

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
Contested Materials Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
4	43	11/16/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: Tom Evans and fighting within the Republican Party. 1 pg.
4	43	11/2/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Letter	From Colson to Hallett RE: creating a realistic appraisal of the 1972 presidential election for posterity. 2 pgs.

November 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Tom Evans/RNC

I was told by a friend of mine at the RNC yesterday that Tom Evans is about to blow his cork. He thinks that we badly mistreated him and the RNC during the campaign. He has been on the verge of talking to reporters badmouthing the White House and the President, etc. Tom is also on the verge of quitting -- and perhaps with a blast at us.

We don't need this right now within the Party. Tom has been out of sorts for months, as you know. Personally I've never thought he was worth much but on the other hand he is co-chairman of the Republican National Committee and a blast from him would be well publicized and damaging.

My informant suggested that a call from you or obviously one from the President merely thanking him for a good job in the campaign and urging him to continue his work for the Party whatever he does would deter him from doing this. Tom, as you know, has been a big money man in the past and I would think from all standpoints we would want to try to keep him reasonably happy, if possible.

I would, therefore, recommend that you call him unless you think that perhaps the President should. I would be glad to do it but I don't think it would carry enough weight coming from me.

November 2, 1972

Dear Doug:

I have your latest missal of October 24 which I find incomprehensible. Either I am getting very dull-witted as the campaign grinds to an end or else Harvard is doing something to you. I have no idea what you're talking about on compounding immaturity, yours against mine, but I'll be glad to let one measure up against the other any day! I'm glad you liked the one speech of the Vice President's before the Conservative Party dinner, especially since it was based on your draft. I assume you also recognized significant portions of your earlier submission in the President's radio speech that I pointed out to you in my last letter.

Just for old time's sake, why don't you call me this weekend and tell me how we're going to do in Massachusetts. I still think Inman Square tells us a lot.

Since obviously the law school gives you nothing better to do than write snotty letters and long speeches, why don't you prepare an article on what the real meaning of this election was. Watch the liberal media turn on McGovern like piranhas. They will never be able to admit that the movement was defeated or that their ideas were out of step with the mainstream of American thought. They will have to come to the conclusion that their ideas were right and that the time was right for the movement, but that poor, bumbling idiot McGovern blew it. They will have to blame him since by definition, "movement" can't be wrong in its ideas and ideology. This is something you could have some fun with and could be damn useful to us.

In my opinion, whether the President builds a permanent new majority or whether this is merely a phenomenon of the 1972 election, will

depend on how well we are able to convince people that President Nixon does indeed represent the mainstream of American thought and that this year's election was a referendum on those very issues which we have identified. If people feel this was a referendum of the kind I think it is, then they may feel a permanent allegiance to a Nixon majority. If on the other hand, it is dismissed as an election year fluke, a bumbling George McGovern blows a golden opportunity and despite all of the vicious subversions of the political process that we have engaged in, Nixon somehow managed to back into a landslide -- that's at least the way they'll print it -- then we won't build a permanent majority. I think it is really how people perceive this.

One of the reasons that CBS and the Washington Post have gone on such an unprincipled and unprecedented vendetta over the Watergate/spying/Segretti/sabotage garbage is that it is the only way they can sour the country on this election. They don't want the majority in this country to feel proud of the way in which this President was re-elected, they want people to have bad memories about this election because if people think ill of this election and want to put it out of their minds or if they think that we "stole" it through our massive army of saboteurs, then they will detract from what really, in fact, has happened in 1972.

Maybe they've already poisoned the water so badly that even honest historians will not recognize what was at issue in 1972 and what was decided by the people. Maybe the post mortems of this election will deal with the Watergate, the fact that it should have defeated Nixon but it didn't because the whole country has become impervious to scandals, has come to accept them as a way of life, all politicians are discredited, etc. Clearly the lesser of evils mythology is building very fast and even though we were filthy sinister people, McGovern was such an inept ass that we won.* That's not the way it is and we need some of the bright young intellects of our party, which includes you, to start articulating what in fact did happen this year.

Let us hear from you.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Colson
Special Counsel to the President

Mr. Douglas Hallett
135 Antrim Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

*At least that's what the Walter Cronkites and Eric Sevareids will say.