

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>
47	37	7/24/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: comments from Eagleton's thoughts on Jane Fonda making anti-war broadcasts from Hanoi. 5 pgs.
47	37	7/1/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian and Buchanan to MacGregor RE: talking points in upcoming speech. 5 pgs.
47	37	7/11/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: letter to the editor from Isreal 'enough to put McGovern away for awhile with the Jewish vote.' 2 pgs.
47	37	7/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Buchanan RE: Kevin Phillips portraying McGovern as Democratic party elite rather than the 'common man.' 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>
47	37	7/17/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Dean RE: legal advice on the use of videotape footage. 5 pgs.

## DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 147] [Doc 148]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Henry Kissinger, with attached draft copy <u>Attachment:</u> Memo, Betty Noland to Khachigian, re Kissinger, 7/28/72	7/31/72	(C/NIP-)
N-2 [Doc 149]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: yesterday's performance on the interview show, with attached draft copy	7/24/72	(C/NIP-)
N-3 [Doc 150]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Eagleton's appearance on "Face the Nation" with attached draft copy	7/17/72	(C/NIP-)
N-4 [Doc 151] [Doc 212] [Doc 213]	Memo	Buchanan to Khachigian to McGovern, re: Jimmy Carter's performance, with attached draft copy and another copy	7/12/72	(C/NIP-)
N-5 [Doc 152]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: letter to the editor from Israel	7/11/72	(C/NIP-)
N-6 [Doc 214]	Memo	Draft copy of N-5 [attached to N-5 case file]	7/11/72	(C/NIP-)
N-7 [Doc 153]	Memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: McGovern & Dem. party elite, with attached draft copy	7/7/72	(C/NIP-)

FILE GROUP TITLE

KEN KHACHIGIAN

BOX NUMBER

6

FOLDER TITLE

July [1972]

## RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
- B. National security classified information.
- C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
- D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
- F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

## DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

p. 2

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-8 [Doc 154]	memo	Buchanan, Khachigian to Haldeman, McClellan, re: strategy - thoughts for period between conventions	7/7/72	C (copy)
N-9 [Doc 155]	memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Dealing with the House after Dem Convention, with attached draft copy	7/3/72	C (copy)
N-10 [Doc 156]	memo	Khachigian to Buchanan, re: Dem. Platform + McClellan proposals, with attached draft copy	7/3/72	C (copy)
N-11 [Doc 215]	memo	Khachigian to Dean, re: use of network footage for ads, w/draft attached	7/17/72	C
N-12 [Doc 211]	memo	Khachigian to Price (with draft) re acceptance speech	7-20-72	C

FILE GROUP TITLE

NIXON PROJECT

BOX NUMBER

6

FOLDER TITLE

July [1972]

RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
- B. National security classified information.
- C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
- D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
- F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

**Collection:** Kenneth L. Khachigian  
**Box Number:** 6

**Folder:** July [1972]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	
147	Retain	Open
148	Retain	Open
149	Return	Private/Political
150	Retain	Open
151	Return	Private/Political
152	Return	Private/Political
153	Return	Private/Political
154	Retain	Open
155	Retain	Open
156	Retain	Open
211	Retain	Open
212	Return	Private/Political
213	Return	Private/Political
214	Return	Private/Political
215	Return	Private/Political

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 24, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN  
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Here is the most egregious material out of yesterday's performances on the interview shows -- things which I believe we ought to jump on right away -- one way or the other.

Eagleton was asked what he thought about Jane Fonda making anti-war broadcasts from Hanoi. His answer:

" . . . I know Jane Fonda is a sort of a blithe, floating figure, a free-thinker and a free-wheeler. I wouldn't try to circumscribe where she would visit. I would not enthusiastically support broadcasting in North Vietnam, but I am not going to try to control Miss Fonda or try to tell her how to live her life and I suspect she will not try to tell me how to live mine."

His absolute refusal to outrightly repudiate what Jane Fonda has done is a blow against the men who are fighting and who have fought in Vietnam. Can you imagine what would have been said if the same descriptions were made of "Tokyo Rose" or others of her ilk. Perhaps the VFW, American Legion and several on the Hill ought to go directly after Eagleton on this. Fletcher Thompson has been giving Jane hell, maybe he'll do it to Eagleton as well.

McGovern made three statements on "Face the Nation" which are very vulnerable. Asked: "If in fact you were President and you pulled all the American troops out, and the North Vietnamese posed some other condition and you didn't get the prisoners back, what do you do then?"

He responded: "Well, I think it's in our interest to get out in any event, Mr. Morton." I. e., we get out even if the POW's don't come back. This is a flat-out statement of admission that the POW's are secondary in importance to getting out of Vietnam. This statement got very little press attention, and it ought to be elevated this week.

7/24/72

*copies  
in MCG &  
MCG EXT.*

MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Here is the most egregious material out of yesterday's performances on the interview shows -- things which I believe we ~~was~~ ought ~~to~~ to jump on right away -- one way or the ~~xxx~~ other.

Eagleton was asked what he thought about Jane Fonda making anti-war broadcasts from Hanoi. ~~xxxxxxx~~ His answer:

"... I know Jane Fonda is a sort of a blithe, floating figure, a free-thinker and a free-wheeler. I wouldn't try to circumscribe where ~~wh~~ she would visit. ~~xixen~~ I would not enthusiastically support ~~xxxx~~ broadcasting in North Vietnam, but I am not going to try to control Miss Fonda or try to tell her how to live ~~x~~ her life and I suspect ~~xxx~~ she will not try to ~~xxxx~~ tell me how to live mine."

His absolute refusal to outrightly repudiate what Jane Fonda has done ~~x~~ is ~~an xxxxxxx~~ a <sup>blow</sup> ~~step~~ ~~xxxx~~ against the men who are fighting and who have fought in Vietnam. Can you ~~im~~ imagine what would have been said if the same descriptions were made of "Tokyo Rose" or others of her ilk. Perhaps the VFW, American Legion and ~~xxxxxx~~ several on the Hill ought to go directly after Eagleton on this. Fletcher Thompson has been giving Jane hell, maybe he'll do it to Eagleton as well.

*in* "Face the Nation"

McGovern made three statements/which are ~~x~~ very vulnerable.

Asked: "If in fact you were President and you pulled all the American troops out, and the North Vietnamese posed some other condition and you didn't get the prisoners back, what do you ~~xx~~ do then?"

He responded: "Well, I think it's in our interest to get out ~~in~~ in ~~any~~ any event, Mr. ~~Morton~~." I.e., we get out even if the POW's don't come back. This is a flat-out statement of admission that the POW's are ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ secondary in importance to getting out of Vietnam. ~~This~~ This statement got ~~very~~ ~~little~~ little press attention, and it ought to be elevated this ~~week~~ week.

Asked by Dave Broder if a "McGovern Administration" would have taken the same action/as we did in the ~~Detroit~~ Detroit busing cases, McGovern responded: "I ~~xxx~~ think not, Mr. Broder." First, Griffin ~~xxx~~ ought to be told about this as he may have missed it. Second, 1701 ought to call our guns in Michigan and tell them about this -- that McGovern would not have given them one ounce of support in their battle against busing.

Finally, McGovern suggested that we had provocateurs who would go to Miami "to cause trouble in order to win sympathy for the candidates they are demonstrating against." This was to ~~offset~~ offset Dole's quote of last ~~week~~ week. We should make the point again and again that Rubin, Hoffman and others

~~we~~ have ~~never~~ endorsed McGovern. They are McGovern supporters. If they do ~~anything~~ anything to mess up our convention, McGovern should be held ~~responsible~~ at least partially responsible. Moreover, ~~if~~ unless McGovern has ~~any~~ any names of provocateurs, he better quit accusing us of ~~trying~~ trying to ~~stage~~ stage a backlash at Miami. He is impugning ~~our~~ our integrity, and ~~his~~ nameless allegations of ~~this~~ this sort are surely beneath the dignity of a U.S. Senator.

July 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN  
KEN KHACHIGIAN

For your speech tomorrow and for your performance on Issues and Answers, we have the opportunity to get across an important line regarding the Dem convention. The line is the amazing political expediency and opportunism that McGovern stooped to get his way at the convention -- the compromises he made which went counter to his record as the man you can trust. Some of the examples which follow should be compared with his position that he wouldn't compromise his fundamental principles and that he would never advocate a course in private that he was too embarrassed to pursue in public. I. e., spare us the hypocrisy and the goody-goody rhetoric about being a man you can trust.

-- He shafted the women in the South Carolina delegate vote. He told the National Women's Political Caucus that he would support their position on the credentials fight, then he turned around and let the gals go down the drain in order to preserve his hide on the California challenge. No one begrudges his desire to save his political future, but why did he lie to the caucus?

-- For months he has taken the position that he would get out of Vietnam lock, stock, and barrel and go on the good graces of the North Vietnamese to get our POW's back. Yesterday, after meeting with the POW wives and getting their support, he said he would leave a residual force in Thailand and off the SVN coast in order to make sure we get our POW's back. Just where does he stand?

-- He has endorsed publicly the \$6500 minimum guaranteed welfare payment for a family of four, yet instructed his delegates to vote against this measure in the platform fight on Tuesday night and early Wednesday morning.

-- He continued to say through his aides that he was not instructing his delegates on how to vote on platform issues. Yet Dan Schoor of CBS News made public a secret McGovern staff memo which showed the party line on all the platform positions -- including instructing his delegates that he would not want the minority plank provisions on abortion and homosexuality among other things. Why did his lieutenants continue to say in public that he would not instruct his delegates?

-- On abortion, Shirley MacLaine his "spokesperson" spoke in favor of the McGovern position -- i. e. , not to adopt the minority position -- on the grounds that this would jeopardize McGovern's chances in the fall -- yet she voted for the minority position (only after she knew it would not prevail on the floor). This is the very kind of expediency he said he would not pursue in his quest for the Presidency.

SUGGESTED LINE:

Spare the country all this pious talk about being "right from the start," about being consistent, candid and open. McGovern's shuttling back and forth on the issues at Miami Beach was one of the most ambidextrous and opportunistic political performances of the past decade.

cc: Jeb Magruder  
bcc; Pat Buchanan

~~McGovern: Right for the State~~

7/12/72

Clark Mac Gregor

FOR: ~~BUCHANAN~~ ~~McGregor~~

FROM: ~~(PAT Buchanan)~~  
(KEN KHACHIGIAN)

For ~~McGregor's~~ <sup>your</sup> speech tomorrow and for ~~his~~ <sup>your</sup>

performance on Issues and Answers, we have ~~the~~ the opportunity to get across an important line regarding the Dem convention.

The line is the amazing political expediency <sup>(an opportunity)</sup> that McGovern stopped to to get his way at the convention -- the compromises he made which went counter to his record as the man you can trust. Some of the examples which follow should be

~~compared~~ compared with his position that he wouldn't compromise his fundamental principles and that he would ~~never~~ <sup>never</sup> advocate a course in private <sup>(in private)</sup> that he was too embarrassed to pursue in public. I.e., ~~spare~~ spare us the hypocrisy and the goody-goody ~~rhetoric~~ rhetoric about being a man you can trust.

-- He shafted the women in the South Carolina ~~delegate~~ delegate vote. He told the National Women's Political Caucus that he would support their position on the credentials fight, then he ~~turned~~ turned around and let the gals go down the drain in order to preserve ~~his~~ his hide on the California challenge. No one begrudges his desire <sup>(desire)</sup> to save his ~~political~~ political future, but ~~why~~ why did he lie to the ~~caucus~~ caucus?

-- For months he has taken the position that he would get out lock, stock, and barrel ~~out~~ of Vietnam and

go on the ~~and~~ good graces of the North Vietnamese to get our POW's back. ~~He~~ Yesterday, after meeting with the POW's wives and ~~getting~~ getting their support, he said he would leave a residual force in Thailand and off the SVN coast in order to make sure we get our POW's back. Just where does he stand?

-- He has endorsed publicly the \$6500 minimum ~~guaranteed~~ guaranteed welfare payment for a family of four, yet instructed his delegates to vote against this measure in the platform fight on ~~the~~ Tuesday night and early ~~the~~ Wednesday morning.

-- He continued to say through his aides that he was not instructing his ~~and~~ delegates on how to vote on platform issues. Yet Dan ~~the~~ Schoor of CBS News made public a secret McGovern staff memo which showed the party ~~line~~ line on all the platform positions -- including instructing ~~them~~ <sup>his delegates</sup> that he would not want the minority plank provisions on abortion and homosexuality among other things. Why did ~~he~~ <sup>his lieutenants</sup> continue to say in public <sup>that</sup> he would not ~~to~~ instruct his delegates?

-- On abortion, Shirley MacLaine his "spokesperson" spoke in favor of the McGovern position -- i.e., not to adopt the minority position -- on the grounds that this would jeopardize McGovern's chances in the fall -- yet she ~~for~~ voted ~~for~~ <sup>in</sup> for the minority position ~~only~~ (only after she knew it would

not prevail on the floor<sup>}</sup>. This is the very kind of expediency he said ~~he~~ he would ~~not~~ not pursue in his quest for the Presidency.

Suggested lines

Spare the country all this pious talk about being "right from the start," ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ about being consistent, candid and open. McGovern's shuttling back and forth on the issues at Miami Beach was one of the most ~~WXX~~ ambidextrous <sup>(sp?)</sup> and opportunistic political performances of the past decade.

July 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN  
KEN KHACHIGIAN

For your speech tomorrow and for your performance on Issues and Answers, we have the opportunity to get across an important line regarding the Dem convention. The line is the amazing political expediency and opportunism that McGovern stooped to to get his way at the convention -- the compromises he made which went counter to his record as the man you can trust. Some of the examples which follow should be compared with his position that he wouldn't compromise his fundamental principles and that he would never advocate a course in private that he was too embarrassed to pursue in public. I. e., spare us the hypocrisy and the goody-goody rhetoric about being a man you can trust.

-- He shafted the women in the South Carolina delegate vote. He told the National Women's Political Caucus that he would support their position on the credentials fight, then he turned around and let the gals go down the drain in order to preserve his hide on the California challenge. No one begrudges his desire to save his political future, but why did he lie to the caucus?

-- For months he has taken the position that he would get out of Vietnam lock, stock, and barrel and go on the good graces of the North Vietnamese to get our POW's back. Yesterday, after meeting with the POW wives and getting their support, he said he would leave a residual force in Thailand and off the SVN coast in order to make sure we get our POW's back. Just where does he stand?

-- He has endorsed publicly the \$6500 minimum guaranteed welfare payment for a family of four, yet instructed his delegates to vote against this measure in the platform fight on Tuesday night and early Wednesday morning.

-- He continued to say through his aides that he was not instructing his delegates on how to vote on platform issues. Yet Dan Schoor of CBS News made public a secret McGovern staff memo which showed the party line on all the platform positions -- including instructing his delegates that he would not want the minority plank provisions on abortion and homosexuality among other things. Why did his lieutenants continue to say in public that he would not instruct his delegates?

-- On abortion, Shirley MacLaine his "spokesperson" spoke in favor of the McGovern position -- i. e. , not to adopt the minority position -- on the grounds that this would jeopardize McGovern's chances in the fall -- yet she voted for the minority position (only after she knew it would not prevail on the floor). This is the very kind of expediency he said he would not pursue in his quest for the Presidency.

SUGGESTED LINE:

Spare the country all this pious talk about being "right from the start," about being consistent, candid and open. McGovern's shuttling back and forth on the issues at Miami Beach was one of the most ambidextrous and opportunistic political performances of the past decade.

cc: Jeb Magruder  
bcc; Pat Buchanan

July 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN  
KEN KHACHIGIAN

For your speech tomorrow and for your performance on Issues and Answers, we have the opportunity to get across an important line regarding the Dem convention. The line is the amazing political expediency and opportunism that McGovern stooped to to get his way at the convention -- the compromises he made which went counter to his record as the man you can trust. Some of the examples which follow should be compared with his position that he wouldn't compromise his fundamental principles and that he would never advocate a course in private that he was too embarrassed to pursue in public. I. e., spare us the hypocrisy and the goody-goody rhetoric about being a man you can trust.

-- He shafted the women in the South Carolina delegate vote. He told the National Women's Political Caucus that he would support their position on the credentials fight, then he turned around and let the gals go down the drain in order to preserve his hide on the California challenge. No one begrudges his desire to save his political future, but why did he lie to the caucus?

-- For months he has taken the position that he would get out of Vietnam lock, stock, and barrel and go on the good graces of the North Vietnamese to get our POW's back. Yesterday, after meeting with the POW wives and getting their support, he said he would leave a residual force in Thailand and off the SVN coast in order to make sure we get our POW's back. Just where does he stand?

-- He has endorsed publicly the \$6500 minimum guaranteed welfare payment for a family of four, yet instructed his delegates to vote against this measure in the platform fight on Tuesday night and early Wednesday morning.

-- He continued to say through his aides that he was not instructing his delegates on how to vote on platform issues. Yet Dan Schoor of CBS News made public a secret McGovern staff memo which showed the party line on all the platform positions -- including instructing his delegates that he would not want the minority plank provisions on abortion and homosexuality among other things. Why did his lieutenants continue to say in public that he would not instruct his delegates?

-- On abortion, Shirley MacLaine his "spokesperson" spoke in favor of the McGovern position -- i. e., not to adopt the minority position -- on the grounds that this would jeopardize McGovern's chances in the fall -- yet she voted for the minority position (only after she knew it would not prevail on the floor). This is the very kind of expediency he said he would not pursue in his quest for the Presidency.

SUGGESTED LINE:

Spare the country all this pious talk about being "right from the start," about being consistent, candid and open. McGovern's shuttling back and forth on the issues at Miami Beach was one of the most ambidextrous and opportunistic political performances of the past decade.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 11, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

You may have missed this letter to the editor from Israel -- it's enough to put McGovern away for awhile with the Jewish vote.

Suggest that it be gotten over to 1701 with orders that it be mailed out to all our Jewish fundraising people. It should receive wide attention along with that Israeli editorial of a few days back and the comments by Ambassador Rabin.

I'm not sure people understand that we have to start now and continue hitting hard on this Israeli proposition in order that we change voter sentiment on the issue safely in advance of the election.

Attachment

7/11/72

MEMORANDUM FOR BUCHANAN

FROM: KHACHIGIAN

You may have ~~miss~~ missed this letter to the editor from Israel~~x~~ -- ~~it~~ it's enough to put McGovern away for awhile with~~y~~ the Jewish vote.

Suggest that it ~~be~~ be gotten over to 1701 with orders that it be ~~mailed~~ mailed~~out~~ out to all our Jewish fundraising people. It should receive wide attention along with that Israeli editorial of a few days back and the ~~comments~~ comments by R Ambassador Rabin.

I'm not sure people understand that we have to start now and ~~continue~~ continue hitting hard on this Israeli proposition in order that we ~~change~~ change ~~voter~~ voter sentiment on the issue safely in advance of the election.

P. Keep signed  
of this letter  
to our files,  
K.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 7, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Kevin Phillips should be able to use the attached to continue his current theme that McGovern represents the Democratic party elite rather than the "common man." Here's the approach.

The photo appearing in the Post amounted to a round-table of Camelot -- the same Eastern Establishment liberals who got us into Vietnam. Townsend Hoopes and Paul Warnke were both prominently mentioned in the Pentagon Papers, and so, probably, was Abe Chayes, the Kennedy legal advisor at the State Department. Moreover, all the others were part of the Kennedy-Johnson team in one way or another -- the ones who gave us the disastrous foreign policy of the 60's. In my opinion, the fact that McGovern is calling on these guys for advice is a damning indictment of his potential foreign policy.

Moreover, a look at the photo will show that the only woman is a secretary. No blacks, chicanos, poor people, etc. McGovern makes a big thing about representing the "people" and that he will bring them into his cabinet. But, in fact, he still calls on the elite for his advice.

I think there is a good potential column along these lines.

7/7/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Kevin Phillips should be able to use the attached to continue his <sup>current theme</sup> ~~angle~~ that McGovern represents the Democratic party elite rather than the "common man." Here's the approach.

The photo appearing ~~in~~ in the Post amounted to a roundtable of Camelot -- the same Eastern Establishment liberals who got us into Vietnam. ~~These are the~~ <sup>Townsend</sup> Hoopes and Paul Warnke were both prominently mentioned in the Pentagon Papers, and so, probably, was Abe ~~Chayes~~ <sup>Kennedy</sup> Chayes, the legal advisor at the State Department. Moreover, all the others were part of the Kennedy-Johnson ~~team~~ team in one way or another <sup>- the ones who</sup> ~~gave~~ gave us the disasterous foreign policy of the 60's. In my opinion, the fact that McGovern is calling on these guys for advice is a damning indictment of his potential ~~foreign~~ foreign policy.

Moreover, a look at the photo ~~will~~ will ~~show~~ show that the only woman ~~is~~ is a secretary. No blacks, chicanos, poor people, etc. McGovern makes a big thing about representing the "people" and that he will bring them into his cabinet. But, in fact, ~~he~~ he still calls on the elite for his advice.

I think there is a good <sup>potential</sup> column along these lines.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 17, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: JOHN DEAN  
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 

We have a potential problem that we may be faced with in the fall and need to get an opinion before the fur starts flying.

There is a great deal of valuable videotape footage on the networks which would be useful for us to use in ads. E. g., the California debates where HHH beat McGovern over the head on the issues and some of the interview shows where Wilbur Mills, Scoop Jackson and others have been pounding away at McG. Obviously, it would help us to be able to use these to prove that McGovern is not liked even by his own party.

However, as you know, these materials (though we have them on tape) are the property of the networks, and it is my understanding that copyright laws stand in the way of their use. Moreover, it is also my understanding that the networks will not give permission for use of these tapes to one candidate to use against another candidate.

Let me pose some questions and fact situations along these lines:

Suppose we ran an ad in October which used footage from "Meet the Press" -- showing Scoop Jackson attacking McGovern. Suppose, also, that we did not credit the tape to the network. What would be the possible consequences? Keep in mind that we are going to have 1701 make these tapes and not drag Signal Corps into the process.

What happens if we run the ad and at the bottom say: "NBC film -- Meet the Press?" Is the network likely to be less apt to take legal action against the Re-Elect committee?

Assume the ad runs with the credit line at the bottom and NBC seeks legal action. Would an injunction be their first act? If they seek an injunction, and we comply, and let's say the ad ran only two or three times nationally, would the network be in a position to seek damages, and if so what would the amounts possibly be?

Generally, do you see the problems as being so insurmountable as to militate against any use of network tapes in the fashion I suggest? Consider these points. Let's say they seek an injunction, and we say: "O.K., we will pull it off the air, and regret using your tape. But we don't see how anyone can be angry about using someone's public statements. We felt that Meet the Press was an excellent source of information and we used it." Of course, if there is a public outburst on this, it only draws more attention to the ad itself -- to our benefit I believe.

I am least concerned about the injunction. It wouldn't be so bad -- moreover, I am not sure the networks would be all that upset over the free advertisement of their interview shows. But I would be concerned about monetary damages, and it is in this area where I would think we might want to focus.

Obviously no action will be or would be taken until we have some idea about how to proceed.

cc: Fred Fielding  
Pat Buchanan

7/17/72

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN DEAN

FROM: KEN KHECHIGIAN

We  
/Have a potential problem that we may be faced with in the fall and need to get an opinion before the fur starts flying.

There is a great deal of valuable videotape footage on the networks which would be useful for us to use in ads. E.g., the California debates where HHH beat McGovern over the head on the issues and some of the interview shows where Wilbur Mills, Scoop Jackson and others have been pounding away at McG. Obviously, it would help us to be able to use these to prove that McGovern is ~~not~~ *not* ~~poor candidate~~ *liked even by his own party.*

However, as you know, these materials (though we have them on tape) are the property of the networks, and it is my understanding that copyright laws stand in the way of their use. Moreover, it is also my understanding that the networks will not give permission for use of these tapes to ~~me~~ *me* candidate to use against another candidate.

Let me pose some questions and fact situations along these lines:

Suppose we ran an ad in October which used footage from "Meet the Press" -- showing Scoop Jackson attacking McGovern.

Suppose, also, that we did not credit the tape to the network. What would be the possible consequences? Keep in mind that we are going to have 1701 make these tapes and not drag signal corps into the process.

What happens if we run the ad and at the bottom say: "NBC film -- Meet the Press?" Is the network likely to be apt to take legal action against the Re-Elect committee?

Assume the ad runs with the credit line at the bottom and NBC seeks legal action. Would an injunction be their first act? If they seek an injunction, and we comply, and let's say the ad ran only two or three times nationally, would the network be in a position to seek damages, and if so what would the amounts possibly be?

Generally, do you see the problems as being so insurmountable as to militate against any use of network tapes in the fashion I suggest? Consider these points. Let's say they seek an injunction, and we say: "O.K., we will pull it off the air, and regret using tape. But we don't see how anyone can be angry about using someone's We felt that Meet the Press was an excellent source of information and we used it." Of course, if there is a public outburst on this, it only draws more attention to the ad itself -- to our benefit I believe.

I am least concerned about the injunction. It wouldn't be so bad -- moreover, I am not sure the networks would be all that upset over the ~~free~~ ~~advertisement~~ ~~of~~ their ~~interview~~ shows. But I would be concerned about monetary damages, and it is in ~~this~~ this area where I would think we ~~might~~ might want to focus.

Obviously no action will be or would be taken until we have some idea about ~~how~~ how to proceed.

cc: Fred Fielding  
Pat Buchanan