

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	16	10/16/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman & Colson RE: suggesting having RN being photographed in quasi-religious services and taking out ads in 'black publications' attacking McGovern. 1 pg.
1	16	10/26/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	From Buchanan RE: "political prostitution." Draft. 2 pgs.
1	16	10/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldemna, Ehrlichman, and Colson RE: attacking McGovern and the media on the 'corruption issue.' 3 pgs.
1	16	10/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: potential political problems which could cause a rapid dissipation of the present lead. 3 pgs.

October 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN  
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some ideas sent in that have some merit: Considering the "corruption" charge, etc., why not have the President photographed in quasi-religious services; either Sunday services, funerals, if they come up -- or other -- which in and of itself makes McGovern look nasty in the character of these charges.

Secondly, strongly recommend that we take out ads in all major black publications attacking McGovern for taking Blacks for granted -- and calling on blacks to repudiate that sentiment. These ads would serve to force McGovern to spend money to answer them -- and they might well weaken him in the black community as McGovern has never been strong there personally. This is the one major voting block where McGovern wins overwhelmingly -- and some hard negative ads might convince blacks either to "go fishing" or cut McGovern.

Buchanan

Wednesday's edition of the Washington Post presents the most conclusive evidence of political prostitution of the press in recent memory.

The Post's banner story of that day was and is a phony from beginning to end. It had been floating around town for more than a week that it was coming. Larry O'Brien, Senator McGovern's campaign manager had been publicly promising and predicting its arrival almost to the hour. And, lo and behold, it arrived the morning of the evening of George McGovern's paid broadcast on the so-called "corruption" issue. Indeed, it arrived precisely at the point where it would do the most to promote the McGovern show -- By foreign networks, wires and afternoon papers to follow up the story with questions and coverage.

As an example of collusion between the McGovernites and the Post, as an example of good P. R. promotion of a McGovern show by the editors of the Post -- it was first-rate. As an example of objective and honest reporting and coverage -- it was a joke.

Mrs. Graham and her obsequious subordinates at the Post have allowed their undisguised hatred of the President of the United States to get the better of them. They should be, frankly, more discreet about their cohabitation with Mr. McGovern.

Here is how the daisy chain operates. The Post puts a banner headline on some unsubstantiated charges by unnamed sources. Within minutes George McGovern is out on the stump accusing the President personally

of being responsible for whatever the Post has alleged and the next morning the Post runs McGovern's repetition of the Post's charges as the hard political news of the day. And on and on and on.

This Post operation is a desperate last-ditch effort to prevent the political humiliation of their radical friend, Mr. McGovern, and to inflict maximum political damage upon the administration and person of the President of the United States.

Like George McGovern, the Post is an imposter and a pious fraud. The former, who promised Senator Eagleton his 1000% support and then stabbed him in the back in one of the most cynical and savage political acts of our time, runs about the country posing as Mr. Morality. The latter, the Washington Post, postures as an objective high-minded, even-handed newspaper while working the gutter for George McGovern.

Mr. McGovern is going down to defeat because his radical defeatist politics would disgrace this nation before the world, his domestic ideas border on the idiotic, and his campaign tactics and rhetoric are among the most vile and filthy in American political history. And the Post, just as it has collaborated and conspired in his campaign, will share with him the nation's repudiation.

#####

October 13, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN  
JOHN EHRLICHMAN  
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

McGovern appears to have but one card left to turn over -- the "corruption" issue. And it is not a bad one. There is a theme abuilding in the media, which runs like this: What has happened that America and Americans are sympathetic that they will not become enraged at the atmosphere of scandal and chicanery that now exists in Nixon's Washington. Agronsky, Sidey, Severeid, Reasoner, Shana Alexander and a host of others are pushing the theme.

The Times has put its top Mafia guy on the Watergate-Espionage-Sabotage issue -- and the Washington Post may very well have a few more trumps to play.

My concern is that we not "freeze the ball" with our twenty-odd point lead, and three and a half weeks to go -- as we did in 1968. We have two possible lines of attack as I see it, and I would prefer the latter.

First, is to attack the Post head-on along these lines. "Just as in 1968, the leftist press is digging up all the dirt it can print between now and the election to salvage the collapsed McGovern campaign. In 1968 it was the Times when their smear on Agnew; in 1972 it is the Post's desperate last-ditch effort to smear the President on Watergate. Innuendo and unproven charges are being given the kind of ride they have not gotten since the days of Joe McCarthy. Where Dick Tuck's screw-ball antics were applauded and laughed off -- pranks performed by some over-zealous types a) have not even been tied to the President's organizations; and b) are condemned as though we were running a concentration camp."

Something along these lines -- taking the attack to the Post. However, before proceeding up this avenue, we had best know exactly how much more the Post has than the stuff it is running right now.

However, my preferred line would be for us to use the above only as an "answer" and to respond to the Washington Post's vendetta, and the others who are fortifying McGovern's charges, with their venom and outrage -- by stepping up the attack on McGovern on our issues. To this end, I believe that:

A) The earlier we use Connally, the broader ~~the~~ audience, the better. This speech not only creams McGovern -- it turns the focus of national debate back onto our issues -- foreign policy, defense cuts, amnesty, bipartisan tradition -- and hits McGovern hard for his radicalism.

B) We need ~~now~~ and more attack ads, in my view; and a crash program should be initiated to provide them. What are the issues hurting McGovern most? When we find these, we ought to have one minute reminder ads -- for massive use on a state-by-state basis in the waning days of the campaign.

C) We ought to consider the possibility of placing print ads in black papers all over the country condemning McGovern for not placing such ads and "taking blacks for granted." An ad which says in effect -- you won't see McGovern taking an ad in this paper because he thinks you're already in his pocket.

D) While we have hit McGovern some on his Vietnam speech, it is not enough, and not hard enough -- his speech disappointed and concerned even Kraft and Reston -- we should be hitting him hard and repeatedly, and at high levels on Vietnam.

E) We have several "bombs" lined up like the Defense Budget Analysis, the Welfare Analysis, the Connally Speech -- we need more major "events" or "attacks" at high levels, which can frame the debate in our ~~terms~~, not theirs. We must keep the country thinking of McGovern and his idiotic schemes, his ineptitude and his radicalism -- if we are going to hold onto our existing lead.

F) The time is approaching I would think, when we would want to move the issue further by calling for a "vote against extremism" and get prominent Democrats and Union Leaders to start talking publicly, and calling for the "repudiation" of the Radical Left that has seized our party.

G) Perhaps we need once again to go back through all our anti-McGovern material -- pick out only the harshest and toughest material we have -- and feed that to the press for one more round.

In brief conclusion, the next ten days are crucial to breaking the back of the McGovern campaign; we ought not to be holding back material now -- but pouring out everything we have. We should be getting as much of this anti-material into the record as possible; if McGovern has made no progress by two weeks before the election, the stampede might begin, and that may be it.

Buchanan

October 9, 1972

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

With four weeks to go the political situation seems to have stabilized. With McGovern not moving as dramatically as necessary; indeed hardly moving at all, according to Harris.

The following are what I see as potential problem areas for us politically, which could cause a rapid dissipation of the present lead.

- 1) Sam Ervin & the Watergate. Should a Congressional hearing be called the focus of the campaign could be turned off of the "negatives" of McGovern onto our "negatives." Given the present disposition of the national media -- the major domos are disappointed in the lack of a contest and enraged and frustrated by RN's above-the-battle tactics -- the hearings would be the most celebrated since Army-McCarthy.
- 2) The McGovern anti-Nixon Commercials. McGovern's people seem finally to have come to the conclusion that their best hope lies not so much in resurrecting their candidate's image -- they don't have the time -- but in tearing down our man. My guess is that they will be extremely rough, and if they are not overdone, fairly effective.

My personal view is that we ought to, now, go on a crash program for some more anti-McGovern commercials to keep in stock.

Beyond that, the latest poll is certain to put pressure on McGovern; and given the fact that his three most sensitive points seem to be Vietnam, (he is proud of his "consistency) Eagleton and "credibility," maybe we ought to begin moving, with some of our surrogates, in a more direct way.

If we can get him talking and arguing about these -- we do well. Frankly, I would like to see the entire Eagleton business, which is such a loser for McGovern, re-elevated by some of our people.

Back to the commercials momentarily -- HHH's anti-Nixon commercials were brutal in my judgment, but effective -- and we should expect that McGovern's will go after the "scandal", "corrupt" issues -- and if they are smart they will not use their principal, McGovern, as they have mistakenly in the past, to act as the Prosecutor.

3) A sharp McGovern movement upward in the polls could conceivably cause a reverse leverage on the "analyses" and "polls" and "local statements" which are right now so damaging to him. Every time a newspaper or survey goes out they come in with startling negative returns for McGovern. And every time a local pol speaks off the record it seems, he raps George. This has to hurt in community after community -- if McGovern starts up, however, this will reverse and one will find poll after poll saying "McGovern closing the gap." While the possibility recedes with each week, the possibility remains of the "comeback" theme catching with the press and public.

4) The apathetic electorate and the low turnout. Though the liberal press has egg on its face now, for its earlier discussion of a aroused and alienated electorate looking for McGovern's kind of politics, there seems to be some truth in the possibility of a low turnout, over-confident Republicans, and a McGovern-hard-core maximizing his vote, while we minimize ours. We ought to be giving this problem serious consideration -- although I do not believe it at all calls for RN to hit the stump at this point in time.

5) The media hostility. One has to have seen Agronsky & Co. to visualize it. Since the Broder column there has been piece after piece, taking up the theme that RN has "outwitted" the press, that he is using the enormous resources of the White House to such effect that it is no contest; that McGovern is at an unfair disadvantage; that the President is ignoring the issues, playing above-the-battle, refusing to "engage" in campaign debate, even by long distance, and -- to top it all -- appears headed for a landslide which the press can do nothing about. If one took a poll of the press corps, I would guess that ninety-five to one hundred percent want to see the gap closed.

Recognizing that they are negatively disposed to our campaign at this point, and anxious to leap on any embarrassment -- perhaps we should give consideration to an offensive media strategy to feed the animals, so they aren't chewing on us the rest of the campaign.

Dont' know what we have of substance coming down the pike -- but the more of that the better. One notes that RN's Texas visit which had some substance to it was played extremely well -- and the NY to LA jaunt was played equally badly. We should be thinking of something to give these fellows to write and talk about -- rather than bemoaning our "lack" of a campaign.

THOUGHTS & SUGGESTIONS:

A) We ought to have adopted in advance a strategy for the McGovern ads, whether to ignore them -- or attack them as "smear" -- hopefully they will be so bad that they will indict themselves. But it would be serious for us, I think, if McGovern's ads succeeded in moving the focus off of McGovern's screw-ups and incompetence and his radicalism -- which should be the last four weeks of this campaign.

B) We should be planning now -- not locking in, however -- some election eve, Saturday, Sunday, Monday type drills, which are certain to create massive national interest and participation in the election -- by our folks. We do need to have our troops excited more out there -- they do need to get stirred up -- and given the Presidential podium, one can get the national attention with relative ease.

C) In two weeks or perhaps three, the time may be ripe to be calling -- not for a mandate for RN -- but for a repudiation of McGovern by Democrats. - On these grounds, we should move out the line that the McGovernites have given up; they are interested only in a large vote to control the party machinery -- and a Connally and Meany and Fitzsimmons and other Democrats can all call for a national "repudiation of extremism" -- so that the Great Democratic Party can be restored to its fightful owners, the American people. Cast a Vote Against Extremism kind of theme -- something that will convince Democrats that if McGovern even comes close their party is gone from them forever.

D) If we can contain McGovern for twenty more days even, or two more weeks, assuredly there is a fail-safe point at which local Democrats have to jump off and start pushing out their split-ticket sample ballots; with sort of an every-man-for-himself philosophy taking over. That almost but did not happen with Humphrey -- as the unions never deserted him. But if McGovern is hanging where he was ~~last~~ -- two or three weeks from now it could start with him.

E) The President should stay out of the attack business altogether, as of now. This still looks good. Also, the President of all the People, standing up for America, is something disgruntled and even anti-Nixon Democrats can vote for -- if the rest of us can keep McGovern painted as an incompetent and opportunistic radical -- who would do or say anything to win. With McGovern's recent horrible charges he has diminished the possibility of his becoming a sympathetic figure, a martyr, which leaves us some room for toughening the attacks on him.

Buchanan