

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>
1	8	9/17/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Khachigian RE: recommendation to hold on to back-up materials. 1pg.
1	8	9/17/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: reasons against televising RN appearance before the Detroit Economic Club. 2 pgs.
1	8	9/17/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Buchanan to Kherli advising against meeting with academics and White House Staff. 2pgs
1	8	9/17/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: concerns about the politics of RN's Phase II Board. 2 pgs.

<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>
1	8	9/7/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Barbara Franklin RE: support for RN. 1pg.

September 17, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Ken Khachigian
FROM: Pat Buchanan

Would hold onto the back-up materials. However, for HRH and the Attorney General, would prefer, only a page and a half. Which iterates the major anti-Muskie themes to which we have contributed. And mention each of our success in passing. We can now add the President's ripping of the "scab" off Muskie -- on the black VEEP -- a course of action we recommended in the briefing book. Can you draft 2 pages Item #1, Item #2, etc.

Buchanan

September 17, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Patrick J. Buchanan

Understand thought is being given to televising nationally the RN appearance before the Detroit Economic Club. Don't think we should do that -- for the following reasons:

1. An hour's show with Richard Nixon answering the concerns of some Detroit Fat Cats does not seem to me particularly good television; it will lack the adversary setting of a press conference, and the sharpness of questions, RN can expect from editors and writers.
2. An hour is simply too long -- to sustain the interest of Middle America.
3. 3. We have nothing really new to say, from my knowledge; the President has already covered the "news" in Thursday's conference.
4. The President's greatest political asset is the Presidency -- part of the power of that asset adheres in the distance between the Presidency and the people. Harry Truman as Harry Truman is a clown -- as President, he fills the shoes of Lincoln, Wilson, etc. The more we show of RN the individual in front of a camera, the more in my judgment we diminish some of the mystery, aloofness that surrounds the office. We make the President too "familiar" a figure -- and not in the best sense of that word.
5. What makes China such an interesting, important country and De Gaulle such an interesting man -- is the aloofness, the distance, from the hoi polloi. Every time we put the President on the camera in a conventional setting -- answering Q and A -- we tend, I think, to bring him down closer to the average man -- and I don't believe that is to our political advantage -- partly for the next reason.

6. I have never been convinced that Richard Nixon, Good Guy, is our long suit; to me we are simply not going to charm the American people; we are not going to win it on "style" and we ought to forget playing ball in the Kennedy's Court.

This new emphasis of running the President on the tube at more and more opportunities is a corollary of the theorem that the more people who see the President, the more who will become enthusiastic about him. We are selling personality; but we know from our experience with television shows, how even the most attractive and energetic and charming personalities don't last very long.

7. As I wrote the President long ago, in 1967, we watched Rocky rise twenty points in the national polls in a year in which he was probably not once on national television. When Rocky took to the airwaves in 1968, running around the country -- he dropped in the polls as he did in 1964. In short, what is said and written around Nelson Rockefeller's accomplishments -- compared with the accomplishments of others -- is invariably better received than the presence of Rocky himself in a competitive situation.
8. The President is going to be on with Phase II in October, and with the Vietnam announcements in November. My judgment is that we ought not to put him on the air, without serious thought, and usually only in context with some significant pronouncement.
9. Finally, am not at all against some of the more imaginative ideas for presenting the President -- but they should come out of a Media Strategy, which I don't know we have right now -- or I don't see how this fits into it.

Buchanan

September 17, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Bruce Kherli

FROM: Pat Buchanan

Your approach here is wrong and unrealistic. First, you are dealing here with some real intellectual heavy-weights, among the more brilliant thinkers in American academic life. What they and the average White House staff person would talk about is beyond me. Secondly, on au courant issues, we are more likely to be up to date, and more sophisticated than they -- such as the political impact of Presidential decisions, etc. These fellows with few exceptions are Governor Wallace's "pointy-heads." Their ideas are available to us in better form, written than spoken. For example, Glazer's piece in Commentary this weekend is going in to the Old Man; Banfield's book should be must reading for the Nixon Domestic. As contacts -- used in the manner of country chairman -- they would be of little value to us; since there is no "functional" purpose in doing this, simply therapeutic, the use would not be regular and thus the benefit none.

What we would like from these fellows is not verbal reports; they are probably less useful in something like that than calling a sharp political mind; (with the exception of Buckley). Rather what their advantage to the President would be in identification with the President, association with him. We can get their ideas out of their publications. But their presence at White House functions, Kristol type dinners, with Moynihan and Kissinger present, discussions (the practical value of which I would not say is great) would reflect well on the President which is what we want.

Between you and me, I don't think the President places a high priority on association with these types; he enjoys it; but he has more important things to do in his own mind; and other ways to exercise intellectually.

Here is the problem in a nutshell. The advantage of these academicians to the President is not verbal communication of their ideas (their ideas are better presented in the tight brilliant articles they write, not the conversation they have) but rather in the burnishing of the President's image as a Man of Thought by public association and intellectual ease in company with these cerebral power-houses.

We cannot get the latter by WH aides calling up Glazer or Trilling and asking them what they think of the "freeze" or RN's speech. To get the benefits that I have in mind, and likely what Moynihan may have in mind, RN must be seen in the company of such men himself. The problem is that the President himself, I don't believe, feels this is such a high priority with all the other "requirements" that he has to get his work done. That is not unnatural. None of us is really "taking advantage" of the intellectual stimulus and interesting associations available to a White House Assistant -- we tend to be less the intellectual aristocrat of man of ease, than the hard-working drones of the President.

Moynihan, similarly Kissinger, are the type of fellows who enjoy spending an hour or so in intellectual sword play with the names included here. Most of the President's appointments, and what they have to say, is of immediate utilitarian value to RN. Most of the fellows on this list, with some few exceptions, are not of that type. Lionel Trilling in a room with the Old Man, the AG, Connally, H & E would be as about as much in place as the President amidst Sly and the Family Stone.

Buchanan

[Item N-11]
September 17, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Patrick J. Buchanan

While not conversant with the substance of RN's Phase II Board, some thoughts about the politics, which have been brought to my attention and concern me:

1. This is the ball game as far as the economic issue is concerned;
2. We cannot trust George Meany; he is our inescapable political enemy; and any concessions to him only strengthen his hand in damaging us further down the road.
3. Very likely we are going to have to confront this blow-hard; the best time to do so would be when the President is at his strongest, which I would suggest is at the earliest, while there is still massive public support for our economic program.
4. For RN to accede to Labor's request for a tripartite board, reporting and recommending directly to the President is to leave RN with the onus of unpopular decisions -- and to guarantee Labor demagoging it on behalf of their own people. Better it seems to me to have a President's board, which will protect the President's interests, and take off as much of the political heat as possible.
5. In the last analysis, my judgment is that politically "Tyrannical labor" is not popular and a presidential collision with Mr. Meany handled properly, "What's good for George Meany is not necessarily good for America" is not necessarily a disadvantageous political position.

There has always existed -- the best political approach in my judgment -- the possibility of going over the heads of Meany and appealing to the workingmen and their best personal interests. We may have no other choice. Nevertheless, these fellows, with their limousines and public statements have grown aloof from the hard basic concerns of the hard hats and the workingmen.

So, recommend strongly that the President retain the fullest possible leverage, and surrender the fewest possible concessions to fellows who cannot be "bought" or "brought on board," notmatter how high a price we pay.

Pat Buchanan

Attached is something worked up by Dick Burress from the 1950s to indicate what Big Labor -- given the Tripartite Approach -- did to their own man, Harry Truman.

PJB

bcc: Dick Burress

September 7, 1971

MEMORANDUM TO: Barbara Franklin

FROM: Pat Buchanan

Any battle-ax that thinks like this probably didn't support us in the first place. Why don't you check and see if she was a member of "Chicks for Dick" in 1968?

Buchanan