

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>
50	15	7/24/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From RN to Tricia and Julie RN: Suggested anecdotes when asked about political events and also of personal anecdotes of Nixon that are not publicly known. 3pgs. 2 copies.
50	15	7/23/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From RN to B. Haldeman RE: Limiting registration efforts to non-college youth. 2pgs. 2 copies.
50	15	7/30/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From RN to B. Haldeman RE: Guidance in handling the press. 3pgs. 2 copies.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [138]	memo	RN to Tricia & Julie re anecdotes	7/24/72	C
N-2 [138]	draft	copy of doc # N-1	7/24/72	C
N-3 [139]	memo	RN to HRH re Gallup Poll on youth	7/23/72	C
N-4 [139]	draft	copy of doc # N-3	[7/23/72]	C
N-5 [140]	memo	RN to HRH re Lou Cannon's article in Washington Post	7/30/72	C
N-6 [140]	draft	copy of doc # N-5	[7/30/72]	C

FILE GROUP TITLE

PPF

BOX NUMBER

4

FOLDER TITLE

Memos - July 1972

RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
 B. National security classified information.
 C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
 D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
 F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
 G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
 H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: President's Personal Files
Box Number: 4

Folder: Memos - July 1972

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
138	Return Private/Political
139	Return Private/Political
140	Return Private/Political

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 24, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR TRICIA AND JULIE

FROM THE PRESIDENT 

It occurs to me that from time to time you may be asked for anecdotes which would relate to some of the political events that have occurred over the years.

One of the best ones is a Churchill quote which could well be used by each of you when the question is raised as to how you felt after the 1960 campaign. As you will recall, Churchill in 1945, after the allies had won the war came up for election. To the great surprise of the whole world and of everybody concerned, the Labor Party won and Churchill lost. Churchill's wife, the next day, said to him, "This may be a blessing in disguise." Churchill's response was, "If this was a blessing it was very well disguised." You might say that that is the way that both of you felt after the election defeat in 1960.

Another line that is very useful is with regard to the comeback after the defeat in California. You could tell of how President de Gaulle gave a luncheon for your mother and me, and that after the luncheon he told some of his very close associates that he thought your father had a position of political leadership ahead of him despite what had happened in the 1960 and 1962 elections. You can also point out that in his informal toast that he gave at the luncheon he surprised everybody concerned by referring to his past friendship for your father and said that he felt that there was more responsibility for leadership in the years ahead.

Of course, de Gaulle had his ups and downs as well. After leading the French resistance forces to victory in World War II and serving as the head of government in France for a period, he lost the election and went into total retirement. He then came back many years later when France needed him to hold the country together and to give a new spirit to the French people.

Also, on a personal side, you might mention some of our Christmas parties where I played the piano for group singing, etc., always by ear. In fact, one particularly interesting anecdote was an occasion in New York when Tom Dewey was there and Monsignor Ahearn as well as Bishop Cooke, who later became Cardinal. Ahearn had a beautiful tenor voice and Dewey was an excellent baritone. I played the piano and the two of them sang a duet to the delight of 75 to 100 of our guests who were present.

You can say that these kinds of events are not publicly known but they have been part of the Nixon story that is to you most heartwarming. And also point out that when you had your own birthday parties, etc., that I from time to time played a happy birthday song for you.

I think another personal note that could be made is that when I come in to dinner at the White House - before dinner I will often make telephone calls. I call people who may be sick, who have had hard luck like losing an election or not getting a promotion in business that they expected, or sometimes the mother of someone who has been killed in action. These calls never, of course, are publicized because they are personal in nature, but I feel this is one of the responsibilities of the President. As a matter of fact, one of the most rewarding things about the position is to be able to call people, not only when they have been very successful and to congratulate them, but also when they have fallen on hard times or had back luck one way or another. To me these personal calls never given to the press are the most rewarding ones I make from a personal standpoint. Everybody, of course, calls an individual when he does well and when he is successful. I know from experience that you receive very few letters or

calls when you suffer a defeat. It is in that period that you find out who your real friends are, and a President should always be the first one to recognize this fact -- to stick by people or to remember them on those occasions when they have reason to believe that everyone else has forgotten them.

RN Tape 7/24/72

Memorandum to Tricia AND Julie

It occurs to me that from time to time you may be asked for anecdotes which would relate to some of the political events that have occurred over the years.

One of the best ones is a Churchill quote which could well be used by each of you when the question is raised as to how you felt after the 1960 campaign. As you will recall, Churchill in 1945 after the allies had won the war came up for election. ~~Britain~~, to the great surprise of the whole world and of everybody concerned, the Labor Party won and Churchill lost. Churchill's wife the next day said to him "this may be a blessing in disguise." Churchill's response was, "if this was ~~a~~ blessing it was very well disguised." You might say that that is the way that both of you felt after the election defeat of 1960.

Another line that is very useful is with regard to the comeback after the defeat in California. You could tell of how President de Gaulle gave a luncheon for your mother and me and that after the luncheon he told some of his very close associates that he thought ~~that~~-- your father had a position of political leadership ahead of him despite what had happened in the 1960 and 1962 elections. You can also point out that in his informal toast that he gave at the luncheon he surprised everybody concerned by referring to his past friendship for your

father and ~~the~~ said that he felt that there was more responsibilities for leadership in the years ahead.

Of course, De Gaulle had his ups and downs as well. After leading the French resistance forces ~~to~~ to victory in World War II and serving as the head of government in France for a period he lost the election and went into total retirement. He then came back many years later when France needed him to hold the country together and to give a new spirit to the French people.

Also on a personal side, you might ~~make~~ mention  some of our Christmas parties where I played the piano for groups singing, etc., always by ear. In fact, one particularly interesting anecdote was ~~when~~ - an occasion in New York when Tom Dewey was there and Monsignor Ahearn as well as Bishop Cooke who later became Cardinal. Ahearn had a beautiful tenor voice and Dewey was an excellent baritone. I played the piano and the two of them sang a duet to the delight of 75 to 100 of our guests who were present.

You can say that
These kinds of events are not publicly known but they have been part of the Nixon story that is to you most heartwarming. And also point out that when you had your own birthday parties, etc. that I from time to time played a ~~happy~~ happy birthday song for you.

I think another personal note that could be made is that when I come in to dinner at the White House - before dinner I will often make telephone calls. I call people who may be sick, who have had hard luck like losing an election or not getting a promotion in business that they expected, or sometimes the mother of someone who has been killed in action. These calls never, of course, are publicized because they are personal in nature, but I feel this is one of the responsibilities of the President. As a matter of fact, one of the most rewarding things about the position is to be able to call people not only when they have been very successful and to congratulate them, but also when they have fallen on hard times or had back luck one way or another. To me these personal calls never given to the press are the most rewarding ones I make ~~on a personal~~ from a personal standpoint. Everybody, of course, calls ~~xxx~~ an individual when he does well and when he is successful. I know from experience that you receive very few letters or calls when you suffer a defeat. It is in that period that you find out who your real friends are, and a President should always be the first one to recognize this fact -- to stick by people or to remember them on those occasions when they have reason to believe that everyone else has forgotten them.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Sunday - July 23, 1972
Camp David

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB HALDEMAN

FROM THE PRESIDENT *AW*

In studying the New York Times release of the Gallup Poll on youth one lesson comes through loud and clear -- it is imperative that we limit our registration efforts wherever possible, without announcing that that is our tactic, to the non-college youth. Of course, some registration of college youth on a very selective basis should be undertaken, but generally speaking we have to realize that there is about a two to one chance that college youth will vote for McGovern. There is about an even chance that the non-college youth will vote for us.

If a youth registration drive begins, pushed by the McGovern forces, every effort should be made to get them to direct that drive to non-college as well as to college youth. I know that our plan is to register youth selectively by finding out in advance which side they are on and then going forward in the registration. Here it is very important that the question asked not be on partisan terms. Over half of all youth list themselves as Independents rather than Republicans or Democrats. Consequently, it should simply be a question of asking whether they are for McGovern or Nixon and then registering those that are for Nixon.

Of course, it could be argued that the registration drive among youth, even non-college youth, is not one that we should undertake at all, since at the very best they would split 50-50. This is much poorer than the national average and much poorer than what we would do among older voters. However, to avoid the effect on older voters of our conceding the youth vote to McGovern, we need to make some effort in this area. Let us limit it to the target states, particularly

the big city areas and the down-state areas where we might pick up support and except for a token effort let us concentrate on non-college, blue collar youth, among ethnics and, of course, among those few that might lean to our side because of their background in a Republican family.

I emphasize again that the whole youth effort should be one that gets across the idea that youth will not overwhelmingly be in McGovern's pocket, that we have in the nation very substantial support among younger voters and that we are going to get more as they learn what the issues are. In fact, something can be gained by pointing out that we are concentrating on registering all youth and that the McGovern people are limiting themselves to the elite youth who have gone to college or are in colleges and universities.

Halderman

Date the memorandum - Sunday - Camp David

In studying the New York Times release of the Gallup Poll on youth one lesson comes through loud and clear -- it is imperative that we limit our registration efforts wherever possible without announcing that that is our tactic, to the non-college youth. Of course, some registration of college youth on a very selective basis should be undertaken, but generally speaking we have to realize that there is about a two to one chance that college youth will vote for McGovern. There is about an even chance that the non-college youth will vote for us.

If a youth registration drive begins pushed by the McGovern forces every effort should be made to get them to direct that drive to non-college as well as to college youth. I know that our plan is to register youth selectively by finding out in advance which side they are on and then going forward in the registration. Here it is very important that the question asked not be on partisan terms. Over half of all youth list themselves as Independents rather than Republican or Democrat. Consequently, it should simply be a question of asking whether they are ~~from~~---- for McGovern or Nixon and then registering those that are for Nixon.

Of course it could be argued that the registration drive among youth, even non-college youth, is not one that we should undertake at all, since at the very best they would split 50-50, this is much poorer than the national average and much poorer than what we would do among older voters. However, to avoid the effect on older voters of our conceding the youth vote to McGovern, we need to make some effort in this area. Let us limit it to the target states, particularly the big city areas and the down-state areas where we might pick up support and except for a token effort let us concentrate on non-college, blue collar youth, among ethnics and of course among those ^{few that might} ~~who tend~~ to lean to our side because of their background in a Republican family.

I emphasize again that the whole youth effort should be one that gets across the idea ~~in the nation~~ that youth will not overwhelmingly be in McGovern's pocket, that we have ^{in the nation} ~~a~~ very substantial support among younger voters and that we are going to get more as ~~wxxx~~ they learn what the issues are. In fact, something can be gained by pointing out that we are concentrating on registering all youth and that the McGovern ~~people~~ people are limiting themselves to the elite youth who have gone to college or are in colleges and universities.

NOTE: Two copies. One for the President's file and one for Bob Haldeman - not for distribution otherwise. That is always the case where I dictate a political memorandum unless I indicate that the political memorandum is to go to others. (RN)

CAMP DAVID
Sunday - July 30, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB HALDEMAN

FROM THE PRESIDENT

In reading Lou Cannon's piece in the Sunday Washington Post I think we can get some guidance as to the handling of the press on campaign matters which should be followed strictly.

I do not want people who talk about the campaign to make the mistake of cutting off representatives of periodicals, TV and newspapers simply because they are generally against us. Consequently, I do not object to an article appearing from time to time, in unfriendly publications which is based on conversations with our campaign people. Having said this, however, we need some completely ironclad rules with regard to who talks to media representatives that we know are antagonistic to us.

First of all, it is vitally important that only the most intelligent and sophisticated person on our campaign staff dare to go in the ring with one of these people. Second, we should not waste time with one of them at the expense of turning down interviews with media representatives who are our friends. Third, even when our most intelligent people are meeting with people like Cannon they must constantly keep in mind that they are confronting a political enemy and that everything they say will, therefore, be used against us. I have to emphasize this over and over again because we never seem to get it across to our people no matter how many times they get burned.

The Cannon piece is the best example we can have of why these rules should be rigidly adhered to. In the first place, while we know the Washington Post is totally gainst us it is just as well to have a piece that has some favorable points in it as well as completely negative ones. Therefore, I have no objections to the fact that Cannon was given interviews by the Campaign Committee. On the other hand, it waa a stupid mistake -which must never be repeated - to allow Cannon to have the run of the White House staff, the campaign staff and the National Committee staff in getting his story together. The PR types representative of each of

these groups must have a rule that when media representatives, who are antagonistic, come in for interviews they are treated courteously but that only the top political man with great sophistication will be allowed to talk to him. In addition, whenever that man talks to the interviewer the press man should sit in on the interview so as to keep it honest.

In that connection, incidentally, I was rather surprised to find that we did not have a recording of Clark MacGregor's remarks at the Press Club. It will be a very modest expense - but it is absolutely essential that a man with a small recording device go with him everywhere he goes so that we have a record of what he says which he can put out in the event that we want to correct a misquotation or get out a story that was not covered adequately. The same, I think, should be true of Dole. As you know we have always followed this custom with regard to my own appearances.

Now, looking at the Cannon story from both the plus and the minus standpoints, we find a good headline - "Nixon Running Scared," and a good thrust insofar as there being no complacency.

From a minus standpoint, it is obvious that Cannon had the run of the shop and in addition to talking to Haldeman in the White House and MacGregor at the Committee to Re-Elect, Dole at the Republican National Committee, he talked to people up and down the line and got a number of quotes that are both inaccurate and not helpful. I am not, of course, referring to quotes that he has from Republican Senators and Congressmen. We have no control whatsoever over this. What I am referring to are quotes that he obviously had to get - since he has it in quotation marks - from people on the campaign staff.

For example, as I have often emphasized, it is a mistake constantly to run down my previous campaigns. We should not contribute to the myth that I did not work hard enough in 1960 and 1968. The quotation to the effect that before the election in November I had gotten so confident that I was working on my acceptance speech, taking rests, etc., is totally inaccurate, as you know, and very harmful.

With regard to MacGregor's own interview, I would like for you to get together with him and Dole on one point and to have a rule enforced throughout the balance of the campaign. He was putting out polls from California and Texas as well as Ohio and Illinois. There was no reason why he should not have done this since we have not indicated in the past what our policy was in this respect. However, under

absolutely no circumstances are any polls whatever to be put out showing us ahead or behind in any of the major states without my specific approval. This is an area where well-intentioned people will put out a poll for what they think is a good reason - in this case to knock down complacency -- but where later on they are going to be asked for polls in these states when they might not want to put them out. Also, I don't want the impression to get across the country that we are conducting our campaign on the basis of polls rather than on the basis of principles. I want you specifically to see that this is brought up at the next meeting where Mitchell, Dole, MacGregor, et al, are present. Mitchell, of course, would not have made this mistake. MacGregor made it only because of lack of experience.

Along the same line, I noted where the statement was made that abortion was a minus issue for the President because polls showed that a majority of women favored it. This obviously comes from the Harper group in the Domestic Council Staff. I want you to get hold of Ehrlichman and tell him that he is to see that absolutely no one in the Domestic Council talks to anyone in the press without his specific approval and then a press man from Ron's office is to be present. Ehrlichman, of course, would not make such a stupid mistake and the only way he can control others is to put a tight reign on them.

For example, Syndlinger ran into outraged reaction the evening that the National Committee put out findings from their Platform Committee poll to the effect that a majority of the members of the Platform Committee found out that bussing was not a significant issue. I want some discipline enforced in this respect for reasons which should be obvious even to the most stupid of our people.

Another line which we should knock down is that there is no grass roots support for the President and that we have to get "volunteers one at a time." This probably comes from Sears or somebody in that group. The question here is not whether this may be true - and I doubt if it is in terms of getting volunteers one at a time - but it plays right into the hands of our political enemies. I could give other examples but I close the memorandum with this admonition: Let's quit tackling our own ball carrier. "

CAMP DAVID
Sunday - July 30, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB HALDEMAN

FROM THE PRESIDENT

This is a post script to the memorandum I wrote to you on the Washington Post story.

In laying down the rules that only our top people can talk to antagonistic media representatives and then only under the very strictest surveillance by one of the people from the press office, I realize that this is difficult to enforce because people at other levels in the campaign need a chance to express themselves and do not like the idea of feeling that they cannot be trusted to talk to members of the press. There is an easy way to handle this. Deliberately develop occasions where they can talk to friendly representatives of the media. I realize there are not too many but on the other side of the coin our major problem, as you know, is that we give about twice as much time to unfriendly people as we do to friendly press people. In this campaign I want this thing reversed as much as we can. One way we can at least reward our friends is to give them the opportunity to talk to second echelon people - something that we will not allow to unfriendly people. This way we kill two birds with one stone. Our staffers will get the satisfaction of being able to sound off about their views in the campaign and in addition our friends in the press and television will be getting something that their competitors will not be getting.

There perhaps could not be clearer proof of the difference between the kind of treatment we will get in the press and the kind of treatment McGovern will get in the press than the Nixon/McGovern articles in the Sunday Post today - July 30. The Nixon article, as I pointed out earlier in the memorandum, makes some points that we want to have made but does not miss an opportunity to make all the negative points that are part of the mythology with regard to our campaigns.

The McGovern article by Spencer Rich, as we might expect, is a total puff piece. This comparison only demonstrates the wisdom of my advice that we have to be much more careful in programming interviews with unfriendly press people than we do with friendly press people.

Incidentally, when I said earlier in the memorandum that I thought we should see some of the unfriendly media people I meant only those who reached fairly substantial audiences that we could not afford to ignore. Under no circumstances, do I want any more time wasted, for example, on John Osborne on the left or his counterparts on the far right. I say this not because they are against us but because the audience they reach simply is not that important to us.

XX

XX

ON ANOTHER SUBJECT

~~MEMORANDUM FOR HALDEMAN~~

This is a memorandum for Haldeman -- he is to be given one copy and the other copy is for my ~~file~~ file -- it is not for file distribution otherwise. That is always the case where I dictate a political memorandum unless I indicate that the political memorandum is to go to others.

In reading Lou Innin's ~~(piece) in the Sun~~ piece in the Sunday Washington Post I think we can get some guidance as to the handling of the press on campaign matters which should be followed strictly.

I do not want people who talk about the campaign to make the mistake of cutting off representatives of periodicals, TV and newspapers simply because they are generally against us. Consequently, I do not object to an article appearing from time to time/^{in unfriendly publications} which is based on conversations with our campaign people. Having said this however we need some completely ironclad rules with regard to who talks to media representatives ~~wh~~ who we know are antagonistic to us. First of all, it is vitally important that only the most intelligent and sophisticated person on our campaign staff dare to go in the ring with one of these people. Second, we should not waste time with one of them at the expense of turning down interviews with media representatives who are our friends. Third, even when our most intelligent people are meeting with people like Kannon (?) they must constantly keep in mind that they are confronting a political enemy and that everything they say will therefore be used against us. I have to emphasize this over and over again because we

never seem to get it across to our people no matter how many times they get burned.

The Cannon (?) piece is the best example we can have of why these rules should be rigidly adhered to. In the first place while we know the Washington Post is totally against us it is just as well to have ~~xxxxxx~~ a piece that has some favorable points in it as well as completely negative ones. Therefore, I have no objections to the fact that Cannon was given interviews ~~with---~~ by the campaign committee. On the other hand, it was a stupid mistake which must never be ~~repeated~~ repeated to allow Cannon to have the run of the White House staff, the campaign staff and the National Committee staff in getting his story together. The PR ~~types~~ representative of each of these groups must have a rule that when media representatives who are antagonistic come in for interviews, they are treated courteously but that only the top political man with great sophistication will be allowed to talk to him. In addition, whenever that man talks to the interviewer the press man should sit in on the interview so as to keep it honest. In that connection, incidentally I was rather surprised to find that we did not have ~~xxx~~ a recording of Clark MacGregor's remarks at the Press Club. It will be a very modest expense but it is ~~absolutely~~ absolutely essential that a small recording device with a man go with him everywhere he goes so that we have a record of what he says which he can put out in the event that we want to correct a misquotation or get out a story that was not covered adequately. ~~The same should be~~

~~The same, I think~~

The same, I think, should be true of Dole. As you know we have always followed this custom with regard to my own appearances.

Now looking at the Cannon story from both the plus and minus standpoints we find a good headline - "Nixon Running Scared." And a good thrust insofar as there being no complacency.

From a minus standpoint, it is obvious that Cannon had the run of the shop and in addition to talking to Haldeman in the White House and MacGregor at the Committee to Re-Elect, Dole at the Republican National Committee he talked to people up and down the line and got a number of quotes that are both inaccurate and not helpful. I am not referring, of course, to quotes that he has from Republican Senators and Congressmen. We have no control whatsoever over this. ~~Ex~~ What I am referring to are quotes that he obviously had to get since he has it in quotation marks from people on the campaign staff.

For example, as I have often emphasized, it is a mistake constantly to run down my previous campaigns. We should not contribute to the myth that I did not work hard enough in 1960 and 1968. The quotation to the effect that before the election in November I had gotten so confident that I was working on my acceptance speech, taking rests, etc., is totally inaccurate as you know and very harmful. With regard to MacGregor's own interview I would like for you and him and Dole to get together on one point and to have rule enforced throughout the balance of the campaign.

He was putting out polls in California and in Texas as well as in Ohio and in Illinois. There is no reason why he should not do this since we have not indicated what our policy was in this respect. However, under absolutely no circumstances are any polls whatever to be put out showing us ahead or behind in any of the major states without my specific approval. This is an area where well intentioned people will put out a poll for what they think is a good reason -- in this case to knock down complacency -- but where later on they are going to be asked ~~if they~~ for polls in these states when they might not want to put them out. Also I don't want the impression to get across the country that we are conducting our campaign on the basis of polls rather than on the basis of principles. I want you specifically to see that this is brought up at the next meeting where Mitchell, Dole, MacGregor et al are present. Mitchell, of course, would not have made this mistake. MacGregor made it only because of lack of experiences.

Along the same ~~line~~ line, I noted where the ~~statement~~ statement was made that abortion was a minus issue for the President because ~~polls~~ polls showed that a majority of women favored it. This obviously comes from the Harper group in the Domestic Council Staff. I want you to get hold of Ehrlichman and tell him that he is to see that absolutely no one in the Domestic Council talks to anyone in the press without his specific approval and then a press man from Ron's office is to be present. Ehrlichman, of course, would not make such a stupid mistake and the only way he can control others ~~is~~ is to put a tight rein on them.

For example, Syndlinger ran into outraged reaction the evening that the National Committee put out ~~findings~~ findings from their Platform Committee poll to the effect that ~~xxxx~~ a majority of our members of the Platform Committee found out that busing was not a significant issue. I want some discipline enforced in this respect for reasons which should be obvious ~~xxx~~ even to the most stupid of our people.

* Another line which we should knock down is that there is no grass roots support for the President and that we have to get "volunteers one at a time." This probably comes from S^{rs} or somebody in that group. The question here is not whether this may be true - and I doubt if it is ~~xxxx~~ in terms of getting volunteers one at a time - but it plays right into the hands of our political enemies. I could give other examples but I close the memorandum with this admonition - Let's quit tackling our own ball carrier.

(End of Tape)

THIS IS A SECOND MEMORANDUM TO HALDEMAN __ a P.S. on
the one that I had written to ~~him~~ him on the Washington Post story.

In laying down the rules that only our top people can talk to
antagonistic media representatives and then only under the very strictest
surveillance by one of the people ~~from~~ from the press office, I realize
that this is difficult to enforce because people at other ~~levels~~ levels in
the campaign need a chance to express themselves and do not like the
idea of feeling that they cannot be trusted to talk to members of the press.
There is an easy way to handle this. Deliberately develop occasions
where they can talk to friendly representatives of the media. I realize
there are not too many but on the other side of that coin our major
problem, as you know, is that we give about twice as much time to
~~unfriendly~~ unfriendly people as we do to friendly press people. In this
campaign I want this thing reversed as much as we can. One way we
can at least reward our friends is to give them the opportunity to talk
to second echelon people something that we will not allow to unfriendly
people. This way we kill two birds with one ~~stone~~ stone. Our staffers
will get the satisfaction of being able to sound off about their views in
the campaign and in addition our friends in the press and television will
be getting something that their ~~competitors~~ competitors will not be
getting.

There perhaps could not be clearer proof of the difference
between the kind of treatment we will get in the press and the kind of
treatment McGovern will get in the press than the Nixon-McGovern articles

~~xxxx~~

in the Sunday Post today - July 30. The ~~xx~~ Nixon article, as I pointed out earlier in the memorandum, makes some points that we want to have made but does not miss an ~~opportunity~~ opportunity to make all the negative points that are part of the mythology with regard to our campaigns.

The McGovern article by Spencer Rich, as we might expect, is a total puff piece. This comparison only demonstrates the wisdom of my advice that we have to be ~~xxxxxxx~~ much more careful in programming interviews with unfriendly press people than we do with friendly press people.

Incidentally, when I ~~xxxxxxx~~ said earlier in the memorandum that I thought we should see some of the unfriendly media people I meant only those who reached fairly substantial audiences that we could not afford to ignore. Under no circumstances, do I want anymore time wasted, for example, on John Osborne on the left or his counterparts on the far right. I say this not because they are against us but because the audience they reach simply is not that important to us.

end of memorandum