

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>
50	31	11/4/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Letter	From Paul W. Keyes to Robert Finch RE: Opinion of Campaign. 4pgs.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 110]	Letter	Paul W. Hayes to Robert Furch re: opinion of campaign [attached to cover slip, "File 1970 Campaign"]	11/4/70	C (copy)

FILE GROUP TITLE PRF BOX NUMBER 23

FOLDER TITLE Campaign 1970

RESTRICTION CODES

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.</li> <li>B. National security classified information.</li> <li>C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.</li> <li>D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.</li> <li>F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.</li> <li>G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.</li> <li>H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

**Collection:** President's Personal Files  
**Box Number:** 23

**Folder:** Campaign 1970

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
110	Return Private/Political

PAUL W. KEYES PRODUCTIONS

*Incorporated*

---

10000 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, TOLUCA LAKE, CALIFORNIA 91602 • 766-9505

November 4, 1970

Dear Bob:

Earlier today I chatted very briefly with Don Hughes on the phone. He asked my opinion of the campaign and when I gave him a few of my thoughts, Don asked me to expand these thoughts and put them into a letter to you.

Please understand, Bob, I make no attempt to sit here on the fringe and Monday morning quarterback.

However, since I do have some feelings on the recent political months, I will set them down as briefly and lucidly as I can.

In general I felt it was wrong to mount a Massive Attack against the Democrats on the issue of Law and Order. There is, as you know, a Point of No Return built into any attack, and unfortunately I believe the Administration's attack peaked far enough ahead of election day so that it was rendered useless as a vote motivator.

In the final desperate hours I believe the Administration lost a considerable number of votes by the total polarization of the Republicans versus Bad Guys. Blanket endorsements like blanket accusations are usually fallible, particularly in an election year when the voters have been pre-saturated with political prose. This was particularly true this year when Ticket Splitting was forwarned. A perfect example was represented here in California when a Conservative was elected Governor, a Liberal Democrat was elected Senator and a Negro Liberal was elected Superintendent of Schools.

Perhaps it is because I live here and "felt" the political climate in the State that these three elections came as no surprise to me.

Feeling all along that they were inevitable, I found the "all Republicans are good guys and all Democrats are bad guys" theology misdirected.

Another example of the same situation occurred in New York where certainly Rockefeller was no surprise nor was Buckley.

I felt that the Democrats came into the campaign as a debt-ridden, unorganized, scattered and shattered party. However, due to some of the reasons I have cited above and others, the Democratic Party emerged from the elections as a unified party obviously now with the taste of victory and in a much easier position to raise financing for the Presidential race in 1972 which no longer looms as a Republican certainty.

In short, the Administration solidified the Democrats by making them "the Enemy".

If either party viewed 1970 as a Dress Rehearsal for 1972, I believe Momentum is on the side of Mr. O'Brien.

I have always been a believer in Humanity and preferred it over Hullabaloo. The difference between the two was greatly evidenced on the eve of the election when we went for the Hullabaloo by running on all three Networks a poor quality, black and white, and very bad audio re-play of an occasion that had already been reported to the Press.

The Democrats, on the other hand, chose to become the Voice of Reason by framing Mr. Muskie in calmness and logic with a low key approach much appreciated by voters who had simply had it by now of slogans and cliches. Certainly many of the key races decided the next day served to prove that our man did not get through as a man.

I believe the voters are a little more sophisticated than they are sometimes given credit for. I do not believe you can say to them "bring us together" out of one side of your mouth; tell them to "watch what we do and not what we say" out the other side of your mouth; and accuse all Democrats of being Anarchists out of the middle of your mouth.

To reinforce the above I have spent all of my life helping a few individual men reach the greatest number of people. In each case - the case of Jack Paar, the case of Dean Martin, the case of Rowan and Martin and more recently John Wayne - I have always found Humanity works better than Hullabaloo.

ZWC  
7-4-5  
1/4-

I have never preferred the Gut Fighter image, and I feel the people basically resent a partisan campaigning President, particularly when he Blankets the Republicans as the good guys and the Democrats as the bad guys.

I long feared that we would overplay our hand nationally and it was in that regard that I violently opposed the national televising of the Anaheim Rally and was, for a brief period of time, responsible for the cancellation of that network coverage.

I am sure that the last ditch, all-stops-pulled Crusade on behalf of George Murphy was ill advised. No matter how personal the friendship, no matter how high the political esteem, the year was never a year in which George Murphy could have been elected once the campaign started. John Tunney was - from the very beginning - an idea whose time had come in California. A more careful reading out here would have shown that earlier.

Believe me, Bob, this is not Monday morning quarterbacking. Whatever intelligence to the contrary that went back to Washington from California was wrong. The danger, of course, is that too often during the heat of political battles the reports that are sent back are colored by the Hopes of those doing the reporting.

As for the San Jose incident which we used far too opportunistically, I find Reagan's quote on the news that same night unforgivable. I refer specifically to Reagan's on-the-air quote that "we kept giving them the Peace sign and that makes them madder than anything".

In other words, Reagan was boasting on the news that while inside the President's threatened car, he was heaping fuel on an already inflammatory situation by taunting those outside the car.

We know we have a better candidate than the Democrats can produce in 1972.

We have two years during which the President, in the conduct of his office, can prove to the people that he is the better man.

Whatever he does, he must not be tagged with using the Oval Room as Campaign Headquarters for 1972.

While I am deeply aware how the loss of so many Governors hurts the party machinery, I am not concerned with the technical aspects. I am mainly concerned with the public image of the President as President and campaigner.

I hope I have been clear in these few thoughts in pointing out some of the things that seemed wrong in 1970. Certainly I don't glory in pointing out past wrongs. My only intention is to put the spot light on a few of them hoping similar situations will be avoided in the future.

You know me well enough, Bob, to know that I would never have volunteered the above unless I had been specifically asked to do so. And would never have burdened you with such a long letter unless I have been specifically asked to do so.

Warmest regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paul".

The Honorable Robert Finch  
Counsel to the President  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.