<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Folder Number</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Notes on Tom Coakley. 1 page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Coakley for Attorney General to Coakley Leadership, re: Coakley pamphlet for mailing. 1 page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Democratic mailer list. 2 pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From Nixon to Freddie Martin (Dorothy), re: Salute to Tom Coakley Dinner. 2 pages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From H. C. Mc Clellan to George B. Gose, re: Note concerning political situation involving Senator Dolwig and Tom Coakley. 5 pages with attachments.
10-29

- talked to Coakley re: Democrats for Coakley....they do have --
  not too active -- Oscar Trippett is Chairman;

- he said he would have to check it out with Trippett -- but
  knew Trippett would want to know exactly what the program was
  -- before signing his name to it.....he would call, and advise MC at noon.

and this ties in with the call I got from Aspe - just a few
minutes later (returning my call).....he really registered his
complaint -- what's the mystery about this show? - why wasn't
the Judge acquainted with what they want him to do? -- you -- or
RN wouldn't do this without some advance notice as to what
was going to be said -- what was planned for the program --
- and if the Judge didn't approved -- he (Aspe) knew he wouldn't
consider doing it -- and what would we do then? and so on!
- when the conversation ended, he had calmed down -- apologized
but said the complaint about the way the whole thing had been
handled was legitimate -- that they really should have known last
week what the show was going to be.
To: Coakley Leadership

Enclosed are copies of a new hard-hitting Coakley pamphlet intended primarily for mailing to Democrats.

We believe this is an exceptionally effective brochure, and it could be the means of obtaining the minimum 20 percent of registered Democrats which Judge Coakley must have to win.

Purchase and distribution of this pamphlet must be locally financed. We hope you will arrange for its distribution at least to these registered Democrats living in selected high income or conservative areas.

This pamphlet has been produced by Robinson & Company, 830 Market Street, San Francisco 2. It should be ordered direct in either of two ways:

1. The Robinson Company has already compiled lists of Democrats in selected areas in numbers indicated on the attached table. Pamphlets will be addressed and mailed to these Democrats on a one-per-family basis for 10¢ each; for example, 10,000 pieces for $1,000.

2. Pamphlets alone will be supplied for local addressing at 3¢ each; for example, 10,000 for $300. Three cents postage is necessary (or 2¢ with bulk mailing permit).

Please determine immediately how many of these you can finance and get your orders in, since time is passing rapidly. You should figure on getting campaign mail delivered to the post office not later than October 26.

Remember, send your orders, not to campaign headquarters, but to Robinson & Company, 830 Market Street, San Francisco 2.

THIS IS A PROJECT JUDGE COAKLEY IS EXTREMELY ANXIOUS TO HAVE GO FORWARD IN THE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE QUANTITY!

Thanks.

COAKLEY FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL COMMITTEE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Complete Coverage</th>
<th>Selective Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>184,510</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>14,866</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>79,482</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>5,811</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>65,429</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>17,184</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>9,269</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>49,856</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,122,052</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>22,895</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>8,564</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>13,690</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>24,295</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>12,543</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>106,477</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>11,288</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>45,422</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>92,871</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>103,260</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>155,965</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>160,527</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>41,425</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>14,698</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>77,917</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>25,687</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>126,769</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>15,707</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Complete Coverage</td>
<td>Selective Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>12,459</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>23,524</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>25,950</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>26,786</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>24,330</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuolumne</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>33,100</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2,846,994   450,000
COMPARE

These
Two
Men
JUDGE TOM
COAKLEY

With a long and honored legal background — 16 years in the private practice of law; a term as Deputy Attorney General; and service in 35 counties as a Superior Court Judge since 1953 — Judge Coakley offers a clear cut, fighting program for the proper conduct of the state’s highest legal office.

FULL-TIME ATTENTION to the tremendous legal responsibilities of the office of Attorney General. That is the keynote of Judge Coakley’s concept of public service. He deplores the incumbent’s use of the Office for political partisanship — the conflict of interest between the Attorney General’s solemn and multifold duties to the citizens of California, and a Party Officer’s entanglements with purely political expediency.

LEADERSHIP IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAW to the end that California’s shocking — and nationally recognized — crime rate shall be corrected; to the end that the rights of all law-abiding citizens shall be faithfully and equitably protected, and that the rights of criminals shall not be over-stressed, to the detriment of society as a whole. This Judge Coakley pledges to his fellow Californians.

RESPECT for the efforts of dedicated local law enforcement officers, instead of an ideological antipathy toward their duties and their performance, characterizes Judge Coakley’s concept of his public duties. It will guide him as Attorney General.

PERSONAL INTEGRITY beyond question. Judge Coakley’s life, his career, are an open book; a book filled with the record of personal, professional and civic achievements, and the honors that go with such accomplishments. He believes deeply that respect for law and order is the key to our civilization; that this respect, this active defense of the rights of others, must begin in the home — and that only through a renaissance of such respect in all levels of private and public life can we hope to restore a high degree of law and order.

PROTECTION of the civil rights of all Americans, including their freedom to engage in lawful political activities, and unyielding opposition to the Communists, their allies, and their drive to destroy these rights, are principles which will guide Judge Coakley in the Attorney General’s important role in the struggle between freedom and its enemies. As Attorney General he will resist with vigor and conviction any forces which threaten the individual rights of Americans. Unlike the present Attorney General, he will not use his office and the personnel of the Department of Justice to play partisan politics, to promote his own ideology, and to engage in public-financed harassment of citizens and organizations with whom he does not agree.

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN TRADITIONS — especially the fundamental tradition that this is a Nation under God, a Nation in which all men, all beliefs can find sanctuary — is basic to Judge Coakley’s philosophy of life and of public service. As he would oppose injection of sectarian religious practices into schools or other public institutions, so will he fight to preserve for all Americans their right to recognize their God publicly, and to honor Him in the conduct of their daily lives.

APPLICATION OF EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING to the intelligent, vigorous, and equitable enforcement of the law can be counted on in Judge Coakley’s administration of the duties of Attorney General. He is a Californian by birth, and is California educated, from Oakland public schools, through St. Mary’s High School, the University of California, Hastings Law College, and finally an LL.B. degree from Boalt Hall, U. C. in 1933. Judge Coakley has been a member of the Judicial Council of California, the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California, the Committee of Bar Examiners, State Bar of California, and served as President of the Bar Association of San Francisco in 1948.

COMPARE THESE TWO MEN . . .
STANLEY MOSK

Stanley Mosk claims to have a “Distinguished Record.” But a careful examination of Mr. Mosk’s career shows many question marks:

WHY does he divide his loyalty between the vital legal responsibilities of the state’s highest legal office, and the political duties of National Committeeman for his political party?

Can Mr. Mosk, as the Los Angeles Herald Express asked following his selection as National Committeeman, “honestly do a fair job of representing all the people of California as Chief of Law Enforcement, the job to which he was elected, and at the same time not show partiality to the Party of which he has become the leader”? Again to quote the Herald-Express: “Either of the two positions is a full time job. . . . No man can be true to two masters.”

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

WHY does Stanley Mosk persist in statistical skulduggery in order to minimize the tragedy of California’s shocking record of major crimes?

Mr. Mosk points with pride to the fact that FBI figures show that in the normal annual fluctuation in crime statistics, there was a decrease last year of 1.4%. Any decrease of course is welcome; but the FBI figures to which Mr. Mosk does NOT point with pride, nor even mention, are those that show that in California the number of major crimes (rape, murder, armed robbery, etc.) is almost twice the number committed in New York State, and almost twice the national average. Furthermore, California official figures show a steady increase in the State’s crime rate during the past eight years: from 1066 per 100,000 population to 1536.6 . . . almost a 50% increase!

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

WHY has Stanley Mosk down-graded California’s law enforcement officers?

Mr. Mosk has been widely criticized for failure to give effective leadership to law enforcement and for giving virtually no assistance or cooperation in obtaining enactment of laws proposed by those groups for more effective control of crime. Actually, Mr. Mosk has apparently been more concerned with the rights of criminals, to the detriment of the public’s protection. At a Town Hall luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles on July 26, 1955, then Superior Judge Stanley Mosk, in commenting on the Cahan decision dealing with gathering of evidence by police officers, sneered: “More officers ‘may find it necessary to use their heads instead of hobnailed boots.”

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

HOW can Stanley Mosk deny, or gloss over, his complicity in the infamous “bugging” case in which he was involved when he was executive secretary to Governor Culbert Olson?

He’s tried to gloss it over, but he can’t deny that the official report of the Assembly Investigating Committee on Interference with the Legislature—which censured the Olson administration for the offense against Speaker Gordon H. Garland—named “M. Stanley Mosk” as one of those involved in the plot and as the one who signed checks to pay for installation of the listening device.

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

WAS Stanley Mosk an officer of the National Lawyers Guild, which has been officially listed as a Communist front organization?

Mr. Mosk dodges the question. But the Los Angeles Daily Journal, which serves the legal profession in that area, in its September 12, 1944, issue named Mosk as a member of the Executive Board of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Guild.

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

WHY hasn’t Stanley Mosk repudiated the stand of the American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations which are intent on stripping God from our public life?

Mr. Mosk has refused to state his views on the nationwide campaign of the ACLU and other organizations to extend the Supreme Court’s “prayer decision.” Many are the reports—in the daily and Communist press—of Mr. Mosk’s participation in ACLU meetings. This, despite the fact that the ACLU is conducting an all-out campaign to further extend the prayer decision . . . a drive that, carried to its logical and dismal conclusion, would result in the elimination of chaplains from our military and our prisons, of the phrase “under God” from our pledge of allegiance to the flag, and of Christmas observances from public schools and institutions.

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

DOES Mr. Mosk really want to be Attorney General?

It has been widely reported—and never denied by Mr. Mosk—that his over-riding interest is an appointment to the State Supreme Court, rather than four more years as Attorney General. Californians have a right to expect their Attorney General to serve a full term and not to go into a campaign for one job while secretly maneuvering to obtain another.

IS THAT MR. MOSK’S CONCEPT OF A “Distinguished Record”?

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR CUT...
Judge Tom Coakley with his wife Katharine, sons Joseph and Peter, daughters Jeannette and Molly, and daughter-in-law Janice.

Ex-bandleader Tom Coakley is joined by some of his contemporaries of the '30's at recent musical Salute to Tom Coakley at San Francisco's famed Palace Hotel: Red Nichols, Anson Weeks, Freddy Martin.

College athlete, rancher, lover of the outdoors, Tom Coakley is seen with his children during the period when he was operating a farm in Alhambra Valley, Contra Costa County—a farm he still owns.

**VOTE NOV. 6 ELECT JUDGE TOM COAKLEY ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**CALIFORNIANS UNITED FOR COAKLEY**

**JOHN B. BATES**
Northern California Chairman

**WILLIAM L. FERDON**
Northern California Democratic Chairman

**C. P. MASSEY**
Southern California Chairman

**OSCAR A. TRIPPE**
Southern California Democratic Chairman

Additional copies of this leaflet may be obtained for 3c each from Robinson & Co., 830 Market St., San Francisco. Quantity prices on application.

**Governor Goodwin Knight is welcomed to the Mariposa County Centennial by Judge Coakley in May, 1954.**

**THIS IS THE MAN CALIFORNIA NEEDS:**

Judge Tom Coakley is a man superbly fitted by temperament, training, and ability for the state's most important legal post.

Nine years a Superior Court Judge, 16 years before that a lawyer in private practice, he has served as President of the San Francisco Bar Association, as a member of the Board of Governors of the State Bar of California, and as a member of the California Judicial Council.

His deep respect for the interests and rights of other people, his dedication to civic responsibility, are mirrored in his many civic activities and honors. He served as President of the Board of State Harbor Commissioners for San Francisco, 1946-1948. He has been President of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities, and the California Association of Port Authorities.

He has served as a director of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco Bay Area Council, Junior Achievement of San Francisco, San Francisco Federation fund (United Crusade) and the University of California Alumni Council. He is the founder and past president of the Mariposa County Historical Society, and Trustee of the California Historical Society.

For more than 30 years he has been a member of the California Farm Bureau Federation and for more than 30 years a member of the American Federation of Musicians, A.F. of L.

A rancher, member of the University of California Pacific Coast Conference championship basketball team in 1929, and musician, during college days, of national popularity, Judge Tom Coakley represents the finest traditions of American life.

Judge Coakley will represent the finest traditions of American public life as California's next Attorney General.
September 27, 1962

Dear Dr. Root:

Your letter of September 26th was appreciated. My personal thanks for your generous remarks on the job we are trying to do.

I do want you to know that Dick Nixon has asked Judge Coakley to participate in all seven of the Telethons which have been scheduled in various cities, and he is planning to do so.

We certainly agree with your evaluation in this connection, and feel certain the Telethon appearances will prove effective in helping Judge Coakley reach the television audiences in strategic locations.

Again, our thanks for your thoughtful letter and for your fine support.

WIN WITH NIXON!

H. R. Haldeman

Terrell L. Root, D.D.S.
1879 Newport Boulevard
Costa Mesa, California
September 26, 1962

Mr. Robert Halderman
c/o Nixon for Governor
3908 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, 5, California

Dear Mr. Halderman:

As a member of the Orange County Republican Central Committee I would like to thank you for the tremendous effort you are making for Mr. Nixon and therefore, the entire Republican slate in this all important election.

We have much to do, but victory will be ours.

I had the pleasure of hearing Judge Tom Coakley speak recently. He is a very effective speaker, with an excellent case against Mosk. (I personally think that Mosk is about as bad as they come.) When I asked him about getting this documented story about Mosk before the people of California via T.V., Judge Coakley felt his time would be extremely limited if at all because of financial reasons. I sincerely feel that if the Judge were given adequate time to develop his theme on T.V. it would not only help him, but would swing many independent and democratic votes to Mr. Nixon and the entire Republican slate. The people in California are thirsting for an issue such as this.

Please consider seriously allowing Judge Tom Coakley enough T.V. time with Mr. Nixon to adequately develop his theme.

Thank you again for your efforts in this election.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TLR/1k
To Dorothy

TO: FREDDIE MARTIN
SALUTE TO TOM COAKLEY DINNER
COCONUT GROVE
AMBASSADOR HOTEL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

IT IS A SOURCE OF GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT TO ME THAT I AM UNABLE TO JOIN WITH YOU AND THE MANY LOYAL AND DEVOTED SUPPORTERS OF JUDGE TOM COAKLEY AT TONIGHT'S DINNER.

THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA ARE INDEED FORTUNATE TO HAVE A MAN OF TOM COAKLEY'S GREAT STATURE AND HIGH ABILITY AS THEIR CANDIDATE TO BE THE NEXT ATTORNEY GENERAL AND I AM PARTICULARLY HONORED TO SHARE OUR TICKET WITH HIM.

ONE OF CALIFORNIA'S DESPERATE NEEDS, AS A RESULT OF THE RINGLING INDECISION AND INCOMPETENCE WHICH HAS CHARACTERIZED THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION, IS STRONG LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT OF LOCAL OFFICIALS IN THE REDUCTION AND PREVENTION OF CRIME AND IN THE ELIMINATION OF THE WHOLESALE NARCOTICS TRAFFIC WHICH BROWN AND HIS ADMINISTRATION HAVE PERMITTED TO RUN RAMPANT. THIS DEPLORABLE SITUATION HAS CAST A PALL OVER THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA WHICH IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE EXAMPLE OF LEADERSHIP WHICH WE MUST PROVIDE FOR THE NATION

IN MOVING AHEAD TO DECISIONS FOR NEW OPPORTUNITY AND NEW PROGRESS FOR ALL OUR CITIZENS.

AS ATTORNEY GENERAL, TOM COAKLEY WILL MOVE ACTIVELY AND AGGRESSIVELY TO REVERSE THIS TREND AND WILL PROVIDE THE SOUND JUDGMENT, THE COMPETENCE
AND THE CLIMATE OF COOPERATION WHICH IS NECESSARY TO ELIMINATE THE BLIGHT OF UNCHECKED CRIMINAL ELEMENTS AND TO MOVE CALIFORNIA INTO THE
SUNLIGHT OF DECENCY, DIGNITY AND INDIVIDUAL PRIDE BEFORE THE EYES OF
THE NATION... AND THE WORLD...
MY BEST WISHES TO THOSE WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN TONIGHT'S DINNER AND
TO TOM COAKLEY, MY GOOD FRIEND AND EXCELLENT TEAM-MATE IN THIS IMPORTANT
CAMPAIGN.

WITH WARM REGARDS,

DICK NIXON
April 13, 1962

Mr. George B. Goode
Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company
523 W. 6th Street
Los Angeles, California

Dear George:

Thank you very much for your note concerning the political situation involving Senator Dolvie and Tom Coakley. I recognize, of course, the complications that you have mentioned.

I have never met Mr. Coakley personally. During a recent visit in San Francisco, however, I talked at some length with Republican leadership there. They said very complimentary things about Judge Coakley. He certainly does have some stout support in the Bay area from the Republicans.

Senator Dolvie’s record speaks for itself. He is a good man and a good Republican too.

The problem we face is simply this; during primary campaigns when more than one Republican is seeking the same office good Republicans differ in opinion as to which candidate should be chosen to represent the party. This is as you know is true in the campaign for the Governorship just as it is in the campaign for State Attorney General. Dick Nixon is not choosing between Coakley and Dolvie at this time. He simply cannot do so prior to the Primary as you will understand. Those of us who are on Dick’s official campaign team are taking the same position for the same reason. Some of Dick’s supporters, however, are I am sure separately supporting one or the other of the candidates for the Attorney General’s Office.
April 13, 1962

Mr. George B. Gore

Should you wish to get first hand knowledge about
Tom Cranley, I suggest you might call Bob Cooke.
Bob knows him well through his acquaintancehip in
San Francisco. I am sure and could undoubtedly provide
further information on his background.

Cordially,

H. C. Mc Clellan
April 12, 1962

Mr. H. C. McClellan
President
Old Colony Paint & Chemical Company
Box 2176, Terminal Annex Post Office
Los Angeles 54, California

Dear Chad:

In working for Senator Dolwig I have twice run into situations where Nixon supporters were helping Tom Coakley.

They tell me Coakley is a very charming guy, but if the statements in the enclosed Democratic letter are correct, he seems a questionable running mate.

He was a Democrat. He sought the support of the C.D.C. He was "considered to hold liberal views."

What goes on?

Sincerely,

George B. Gose

cc. Chas. Ducommun
Earl Adams
Ed Valentine

YOUR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE
March 37, 1962

Dear Fellow Democrat:

It would seem appropriate, considering that our committee is obligated to sponsor the candidacy of Attorney General Stanley Mosk for reelection this fall, that I as chairman of the committee outline some personal reactions to the recent announcement of Judge Tom Coakley that he is a candidate for the Republican nomination.

Those of you who were on the committee four years ago will remember that just prior to the CDC convention that winter, Tom called me up to ask our help in placing his name in nomination as a Democrat running against Stanley Mosk. Tom told me at that time that since his brother was not planning to run as a Republican, he felt free to run as a Democrat. He told me that he had already secured many offers of financial support from attorneys all over the state.

I explained to him the usual procedure needed to obtain official party support in the primary. With his blessing, we began to work to develop an organization in Northern California so that we could present Tom's name at the CDC convention. I personally developed a fairly strong bloc in the Second Congressional District and obtained promises ranging from strong interest to support from the chairman of nearby San Joaquin Valley central committees. I contacted Roger Kent, who was our Northern California chairman at that time, and found him interested. At the last minute Tom called off our drive.

A year later, Pat Brown had been elected Governor, and we as local representatives of the party in power began to recommend Democrats to replace active Republicans in county offices as their terms expired. Tom took violent exception to this, as you will all remember. By the next election he had changed his registration to Republican.

(This may be literally true, but long before then I was committed to work 4 told Coakley that I that in my opinion the AEA had to come from So Calif. D.L.)
Personally, I think Tom’s chances in the primary are reasonably good. The Republican party organization is supporting Senator Dolwig of San Mateo County. The man he defeated for the party endorsement, Assemblyman Allen of Santa Clara County, is running independently. This leaves a Southern Californian no place to go but to Tom Coakley, if he puts sectional interest above party loyalty. In a three-way race, Tom, if he has good financial support, could win. The financial support seems to be forthcoming.

It is my personal belief that one of the reasons Tom pulled out in 1958 was because he discovered his financial support from attorneys was all Republican and consequently unavailable to a Democrat. I think Tom has been eager to run for something for some time and is using our county as his steppingstone to bigger things.

I am also surprised at Tom’s complete switch within four years. He used to be considered to hold liberal views. Last week when he declared his candidacy, he described himself to the press as a conservative.

I am especially disturbed by his most specific criticism of Attorney General Mosk, which, and I quote directly, is as follows: “He’s gone out of his way to ridicule people who do not agree with him. He is the hatchet man for the left-wing element of the Democratic Party.”

It is obvious that he is referring to Stanley Mosk’s report on the John Birch Society, in which Attorney General Mosk said, “The John Birch Society is composed of wealthy businessmen, retired army officers, and little old ladies in tennis shoes.” This classic remark has been quoted all over the United States and has been an effective blow to the growth of that society, for nothing is as effective against a bigot as ridicule.

It is also interesting that now Tom Coakley feels it is not necessary for him to resign his judgeship in order to be a candidate for Attorney General, which is contrary to the position he took four years ago. He rationalizes by saying that the position of Attorney General is a quasi-judicial job and should be nonpartisan, even though the election code sets it up as a partisan office and even though he himself is running with a partisan label for a partisan nomination.

All of the above is strictly personal. However, Mariposa County seems to be a focal point for Republican activity in the forthcoming campaign. This will put more than usual pressure upon us as the Democratic Party representatives in the county.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sterling S. Cramer
Chairman