies. If they asked the policeman to clear the streets, they were reactionaries. And if they dared to see some virtue in family, thrift, industry or self-reliance they were merely bourgeois." And he concludes that "George Wallace would never have been heard of if others had not for too long ignored the discontents of many decent honorable and justly concerned people." [Wall Street Journal, September 11]

Irving Kristol says that so long as the anti-bourgeois, or "adversary" culture "was restricted to an avant-grade elite, the social and political consequences...were minimal.... But in the 1960's the avant-grade culture made a successful take-over bid, so to speak, and has now become the popular culture as well." It has indeed become the popular culture of the growing educated elite; but it's pretty unpopular with Mr. Kraft's "Middle America" and that's what much of the fuss is about.

Mr. Kristol writes that "An intellectual may be defined as a man who speaks with general authority about a subject on which he has no particular competence. This definition sounds ironic but

Note

Note

it is not. The authority is real enough, just as the lack of specific competence is crucial. An economist writing about economics is not acting as an intellectual, nor is a literary critic when he explicates a text. In such cases, we are witnessing professionals at work. On the other hand, there is good reason why we ordinarily take the 'man of letters' as the archetypical intellectual. It is he who most closely resembles his sociological forbear and ideal type: the sermonizing cleric.

"Precisely which people, at which time, in any particular social situation, are certified as 'intellectuals' is less important than the fact that such certification is achieved - informally but indisputably. And this process involves the recognition of the intellectual as legitimately possessing the prerogative of being moral guide and critic to the world. (It is not too much of an exaggeration to say that even the clergy in the modern world can claim this prerogative only to the extent that it apes the intellectual class...)." Further, "the intellectual lays claim - and the claim is, more often than not, recognized - to moral authority over the intentions and actions of political leaders" (Foreign Affairs, July 1967).

Here Mr. Kristol's insights have to be supplemented by Mr. Kraft's. Among the educated elite, the intellectual's claim to the role once played by the clergy is recognized. But among the rest of society, in "Middle America," among the inarticulate majority, the intellectuals' claim so far from being "indisputably certified" is indisputably and indignantly rejected.

U. S. News and World Report (June 3, 1968) finds a "Middle Class Revolt Brewing" in America: "The extremists have been getting the headlines.... But now, soundings across the country point to another kind of uprising that may be in the making - a big protest vote at the polls in November...."

"The public seems appalled by the collapse of accepted standards of behavior. In many instances, church members feel their pastors are preaching social revolution and civil disobedience rather than religion." In other words, not everyone is happy to see the clergy "aping the intellectual class."

The intelligensia's claim to replace family and church as the sources of moral authority and to replace traditional individual moral standards (we shall discuss in a later paper what they propose to replace these standards with and why) is what our current social-political-ideological upheaval is essentially about. Wallace's strength is that he has recognized this and has attacked not the Administration, but "the Establishment," and in particular what to the inarticulate majority is the voice of "the Establishment" namely the "psuedo-intellectuals."

Humphrey cannot attack the Administration because he is a part of it. Likewise Nixon does not attack "the Establishment" because he is a part of it, and in fact could not expect to govern without it. And to the extent that the revolting middle class blames "the Establishment" they will be attracted to anti-Establishment politicians - like Wallace and (Gene) McCarthy - and will not see a significant difference between Nixon and Humphrey, or between them and Johnson, Rockefeller, Muskie or Agnew.

The challenge to political leadership, as we shall argue more fully later, is to launch a dramatic movement to reform the non-monolithic "Establishment" from within by altering the balance of influence among its diverse and often conflicting components. The key concept, as we shall see, is to recognize a deep split within the intelligensia itself between a vocal majority and a sophisticated, responsible, realistic minority of what might be called reform intellectuals or a counter-intelligensia.

Just as there are forgotten men who make up the majority of the inarticulate majority, so there are forgotten men who make up a minority, but a crucial one, of the intelligensia. This minority and the silent majority are not in conflict. They are just out of touch. The challenge to political leadership in 1968 is to bring these two groups into an alliance and thereby (1) hold Middle America in the mainstream of American politics, (2) transform "the establishment" by altering its internal balance of influence, especially among the men of ideas and the men of words, and (3) change the climate of opinion in a way which preserves the essence of the traditional standards and makes them relevant to the new day.

Note

Note

The primary function of the next President will not be as a manager of the economy, or an interest broker, or even as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, or conductor of our foreign relations. It will be educational, intellectual and ideological (in the broad sense having to do with the underlying beliefs, convictions, standards and values that make possible a viable order that's not a police state). The next President, if he is to cope with the chaos threatening to overwhelm us will be, above all, the occupant of what Theodore Roosevelt called "the bully pulpit."

October 7, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC

FROM: Bob Ellsworth

I. Pennsylvania

On the basis of his polls plus registration figures
Duschi now predicts Nixon will carry Pennsylvania 47 - 43.

Wallace continues to gain and is pulling more and more
from Humphrey every day.

The Democrats in Philadelphia are working hard to counter
this, utilizing COPE.

Humphrey continues weak although COPE in Philadelphia
and the Barr organization in Pittsburgh (in addition to being
Mayor he is also Democratic National Committeeman) are active.
The Humphrey stop the bombing maneuver apparently has had no
effect whatsoever. The McCarthy people are still not in the
campaign.

Party leaders seem to be alert to the apathy/over-confidence
problem and are working to combat it. They have assigned quotas by
precinct, based on a computer analysis, and Shafer is actively
engaged in the project of meeting with all 18,000 precinct
committeemen and women. He has already met with 2000 and is
meeting with another 800 in Harrisburg tonight.

State Chairman Jordan and Allegany County Chairman
Hillman will aggressively go after weekly ^{newspaper} endorsements.

file

HRH

II. OHIO

Apathy and over-confidence are greatly feared although not measurably observed. To counter it in advance Andrews has called district meetings all over the state to get out the vote and is meeting next week in Columbus (assuming Congress has adjourned) with the 19 Republican members of Congress. In any case, there is substantially more apathy among the Democrats -- Wallace is hurting Humphrey a lot more than he is Nixon.

They are now predicting Nixon will carry Cincinnati by over 60,000 (substantially higher than 1960); will carry Franklin County (Columbus) with 63 percent of the vote (compared with 57 percent in 1960); and will not lose Cleveland by more than 120,000 (compared with a losing margin of 147,000 in 1960).

Statewide, Nixon will do better than 1960 when he carried Ohio by 200,000.

The Humphrey stop the bombing maneuver has had no effect so far. There have been no prominent McCarthyites doing or saying anything for him.

Andrews says the Wallace vote will be lower than is generally supposed.

Andrews is embarked on the program of having his legislators procure the endorsements of weeklies all over the state.

cc: Bob Haldeman
Bob Finch

7

10/8/68

TELEPHONE CALL

Jimmie Stewart has heard again from Onasis' man -- needs to talk with RN on telephone

Area Code 212

944 3300 -- office

TE 8-7400 -- Metropolitan Club where he lives

India House - where has lunch BO 9-2323

Saturday and Sunday - PL 3-9700 (Racquet Club)

Handwritten notes:

10/8/68 call Jimmie
 Jimmie Stewart
 (his)
 I should probably
 check with
 [unclear]
 [unclear]
 [unclear]

①

file

L.
R. & H. H.
[Signature]

October 9, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Keogh (cc: ✓ DC, Haldeman)

FROM: Ellsworth

In addition to the evidence of the "pocketbook" effect on the 1966 Congressional elections, we now have evidence that some of the sharpest COPE politicians think it is a dangerous sleeper against the Democrats this year. And now we have direct evidence that HHH himself thinks so.

Seems to me RN should hit this in some form or another every day.

good
Hit -
"mountain of evidence"
President for
now or out
of town (hosting) et
all press line to
other speech -

File Bryce

MEMORANDUM FOR DC
FROM BRYCE HARLOW

October 1, 1968

Congressman Brownie Reid of New York telephoned this morning -- said that at the Westchester County rally RN commented that he would like to visit with Reid sometime about foreign policy -- meaning, after the election.

Reid says he would enjoy a chance to talk this with RN before election, because he thinks he has some quite useful information on the Near East and on Vietnam that RN could put to good purpose in the present campaign.

I assured Reid this message would be passed along. He will gladly meet RN at any spot; it doesn't have to be Washington or New York.

There's no possibility ~~of~~ before the election + I guess Reid should be so advised.

B.H.
Bryce will phone.

④
4 del
Nox
October 10, 1968

five

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC
FROM: Ellsworth

One of HHH's TV commercials is on the Non-Proliferation Treaty and ends up with "Do you want the bomb in Mr. Castro's hands?"

Neither Cuba nor Red China is a signatory to the Treaty, and ratification of the Treaty this fall would not have had any effect on the possibility of Castro receiving nuclear bombs from Red China.

If Humphrey followed international affairs closely, he would have known that.

NB: RN should not bring this up. This material is provided only for defensive purposes. However, Kleindienst is filing a complaint with the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and also protesting directly to the TV networks and stations which showed the commercial.

Go out!
See if Klein can't
get Kleindienst on
TV to make this
point.

Phone H.

~~MLG~~ ~~RA~~

October 10, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC
FROM: Ellsworth

LG
G will check
to let me know
OK
Hold down
with a line

OK to set up
meeting? \$

Yes —
No —

let Ellsworth
know

Dr. J. H. Jackson is the head and the ruler of the National Baptist Convention, the nationwide convention of Negro Baptist churches. Jackson is an ultra-conservative and a strong ruler who has very great influence over the thoughts and actions of his members.

He has been authorized by the convention and the governing board to decide who the National Baptist Convention will endorse for President; he doesn't want to endorse HHH; he wants to endorse RN and will do so.

But, in order to satisfy his board and his convention he must meet with RN personally. He now awaits a signal from us as to when and where. His home base is in Detroit, but he will travel to whatever location we designate for the purpose of meeting with RN.

I strongly recommend the meeting be authorized, as soon as possible since of course it will take a while for the word to get disseminated and driven home to the 6 million members.

Garment

file

9

10:30
Am
Charles
Fletcher

Dwight -

H. / HRH call.

RN should see this
memo before he sees
Volpe.

Dr. Jackson
N.E. 6 0148

Risk - aff of man
& children

Moline Daily Dispatch
AP
October 10, 1968
Seoul, Korea

U.S. and North Korean negotiators met at Panmunjom today for the second straight day and a substantial breakthrough was in the making on the release of the crew of the USS Pueblo, intelligence sources said.

The sources declined to elaborate on what they meant as a breakthrough.

H - Have you new
check book?

October 11, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC
FROM: Ellsworth
RE: TV "Debate" issue.

(1) RN should not undertake to issue a positive statement on it, as that would only elevate the discussion to a level of the highest concern. Instead, RN should handle it in response to questions. (See Ellsworth statement issued this morning - attached).

(2) The RN response to questions should be short and to the point, not drawn out. Further, the tone of the response should be offhand and not particularly intense -- this also for the purpose of not elevating the matter to a level of high concern on the part of RN.

(3) Substance of the response should be:

(a) I said last spring I would debate the nominee of the other major party (May 30, 1968 Atlanta, Georgia) if Congress could work it out, as they did in 1960, to suspend the statutory requirement that all Presidential candidates be given equal TV time. We don't want third, fourth and fifth party splinter politics in this

country and I said last spring and I say again I will not participate in undermining our two-party system.

(b) Now, Congress hasn't been able to work it out -- the Senate, with 63 Democrats, was unable to get a quorum to consider the matter, so it has been dropped. Thus, any debate that took place this year at the Presidential level would have to^{be} a three, four or five-ring political circus.

(c) Therefore, because the Senate wouldn't take it up, there won't be any TV debates this year. It's as simple as that.

(d) Incidentally, although I do not put the matter on this basis, I do have an interesting quotation here:

"...losers always issue challenges to debate and winners never accept."

That was Mr. Humphrey's own campaign manager, Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, speaking in May of this year (Chicago Sun-Times, May 17, 1968).

NB: The question will undoubtedly come up that Humphrey has offered to purchase TV time and engage in a strictly two-man debate -- so doesn't that call Nixon's hand on his statement he is willing to debate Humphrey as long as splinter candidates can be kept out of the picture?

The answer: That is a slick, superficial public relations trick by Humphrey to make it appear that a two-way debate would be possible, but he knows perfectly well that unless the equal time law were suspended, which it has not been, it is impossible to work out a straight two-man "debate". Third, fourth, and fifth party candidates would still be able to demand the right to purchase an equal amount of time and an equal quality of time. This could even involve such splinter candidates demanding the right to purchase actual participation in the show. Basically, that is what Humphrey wants: to build up the third party candidate by forcing his participation on national televisions in a three-ring political circus. The Senate's inaction on the suspension of the equal time law has simply closed the subject of joint television appearance in this Presidential campaign.

Here is another interesting quote:

"...the Vice President said he would not participate in a television debate between himself and McCarthy if it included either McGovern or Maddox 'that would be a four-man wrestling contest.'"

(UPI-August 18, 1968)

Statement by
ROBERT ELLSWORTH
National Political Director
October 11, 1968

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Friday, October 11, 1968

Hubert Humphrey's desperate effort to change the equal time law has failed.

It is now time to reveal this gambit for what it really was.

Hubert Humphrey was not sponsoring a piece of legislation -- he was trying to sponsor George Wallace on national network television.

Humphrey and his campaign managers are well aware that he stands no chance in the popular election. However, they have clung to the vain hope that they could generate enough electoral college votes for Wallace to throw the election into the House of Representatives.

Their only chance was to get Wallace the greatest possible exposure on television.

That is why Hubert Humphrey personally patrolled the halls of Congress while the bill was being argued.

That is why Speaker McCormack took the fantastic step of locking in the Members of the House.

These desperate and cynical tactics succeeded temporarily when the House Democrats voted approval of the Wallace-Humphrey TV show.

But in the Senate, Senator Everett Dirksen saw through the cynical scheme and nailed it for what it was. Good night, Hubert. Good night, George.

#####

October 11, 1968

From Ellsworth

As Senator Fred Harris said earlier this spring when he was Hubert Humphrey's pre-convention campaign manager and Humphrey was being challenged by Senators McCarthy and Kennedy to debate, losers always challenge to debate and winners never debate -- of course, we ~~are~~ are not about to debate anybody.

Also, both Humphrey and Muskie voted to kill the ~~Vx~~ TV debate bill in 1964 when Goldwater wanted to debate Johnson, but that was an incumbent President, so I think the Fred Harris quote ~~is~~ ^{is} much more to the point ^{now} than the Humphrey-Muskie Senate votes of 1964.

This is silly -

a V.P. ~~has~~ has
access to all the
confidential info a Pres
has. ~~W.V.M.~~ Don't let them
duck out on this one -

October 13, 1968

MEMORANDUM

Done. / L. Wade

TO: DC

FROM: Ellsworth *[Signature]*

Minnesota poll of this morning was:

Nixon	44.5%	(up 0.5 from three weeks ago)
Humphrey	42.5%	(down 3.0)
Wallace	9.0%	(up 1.0)
Undecided	4.0%	

This poll based on questioning last Saturday, Sunday and Monday -- before RN Tuesday, October 8 visit to Minneapolis).

State-wide reaction to RN visit has been excellent. Governor LeVander now openly and actively enthusiastic as never before.. DFL state chairman told Clark MacGregor at lunch yesterday: "It's all over", referring to Minnesota as well as to the nation.

*Chamberlain
N.C. or Iowa*

!

*Finch -
Be sure this
is included
in round up*

*H
Agnew should
definitely be sent
there for a full day
also some surrogates
to this is better*

*Q N.B. while we
ship in East - we
seem to be gaining
slightly in the west*

get this
around in papers

K1
Will Do along
w/ other friends
Editorial

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS
October 14, 1968

Editorial supports RN and STA: Of STA, "...we are convinced he is a wise, a solid, and a courageous man who could qualify notably as Chief Executive if fate should call on him to do so." Of RN!... the more we study his ideas and hopes for the Nation, the better they look to us." Praising RN's "courage and astuteness," the NEWS cites the Hiss case and the Moscow kitchen debate, and goes on to list points in Foreign and Domestic affairs on which it thinks RN is sound and strong. "...He has proved that he is neither afraid of nor fooled by the conscienceless Communist tyrants in the Kremlin, Havana, Belgrade, and Peking...the most dramatic RN idea, we think, is his conception of 'Black Capitalism' -- meaning hard-headed banker and business help for responsible Negroes in founding or enlarging..enterprise...instead of softhearted and often graft-ridden Government handouts..."

#

Jill

October 15, 1968

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Fred LaRue
FROM: Manly Molpus
RE: Southern and Border States Speaker Schedule
Labor Day through Election Day

SEPTEMBER

<u>Date</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Place</u>
3	John Tower	Spartanburg - Florence, S. C.
12	John Tower	Nashville - Jackson, Tenn.
13	John Tower	Greensboro - Charlotte - Moorhead City, N. C.
	George Bush	Newport News, Va.
14	Howard Baker	Dallas, Tex.
23	Buz Lukens	Goldsboro, N. C.
25	Albert Watson	Jackson, Miss.
	Bo Callaway	Tampa, Fla.
28	John Tower	Fort Smith, Ark. - Lake Texoma, Okla.
	Strom Thurmond	Winston-Salem, N. C.

OCTOBER

1	Louie Nunn	Fort Lauderdale, Fla. - Savannah, Ga.
2	Strom Thurmond	Kannapolis, N. C.
3	Bill Brock	Panama City - Gainesville - Fort Pierce, Fla.
4	Strom Thurmond	Savannah - Vidalia - Dublin - Macon - Statesboro, Ga.

LaRUE
SOUTHERN SPEAKER SCHEDULE
PAGE 2

OCTOBER (cont'd)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Place</u>
4	Bill Brock	Wilmington - Clinton - Greensboro - Burlington, N. C.
	John Tower	Danville - Lynchburg - Martins- ville, Va.
	Julie/Tricia/David	Pensacola - Tallahassee, Fla.
5	Bill Brock	Bowling Green - Somerset - Ashland, Ky.
	John Tower	Richmond - South Hill - Harrisonburg, Va.
8	Julie/Tricia/David	Lexington, Ky.
9	George Bush and Rogers Morton	Arkansas
	Julie/Tricia/David	Knoxville, Tenn.
10	Ronald Reagan	Asheville - Greensboro - Gastonia, N. C.
11	Buz Lukens	Athens - Marietta - Atlanta - Macon, Ga.
	Strom Thurmond	Lake Charles, La.
12	Strom Thurmond	Tampa - Lakeland, Fla.
	Jack McDonald	Charlottesville, Va.
13	Strom Thurmond	West Virginia
14	Albert Watson	Griffin - Carrollton - Macon - Newnan - LaGrange, Ga.
	Gen. B. A. Schreiver	Houston - Corpus Christi, Tex.
15	Gen. B. A. Schreiver	San Antonio, Tex.
16	Bill Brock	Lawrenceburg, Tenn.
	Strom Thurmond	Hickory, N. C.
	Julie/Tricia/David	Paducah, Ky.
17	John Tower	Lexington, Ky.
	Paul Fannin	Atlanta, Ga. - Greenville, S. C.
	Julie/Tricia/David	Asheville, N. C.
18	John Tower	Louisville, Ky. - Gainesville, Fla.

OCTOBER (cont'd)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Place</u>
18	Julie/Tricia/David	Lynchburg, Va.
	Strom Thurmond	Hammond - Baton Rouge - Alexandria, La.
	Paul Fannin	Big Springs - Austin, Tex.
19	John Tower	Tampa - Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
	Strom Thurmond	Rome - Marietta - Augusta, Ga.
	Paul Fannin	Bryan - Orange - Beaumont, Tex.
	John Buchanan	North Carolina
21	Strom Thurmond	Greenville - New Bern - Wilming- ton, N. C.
22	Strom Thurmond	Columbus - Waycross - Thomasville, Ga.
	George Bush	Midland, Tex.
23	Strom Thurmond	Vidalia - Dublin - Macon, Ga.
24	Gen. B.A. Schreiber	Cocoa Beach, Fla.
25	Strom Thurmond	Texarkana - Marshall - Tyler - Longview, Tex.
	Jack McDonald	Florida
26	Strom Thurmond	Waco - Orange - Houston - Beaumont, Tex.
27	Jack McDonald	Atlanta, Ga. - Baton Rouge, La.
28	Julie/Tricia/David	Texas (tentative)
29	Gen. Mark Clark	Orlando
	John Rhodes	Oklahoma (tentative)
30	Bud Wilkinson	Atlanta, Ga.
31	Bob Taft, Jr.	Palm Beach, Fla. (tentative)

NOVEMBER

1	Strom Thurmond	Jacksonville - Gainesville - Tallahassee, Fla.
2	Strom Thurmond	Ocala - Pensacola - Panama City, Fla.