

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	39	7/19/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to John Scali RE: Chancellor's coverage of the Democratic National Convention. 1 pg.
4	39	7/5/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Buchanan RE: a recent "New York Times Magazine" piece which, if used properly, could be devastating for McGovern. 1 pg.
4	39	7/5/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Buchanan RE: McGovern's reaction to J. Edgar Hoover's death. 1 pg.
4	39	7/24/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Colson to RN RE: problems with Connally and Stans. 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>
4	39	7/5/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Colson to Cohen RE: Graham's "Goodstock" festival. 1 pg.
4	39	7/24/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Howard RE: the absence of a statement from Fitzsimmons in "Monday." 1 pg.
4	39	7/5/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Steve Karalekas RE: the evolution of RN's views on North Vietnam from 1968 to 1972, as well as McGovern's ideas on the country. 1 pg.

July 19, 1972

HIGH PRIORITY

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN SCALI

FROM: CHARLES W. COLSON

Chancellor's coverage during the Democratic National Convention was in some cases absolutely horrible. At times, he in effect, advocated McGovern's positions. It is felt that you should talk to him about this and indicate not only our feeling; but ask him if he is going to continue advocating this, he should tell us so we know what to expect from him.

July 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: CHARLES COLSON

As part of your research effort on McGovern, you should read the Shannon piece in yesterday's New York Times Magazine. It is utterly devastating if used with the right people. I am sure you have already seen it and probably came to the same conclusion I did. Shannon is a member of the liberal establishment and regards McGovern as a phony.

Howard K. Smith was so impressed with it he called me to be sure that I read it. He said he thought it would turn a awful lot of people off. The responsible moderate liberals might turn very sour on the guy if the one thing he has going for him, supposed credibility, is tarnished and the Shannon piece really does tarnish it.

July 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

PAT BUCHANAN

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

There is an extraordinary segment of the McGovern interview in Life dealing with J. Edgar Hoover. McGovern almost suggests that he was happy that Hoover died. When I read it the first time I couldn't believe that that's the way it was intended. I re-read it and it is perfectly obvious that McGovern is saying that Hoover had lived more than the normal useful life.

This is the typical mindset of the master, big brother, bureaucratic planner. When people outlive their usefulness, get rid of them. It is utterly incredible and I would think that a neat little piece could be written really tracing out all of the implications of what McGovern is saying. Not only would it infuriate the pro-Hooverites, reflect very poorly on McGovern's obvious bad taste, but it could also frighten a hell of a lot of people. It is the kind of thing that I would think Human Events would love to run or National Review. We could then get reprints and distribute them out to law enforcement officers as to whom Hoover was something of a folk hero, other friends of Hoover and conservatives generally. This kind of an article could bring out the little old ladies in their tennis shoes that we need this year.

If you think well of this, is it something that perhaps could be handled in your shop? I don't think anyone else can write it with the same bite you could. Maybe this is one that we could farm out to Jeffrey Hart and possibly even publish under his byline.

EYES ONLY

July 24, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Connally/Stans

I am sorry to report to you on an unfortunate incident involving Connally as to which you should be advised and perhaps call Connally if you feel it is warranted.

Last week MacGregor asked to meet with Connally and myself to be sure we were thoroughly coordinated -- a necessary thing to do obviously. We decided to include Stans because under the new statute, Connally cannot spend funds without Stans' permission. Obviously fund raising and expenditures have to be closely coordinated because of the inevitable competition for the same sources, the need for initial funding by Stans as well as the strict statutory ceilings.

In the meeting we had this afternoon (after your visit with Connally), Stans became very difficult; he seemed very unhappy over the whole Democrats for Nixon effort. He said that he was already getting money from Democrats and obviously any funds Connally raised would be "in competition" with his efforts. He further said that he had an obligation to raise \$40 million and that anything Connally needed would be in excess of that and he didn't think he could raise it. MacGregor said that he would gladly reduce his budget to make room for Connally's needs. I made the point that Connally would have to be assured of a budget of at least \$3 million (since Connally had told me over the weekend he didn't want to launch an effort unless he was assured of funding of at least that amount).

Connally became visibly angry during the lunch especially when Stans said that if Connally raised more money than his "budgeted" figure, he would have to turn it over to Stans. During the lunch Connally said

he wasn't sure he wanted to embark on the Democrats for Nixon effort at all and Stans allowed as to how he wished the President could find another fund raiser. Despite frequent attempts by MacGregor and me to keep it under control, the atmosphere was distinctly hostile.

After the lunch, I assured Connally that the candidate's views on this would prevail and that I knew exactly how you felt about it and that he shouldn't worry about Stans. I urged him to leave it in my hands. He said that he didn't ask for this job and that while he had no trouble at all dealing with MacGregor or myself, that it was best to find out right from the beginning where he stood. He said attitudes were very important to him, that he thought Stans had a very negative attitude and really acted as if Connally was an "intruder and competitor". I said again that I knew where the President stood and Connally said that isn't good enough. He said, "The President has to let his people know where he stands. Obviously Stans doesn't have the word."

I assured Connally that I would see that Stans did understand the President's views and Connally said, "Well, I will have to see for myself". He said he was unable now to agree to announce Democrats for Nixon on August 1. (Yesterday he had decided that would be the date.)

I think Connally was putting on a little show for everyone involved. He is a very sensitive fellow and Stans can indeed be rather dour when it comes to discussing campaign funds. Also, Maury is very tired and under a lot of pressure.

Connally, unfortunately, will have to work with Stans; under the new statute, complete autonomy is impossible. I assured Connally that he would be spared anything like this in the future and that Jacobson, Connally's counsel, could handle it. He said he didn't want Jacobson "subjected" to this either.

Under the circumstances, MacGregor and I think it may be important for you to tell Connally that we have reported to you on the lunch and that he can be assured that there will be no problem, that the budget matters have been determined by you, that autonomy is to be maintained and that if he can't deal with Stans, he can work through MacGregor and me exclusively. Clark and I will simply have to handle Maury.

July 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: HOWARD COHEN

FROM: CHARLES COLSON

Please get together with Ken Rietz and tell me what we are doing to exploit the Graham "Godstock" festival. We have simply got to get more closely identified with Graham's effort. He wants to help. Haldeman is the only one who can talk to him, but our people should be planning how to make maximum use of Graham's organization.

Be certain to give me a report on this. Don't let this one slide.

July 24, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

DICK HOWARD

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

Why? Please tell me why -- (by the way, at this point I am frothing at the mouth), the full Fitzsimmons statement was not printed in Monday? If you will recall, I discussed this with you and you told me Lofton was going to use the statement intact and the picture on the cover. The picture on the cover is delightful, except that it happens to be one that was taken when the President had the Canadian flag on his lapel as well as the American flag, which will incense the Teamster executives, since it was put on the President Monday by their Vice President from Canada who is a jackass. And, there is no Fitzsimmons statement anywhere in the copy. The Fitzsimmons statement is a perfect thing for our Party people to use. I am absolutely running out of patience on this. We keep being told things are going to be in Monday and then they are not. What in God's name does it take to get this straightened out? Would you please ask for an explanation and I think from now on we had simply better see the page mock-ups of Monday before it goes to print.

July 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: STEVE KARALEKAS
FROM: CHARLES COLSON

Would you please put together a couple speeches and a fact sheet on the things that Candidate Nixon said in '68 about the negotiations then underway between the Johnson Administration and North Vietnam. Then-Candidate Nixon was very restrained. Bear in mind the interesting point that McGovern will be making his acceptance speech on the day that the Paris peace negotiations resume. This may pose a lovely trap for him if we can get the right foundation built. People should start speaking about the responsibility of Presidential candidates; the danger of candidates speaking out in such a way that may sabotage negotiations; this historical comparison with Candidate Nixon, etc. Then, if McGovern does what is predictable in his acceptance speech, our people should be ready to hit very, very hard. His acceptance speech may be the most significant speech of the campaign. He will undoubtedly talk about his better deal with Hanoi, but he will be careful not to put it in those terms; it is up to us, however, to put it in those terms.

If you will get the information together, Noel Koch can start some of the fellows on the Hill on this drumbeat. Clawson can perhaps promote a column or two or maybe work this into pieces written about McGovern and you might talk to the Vice President's staff to see if he has an opportunity in the next 10 days to give this kind of speech. No one has to mention McGovern by name.