

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	14	8/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: Presidential acceptance speech. 2 pgs.
1	14	8/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman and Colson RE: Monday morning 9:15 meeting. 3 pgs.
1	14	8/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: thoughts on recently received poll briefing. 2 pgs.

August 17, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

(Per L. Higby)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

The President's acceptance speech should be directed to the whole nation of course, but politically to the voters between RN's rock bottom 40 percent, and his top of 65 percent. That 25 percent of the electorate is our target. It is: not Republican at all; Independent and Democratic, conservative socially, moderate politically; middle income, working income economically; Northern Catholic and ethnic largely but Southern Protestant also; in addition, there are several million young people who are largely apolitical, one would guess -- they are probably not the brightest or best students; they are more likely from Ohio State, SMU, Notre Dame, NYU, than from Harvard and Yale.

This is the segment of the population which is the "swing vote" this fall, where the opportunity is great, where our appeal can and should be made -- without alienation of the 40 percent base, which is essentially Conservative and Republican.

STRUCTURE

The speech in my view, should be essentially of three parts:

1. What the President has accomplished. Foreign policy, Vietnam should dominate here, but the Supreme Court, the efforts against crime and pollution, the new approach to the cities, etc., can all be included.

The purpose of this section simply would be to remind the voters of tremendous accomplishments of RN, and to set the stage, for the last crucial part of the speech -- which deals with RN's Vision of where we should be going. Would argue that RN detail briefly and toughly what was the situation in the nation when we took over the helm in 1968 -- what was it at home; what was it abroad and how all that has changed dramatically.

2. The middle part of the speech should strongly contrast the President's positions and views with those of McGovern -- on Defense, Amnesty, Permissiveness, Welfare, Foreign Policy, Isolationism, Taxes, and Spending. We should draw McGovern's position without naming here in stark terms on one side -- and RN's views on another. This should be interspersed with the strong political material, making clear they are dreadfully wrong in their approach and options, and we should be fairly tough here.

3. The third section is the Vision, RN's view of where we are going if you choose to join us. My view is that this section goes into two parts -- the evils we will continue to halt, and combat, in the society -- but more important the concrete dream of what we and our gathering here intend to do. We are to be the instrument of a new elite or a new order in American society, where the sons and daughters of workingmen and middle class are going to assume the helm of the nation, at every level from that elite which has dominated so long.

We should portray the President and his people as the instrument who are pushing open the door -- not to affluence for these people -- they are fairly well off, but to leadership, to bringing in to Government the successor generation to the New Deal types who did their thing, but who now must give way as the Hoover business types did. We should be concrete here.

And what are the accomplishments of this new generation of leaders to be:

The ending of the agony in Vietnam, the building of a new enduring structure of international relations that can preserve for our children the peace this generation of war veterans has never known. The remaking of American society so that not just the sons of Harvard and Yale, but of SMU, Notre Dame, of NYU and Whittier move into the decision-making positions in American life. They chart the destiny of the nation, henceforth. The President is the John the Baptist of a new leadership emerging in all aspects of national life. The Old Establishment must give way to these new blood, new men, with new ideas and old values.

At home, their jobs are to preserve and protect the environment that has been destroyed, to provide new guarantees for the rights of the victims in society. In any event, this will be spelled out in much more detail in subsequent memoranda and paragraphs. These will be coming up today and tomorrow.

Buchanan

August 14, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

SUBJECT: Monday Morning 9:15 a.m. Meeting

Have to be at the doctor's for a 9:00 a.m. appointment at Naval Medical, but the following are followup attack recommendations for today:

1. Ramsey Clark, along with the Shriver charge, this is issue number one today. Clark will have a press conference. We can piggy-back on this for tonight's TV. Suggest Mitchell Written Statement by PJB -- iterating our demand that McGovern either endorse or repudiate Clark's performance and his "perfect" choice for the FBI. Ignore McGovern charge of "treasonous allegations," and focus on McGovern once again evading re-endorsing a man whom he seems ready to dump over the side. Also, Fletcher Thompson in attacking Clark, and others should keep before the public that he is McGovern's "perfect choice" for the FBI job. Suggest that MacGregor go on TV -- this is "the" story of day, for tonight, demanding anew, along the lines of Mitchell statement that McGovern stop evading and obfuscation and answer to American people if this individual who last week was broadcasting Hanoi's propaganda is still in line to head up the FBI. Also, Mitchell statement of page and a half should contain defense of U. S. pilots slandered by McGovern yesterday. (PJB can have this by noon, by one at latest.)
2. On the Shriver story, that RN "blew it" we should get Lodge on TV; we should turn the focus of this on Shriver and McGovern's credibility; and re-issue that resignation letter from Shriver; as long as the issue turns on whether Shriver was telling the truth or not telling the truth, they can't be making ground. Further, this boiling controversy keeps the Watergate Caper off of page 1. Everything should be done, in statements and the like to portray Shriver as a) not telling the truth and b) keeping silent for three years, seeking a GOP job, and then speaking out only when it was politically profitable. Shriver was a "Silent Partner" in the escalation in Vietnam; endorsed RN's policy, and now for

crass political gain is stabbing in the back a President whose policies he endorsed wholeheartedly while in the President's employ.

3. The White Paper of McGovern's on the environment got hardly any serious coverage. We can and should elevate this -- with an EPA, and/or CEQ press conference today -- which attacks McGovern for "gross ignorance of the President's record, for "sloppy staff work" for utter lack of knowledge of the toughest environmental record ever compiled by any President. Impossible to believe Senator McGovern could have seen or signed this idiotic paper -- then a briefing listing of RN's environmental achievements. But the attack on McGovern's "incredible document" should be the lead. Once again reflecting the sloppy staff work that has plagued the McGovern campaign. Tone indredulous that McGovern could have issued such a paper.

4. Don't respond to the false allegation that we accused Clark of treason -- this is what they would like to make the issue -- our issue is that this tool of Radio Hanoi is McGovern's perfect choice for FBI Director, and this is a travesty; and that McGovern should repudiate Clark (even as Senator Proxmire did) and tell the American people in no uncertain terms that he withdraws his endorsement of Clark for FBI Chief.

5. We might need some polling in Pa. to see the damage done on this flood controversy.

6. Page 30 of Saturday News Summary -- Jesse Jackson has some negative remarks on McGovern -- we should get these out to the black press, and have Floyd McKissick use them in attack on McGovern and defense of his decision to go with RN.

7. We should have Paul Keyes working up some humorous lines of ridicule to use against McGovern; if we can get the country making him and his campaign as ridiculous, he may never be able to regain credibility and recover.

8. Within the attack book there are three or four McGovern predictions about what the NVN would do if we halted bombing, etc. All provided wrong. We should have a foreign policy spokesman who can speak to these points, and indict McGovern for having been wrong about every other opportunity, wrong about Hanoi's intentions throughout his career, and a record of misjudging the enemy, reflected anew in his endorsement of Shriver's charge.

9. Note page 18 of N. Y. Times, where McGovern is working on Hill to remove equal time requirement, in which event networks will grant free time. Can we block this?

10. Important thing -- ride the big stories of the day -- Clark, and Shriver credibility.

Buchanan

August 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH As Requested)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Have received the poll briefing and while the findings on the issue are unexceptional, the conclusions that are drawn are wrong, I think -- if I do not mistake them. Our surrogates and the Vice President should not spend a disproportionate amount of their time defending our record on unemployment, and economic management. By most everyone's judgment, our record is not considered as that good; this is our "weakest" point -- and a national debate over whether we managed the economy well is perhaps the one debate with McGovern we can lose.

Agreed that Vietnam, inflation, etc. are the crucial issues. We can win on these issues by not so much verbally defending our record, but by portraying McGovern as disasterous to the stock market, disasterous to the job market with his budget cuts in defense and space, disasterous to the security of the U.S., disasterous to the price situation, because of his \$1000 program, or his \$6500 welfare giveaway. In short, let's not so much defend our record, which is subject to criticism, as to attack McGovern with being a clear and present danger to the prosperity we now have.

The point is this: If the Democrats had nominated Harpo Marx, the Teeter polks would have said Vietna, economy, inflation are the mamor issues. Would we, in a race with Harpo, talk about those issues -- or would the winning issues rather be the manifest lack of qualification of their candidate -- despite our record.

The decision in November and our rhetoric must not focus upon their issues -- i. e., "unemployment" and the unequal economic record of the last four years -- it must focus upon our issues -- i. e., the extremism, elitism, radicalism, kookism, of McGovern's person, campaign, and programs, against the solid, strong, effective leadership of the President. The first campaign described above is the only way we can lose in 1972 -- and if I am not mistaken,

this is something close to what the Teeter folks recommend, when they say we ought to talk up the economy, and spend an inordinate amount of time defending our record on unemployment.

Nor should we forget the capacity of a candidate (i. e., Kennedy and the "missile gap," Goldwater and "extremism") to create issues, on which elections turn, sometimes legitimate issues, sometimes illegitimate. When we portray McGovern's ideas as preposterous, foolish, and even dangerous to U.S. security and the nation's economy, we are right now pushing against an open door -- with the media at large, as well as the country.

The campaign should turn, we should make it turn, upon the manifest unqualification of this character and his ilk to even be in the Presidential contest -- not whether a damn referendum in our spotty economic performance, which talking, talking, talking about the economy and jobs, and unemployment would make it. So, I disagree strongly with what I view as the central thrust of recommendations of the Teeter polls.

Buchanan