

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>
10	47	1/24/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Letter	Copy of a letter from L. Richard Guylay to RN RE: how to confront the media's anti-White House bias. Handwritten notes on original added by unknown. 5 pgs.
10	47	2/1/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Memo	From RN to Ehrlichman RE: the former's post-presidential plans. 4 pgs.

L. RICHARD GUYLAY and ASSOCIATES

A DIVISION OF PUBLIC OPINION POLLS, INC.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

TIME & LIFE BUILDING

ROCKEFELLER CENTER

NEW YORK, N. Y. 10020

AREA CODE 212 765-1923

January 24, 1972

President Richard M. Nixon
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

You have had a highly successful year and are enjoying substantial support as a result. This demonstrates that the crowd loves a strong leader; it responds to positive words and decision and appreciates solid accomplishments taken with modest grace.

Major Press Problems Ahead

Although there has been an uneasy quiet on the TV and newspaper commentator front for the past few months, it would be a gross mistake to underestimate the continuing antagonism of the press. The feeling toward you and your administration among some reporters and TV people is almost pathological in its intensity and it's only a matter of time before it erupts again. Meanwhile, it serves the press' purpose to let this "honeymoon" period extend for some months because it builds up the appearance of fairness and sets the stage for the coming

(more)

Availability, right.

attack - which will be brutal. The whole TV apparatus has not forgotten Agnew's attacks and will try to demolish him and, through him, you.

I'm sure you are aware of some of the reasons for this hostility. Allen Drury sees it very well. But the problem is a major factor in the campaign and needs much more attention.

It also points up the need to consistently sell the record of your Administration. The good is overlooked and the bad makes news. This has been true of every Administration but the difference is that the Democrats get a lot of free help from a friendly press. The Republicans don't.

I have written you before on the need for a better "Answer Desk" operation. There has been some improvement but the attached Times article giving G.O.P replies to Ted Kennedy's speech shows much more work needs to be done.

KENNEDY CRITICIZED FOR ATTACK ON NIXON

WASHINGTON, Jan. 18 (UPI)—Republicans struck back today at Senator Edward M. Kennedy for his attack yesterday on President Nixon and his record.

The House minority leader, Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, noted Senator Kennedy's charge last night that the American people no longer trusted their President and said that "of all the issues which the Senior Senator from Massachusetts might raise among the American people, the question of trust seems least likely to serve his interests."

Asked to explain the reference, Paul Mitchell, Mr. Ford's press secretary said: "It's obvious. It's an oblique reference to Chappaquiddick."

The Senate minority leader, Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, accused Mr. Kennedy of being a "point man" interested in the 1976 Presidential nomination, and said he owed the President an apology.

Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, the Republican National Chairman, called Mr. Kennedy's denunciation of the Administration "the usual cacophony of mindless negativism about our country."

- a. Ford's is so oblique it had to be explained by his press secretary.
- b. Scott's talks about a "point" man -- What is that?
- c. Dole calls Kennedy's talk the "usual cacophony of mindless negativism".
That's hardly the language of the man in the street.
It's all amateurish and ineffective.

C. White

(more)

(4)

like going into a fight with one hand tied behind your back while your opponent is free to swing with both.

The campaign strategy should be to try in every state and the unpublicized goal would be to win by the biggest Republican majority in history. You were part of the ticket in '56 that holds the record Republican plurality of 9½ million. If you give up in advance on the Eastern seaboard and other industrial states, the campaign starts with an unnecessary handicap. There are lots of people in all 50 states who want to work for you and they should be encouraged to put on a maximum effort in their own area.

Muskie is doing what Goldwater did in '64 - quietly lining up delegates - one by one - and he may sew up the nomination that way - although I doubt it. He is just not coming over well.

Lindsay is planning a massive TV campaign for his primaries and is choosing states that are easy to saturate with TV. While his record as mayor is miserable, he should not be underestimated: (1) most people outside of New York don't care what kind of record he has - and feel nobody could govern New York any better, (2) he has a personality that could excite the masses under the supercharged conditions of a presidential campaign, and (3) he has superb skills in the use of TV - especially in commercials and non-live presentations.

The threat, however, remains Ted Kennedy. ("Kennedy's the Chap.") The country is hungering for excitement and glamour and novelty -

(more)

(5)

new promises for the Good Life for everyone. Kennedy is a counterpoint to what Senator Mondale calls the boredom gripping the country.

You need fresh ideas, a capsule description of the successes of your first term - there still is no simple and memorable characterization for what you have achieved - and some new faces. Connally has had some success because of the contrast between his flamboyancy and others in your cabinet. But it would be a serious mistake to put him on the ticket. He is a Democrat - and he reminds too many people of Lyndon Johnson, whom he looks like, and sounds like, and that could spell disaster. Great sections of the country dislike or distrust Texans - however unfair that may be.

Finally, if you think I can help you in the campaign, I would be most anxious to do so. I look forward to hearing from you.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,



L. Richard Guylay

LRG:fc

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 1, 1972

EYES ONLY

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN EHRLICHMAN

FROM THE PRESIDENT



For your guidance in preparing the estate plans I would like to emphasize some private conclusions I have reached which are irrevocable.

1. I know there are some who assume that I will supplement my retirement income by going back into the practice of law, serving on boards of directors, or taking honorariums. All of these courses of action are totally out of the question.
 - (1) The practice of law, even at the rarified levels in which I participated in it, was terribly difficult for me, and in some cases where I had to run errands for clients degrading, during the period after I served as Vice President. It would be impossible, after serving as President. Under no circumstances whatever will I consider any offer in this area, no matter how lucrative.
 - (2) The same goes for serving on boards of directors for many of the same reasons. Clearly apart from the companies and the individuals with whom I served I detested serving on boards of directors in the period from 1961 to 1968. Under absolutely no circumstances will I serve on any boards of directors for remuneration or for charitable purposes after I leave office.

- (3) The idea of a former President accepting honorariums for speeches or for going on television is totally abhorrent to me and cannot be considered as a possible source of additional income.
- (4) That leaves open only the possibility of writing a book which would, of course, provide a rather sizable item of income if I decided to write a book. But I do not want to be in the position to have to write a book. My present inclination is not to go through that agony again, having experienced it after serving as Vice President when I was much younger and had infinitely more energy. Fortunately I have been around the track with regard to the come on you get with the book publishers that a good writer can do all the work and all you have to do is to see him for an hour or so a day for several weeks. This may work with some. It is out of the question as far as I am concerned. Consequently, you must assume that as of this writing we cannot include possible income from a book in our estate planning.

This means that I shall have to live on my retirement. I want to get from you a final figure of what that will be, including the Presidential retirement and the Vice Presidential retirement to which I contributed over a number of years. My recollection also is that there may be some kind of insurance which provided an annuity but it may be that this was purchased for Pat after my death and probably does not apply to me on retirement age. Incidentally, be sure and have this insurance analyzed and cancel as much as possible of it if it serves no useful purpose at this point.

While the retirement income is a rather handsome amount it would be totally inadequate to maintain a household staff and to provide for the other personal expenses which I will inevitably have if I am to maintain the position a former President ought to maintain after retirement. It is for this reason that I either will sell some of the personal papers outright in order to get the funds which will provide that necessary income or I will sell them to a foundation in return for the foundation undertaking the following commitments:

1. The income must be adequate to maintain the grounds of the San Clemente home.
2. A household staff including Manolo and Fina and possibly one like Monzon or Della Cruz would have to be provided for.
3. The allowance for office staff and particularly for office expenses like telephone calls would have to be substantially increased over the amount now provided for by law. On this point, incidentally, I would like for Haldeman to work out a tentative budget, which I realize will be subject to change as the law changes in the future, as to what the supplemental amount probably would need to be. The reason it is vitally important to have this amount substantially increased is that otherwise I would be in the same position Eisenhower was in when he had to go begging to the National Committee to get them to subsidize a research assistant to help him with speeches, statements, etc., and also for other expenses that were not covered by the niggardly allowance provided by the Congress. I realize the allowance is more now than it was, but it is still totally inadequate in view of the tremendously escalated salaries that will have to be paid for secretarial help and what professional help I may decide to employ to handle mail, statements, etc.

EYES ONLY

- 4 -

To sum up, I am not interested in selling my papers for personal profit. On the other hand, in view of the change in the tax laws, I thoroughly intend either to get the above amounts taken care of through an arrangement with a foundation or, as far as the personal papers are concerned, I shall either find a way so that Tricia and Julie can get benefit from them, or what is more likely I will destroy them on my death. The latter, incidentally, is a very lively option anyway as far as most of these personal papers are concerned. I have no confidence whatever in the various intellectuals who might want to paw through them and misinterpret them for posterity.

Incidentally, one point I made to you this morning which I re-emphasize is that the conditions I set forth above as far as income, except for the office staff, would apply to Pat after my death. To leave her \$35,000 a year to live on as Ritzel suggested in his estate plan would not only mean that she would have to move out of the San Clemente property, which she probably would want to do anyway, but it would mean that she would not have enough for any household help considering present prices. This I would not be able to put her through at this point in her life.

I am rather surprised that Ritzel and the others who worked on this came up with such an inadequate plan insofar as taking care of my personal expenses was concerned. My guess is, however, that they just assumed as a former President I would take advantage of that position by selling my name, by joining some big law firm again, or through honoraria, etc. All of this is out of the question.