

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	43	10/12/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Shumway RE: attachment being used in the media. 3 pgs.
47	43	10/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Statement for Senator Goldwater on Cora Weiss and her ilk. 8 pgs.
47	43	10/4/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Haldeman RE: Presidential Campaigning. 17 pgs.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 19]	Memo	Khashigian to Shumway, re: attached on large national anthem with annotated copy - draft copy	10/12/72	c (conf)
N-2 [Doc 20]	Speech	Statement for Senator Goldwater on Cora Cuais and her ill, with attached draft copy	10/17/72	c (conf)
N-3 [Doc 21]	Memo	Kachigian to Waldeman, re: Presidential Campaigns with attached draft copy	10/4/72	c (conf)

FILE GROUP TITLE
.....

BOX NUMBER
7

FOLDER TITLE
October [1972] [2/2]

RESTRICTION CODES

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>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 G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
 H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: Kenneth L. Khachigian

Box Number: 7

Folder: October [1972] [2 of 2]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
19	Return Private/Political
20	Return Private/Political
21	Return Private/Political

October 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: VAN SHUMWAY
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Do you think you can milk the attached for a few columns? They would also be good material for "Washington Wire" type columns.

Maxine Cheshire might even want to run the one on Sarge and the National Anthem.

Attachments

Plain paper

10/12/72

MEMO TO VAN SHUMWAY

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Do you think you can milk the attached for a few columns? They would also be good material for "Washington Wire" ~~xx~~ type columns.

Maxine Chesire might even want to run the one on Sarge and ~~the~~ the National Anthem.

October 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: VAN SHUMWAY

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN *kh*

Do you think you can milk the attached for a few columns? They would also be good material for "Washington Wire" type columns.

Maxine Cheshire might even want to run the one on Sarge and the National Anthem.

Attachments

Ken —
I sent them out to
Reg Murphy (the one on
the South) and to Bob
Allen (the one on the
National Anthem)

Va

October 7, 1972

STATEMENT FOR SENATOR GOLDWATER ON CORA WEISS
AND HER ILK

Senator McGovern has managed to surround himself with a menagerie which we probably won't ever see matched again in any campaign. He's got Jerry Rubin and Abby Hoffman endorsing him and Ramsey Clark traveling to Hanoi for him. But the ones I find most despicable are those who trampled the flag of the United States when they propagandized the release of three POWs.

Cora Weiss and David Dellinger -- the Hanoi Odd Couple -- took off for Hanoi and played the enemy's game by letting it pluck the propaganda strings of the POW release. What a sight to see American servicemen being used by the American surrender movement to spread hate for America and its role in Southeast Asia. I'm glad that we got our boys back, but I am outraged at the way their lives were used by anti-war-person Weiss and the pre-eminent pacifist, David Dellinger.

Cora Weiss is today the most frustrated person in the world. You will recall that when the POWs were returned to American soil she screamed to American newsmen: "We have just witnessed a recapture scene, one incarceration replacing another." My only regret is that Cora didn't stay behind in Hanoi in trade for the POWs. What really frustrates Ms. Weiss is that Major Edward Elias would not spout anti-war sentiments for benefit of the television cameras. She moaned that

Elias had indicated anti-war sentiments in Hanoi but deceived her by not doing so in America. What Ms. Weiss overlooked was that Major Elias was engaging in the time-honored tradition of not tearing one's country down.

Where does George McGovern fit into all this? It is a matter of public record that Cora Weiss is a member of the Citizens Committee of New Yorkers for McGovern, along with former Mayor Robert Wagner and other luminaries. The logical next step is that Cora Weiss visited Hanoi as Mr. McGovern's agent in the POW release and acted as his P. R. representative to see that McGovern could squeeze a few pounds of publicity out of this spectacle. The fact that George McGovern rushed out press releases attacking the Defense Department during this period indicates that the Weiss-Dellinger operation was tightly orchestrated out of the McGovern headquarters.

David Dellinger must also be a prize catch for Senator McGovern. Dellinger is one of the famous Chicago Seven indicted for disrupting the 1968 Democratic Convention. What is rarely publicized about Mr. Dellinger is that he served a prison sentence during World War II for refusing to serve in the armed forces. It comes as no surprise that one who is unwilling to fight the Nazis is no less unwilling to do anything to hurt the Communist North Vietnamese.

About all one can say is that George McGovern deserves the Hanoi Odd Couple. I only hope that George regains his senses someday and repudiates these nuts and kooks who play footsy with him. He is going to learn his lesson the hard way on the morning of November 8th.

Democrat 12/12/52 9/20/52

FDR Jr. on committee for McGovern in N.Y.

NEW YORK — (AP) — Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. yesterday was listed as a member of the Citizens Committee of New Yorkers for McGovern.

Three other sons of former President Franklin Roosevelt — James, John and Elliott — have endorsed President Nixon.

The names of about 200 members of the committee to

support the presidential bid of Senator George S. McGovern were released by former Mayor Robert F. Wagner, state campaign chairman for the South Dakota Democrat.

Others on the committee include Mayor John V. Lindsay, State Comptroller Arthur Levitt, Buffalo Mayor Frank Sedita, former U.S. Attorney Ramsey Clark and anti-war activist Cora Weiss.

Major Edward Elias would not spout anti-war sentiments for benefit of the television camera. She moaned that Elias had indicated anti-war sentiments in Hanoi but deceived her by not doing so in America. What Ms. Weiss overlooked was that Major Elias was engaging in the time-honored tradition of not tearing one's country down. ~~She might have learned from the experience, but she didn't.~~

Where does George McGovern fit into all this? It is a matter of public record that Cora Weiss is a member of the Citizens Committee of New Yorkers for McGovern, along with former Mayor Robert Wagner and other luminaries.

The logical next step is that
~~it is a matter of only one step to deduce that Cora Weiss~~

visited Hanoi as Mr. McGovern's agent in the POW release and acted as his P.R. representative to see that McGovern could squeeze a few pounds of publicity out of this

spectacle.
~~by means of~~. The fact that Senator McGovern rushed out press releases ~~attacking the~~ *during this period* attacking the Defense Department indicates that the Weiss-Dellinger operation was tightly orchestrated out of the McGovern headquarters.

David Dellinger must also be a prize catch for Senator McGovern. Dellinger is one of the famous Chicago Seven indicted for disrupting the 1968 Democratic Convention. What is rarely publicized about Mr. Dellinger

is that he served a prison sentence during World War II for refusing to serve in the armed forces. It comes as no surprise that one who is unwilling to fight the Nazis is no less unwilling to do anything to hurt the Communist North Vietnamese.

About all one can say is that George McGovern deserves the Nanoi Odd Couple. I only hope that George regains his senses someday and repudiates these nuts and kooks ^{who} play footsy with him. He is going to learn his lesson the hard way on the morning of November 8th.

P.

(better make a few extra)


Make me a copy/of attached x for McGovern rhetoric file. Then take the original and send it Dick Howard along with his memo to me -- I don't need to keep a copy of his memo.

k

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HALDEMAN
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN 
SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNING

From the vantage point of having tracked the opposition activities more closely than most observers, I am submitting these thoughts as to what's ahead for us when the President takes to the hustings.

I am convinced that the extent of the victory on November 7 -- or even whether that victory will be of historic landslide proportions -- will be determined almost solely by the Presidential tone in the last three weeks of the campaign. If the returns coming in from the New York/California swing mean anything, it is that the anti-McGovern line, coming from the President, may be counterproductive.

We all know that there exists in the media a great deal more tolerance for the rhetorical excesses coming out of the Democrats. There is nothing approaching a groundswell of editorial comment and subtle television reportage which attaches the labels "divisive" or "polarizing" on the opposition ticket. It comes out more like "hard-hitting" and "spirited."

I regret to say that we must live with this double standard for the remainder of the campaign. I do not think there is anything we can do to prevent it. The question is how to deal with it in terms of Presidential tone.

The wonder of television is that it can belie any editorial comment or criticism. For example, if, on the tube, the President is lofty, spirited, and uplifting, it is difficult for the commentators to make the public think differently. If Dan Rather says RN was "harsh" or "strident" and the television image is objectively not harsh, then Rather has been effectively rebutted. The voters are not damn fools in this respect.

What will hurt is when the President takes to the attack -- say, per the Cassie Mackin report of last week -- and gets a label hung around him by the Rathers and Jarriels. If the image confirms the commentary, I fear we lose points.

Consequently, if the label is effectively pinned on RN that he is divisive and polarizing, we will have handed George McGovern one of his most potent campaign issues. I believe this will be as central an issue as anything else in the campaign. The fact that McGovern has picked up his personal attacks more decisively this week is proof positive that the Democrats think they have the right combination.

The one thing that we cannot afford to do in the last three weeks of the campaign is to allow McGovern to make RN the campaign issue. He is desperately trying to do this and will probe for an opening. One of the basic components of the landslide margin in the current polls is, of course, the overwhelming support from Democrats. About a third of this is "soft" support, and many of these Democrats will be searching for a reason not to vote for RN. McGovern will try to give them as many reasons as possible -- the basic one which will be "you cannot trust him; he is tricky, political," etc. Let's not give them the opening.

It is interesting that we have come full circle from the time of the primaries. McGovern was the white Knight, anti-politician. RN was the quintessential politician. Now, according to all polls, McGovern skidded because he turns out to be just another politician while RN is perceived as statesmanlike and Presidential -- a man you could trust. But it is important to remember that if the public was volatile enough to switch quickly from McGovern to RN on the "politician" issue, it can just as quickly switch back in a pendulum swing.

That will be McGovern's secret weapon -- try to rehabilitate himself as an anti-politician (he began that Monday) and when RN comes out on the stump, put the politician label on him as rapidly as possible. With the media's help, that could be done in a matter of days.

We are not inevitably locked into this scenario. Again, it is my opinion that the public will not buy the politician label for RN if, in fact, there is little in his image and tone which projects "politics." We can frustrate the media on this account. And let us remember, too, that once RN is out campaigning, the press may complain about his lack of discussion of the issues, but that charge is one which won't make a damn bit of difference. If RN is talking about what we perceive to be important to the voting public, then we should not be bound by what the gurus of the press think should be said.

* * * * *

This brings me to the more crucial part of the analysis. If there are certain things the President should not do, what, in fact, should be the tone and content of his campaign effort?

First, I don't believe that the President should move out any of the attack material, and if so, only by strong, positive RN counter-positions. If we are doing our job right on the staff level, we can get the attack stuff out. So far, I think, without a doubt, we have succeeded in hanging some uncomfortable labels on McGovern. His efforts to wiggle off the fishhook are proof that we have hit a nerve. Moreover, the polls confirm that McGovern is tarred with the radical label. The job from the Vice-Presidential level on down is to keep that record of radicalism out front. I don't doubt our ability to do that.

But the Presidential level should be altogether different. I frankly think the President need not even concern himself with pointing out the radicalism in the opposition camp. I say this, not because I think it is unfair for a President to do this, but because RN gets unfair treatment when he does it. If RN did so, the focus then comes back to RN's tactics" rather than to the record we want to surface to the public.

Instead, there are a number of things the President can do as he campaigns to keep Republican spirits high, prevent too much Democratic party slippage, and, in general, go into election eve with the feeling that a posture has been presented to the American public which maintains its confidence in the stewardship of RN.

(1) In my judgment, one of the central issues of this campaign is the "good" America of RN versus the "corrupt" America of McGovern. I think McGovern has been absolutely stupid in the way he has been seen to side with those who tear America down. The best way to exploit this is from the positive side of RN's belief in a good country. I know this has been a thematic favorite of the President's, but I think it needs to be developed as a more comprehensive slice of the pie we are presenting this year.

You saw the Yankelovich results in TIME which said that McGovern's biggest miscalculation was on the depth of bitterness and dissatisfaction among the voters. And 75% of those sampled said that they were sick and tired of hearing people attack American values. I don't mean here simply a few paragraphs on America being a good country, but a full speech should be developed on this subject, and I would think that it be one of the first delivered.

The best contrast of the campaign will be the bitchy George McGovern with his whining, whimpering, crybaby attitude matched against the strong confidence of RN. The people of America are not basically mean-minded and sour, but are, instead, people who respond to lift and optimism. McGovern erred in trying to harvest the bitter fruit when in fact there is, as the polls universally show, an almost serene satisfaction with the way things are. The desire is for change, sure, but, damn-it-all, change which plays on the goodness of America, not that which craps all over its institutions.

(2) The President should develop, or ask to have developed for him, some basic lines which respond with calculated indignation to some of the pure bull that McGovern is throwing around. This is a chance for RN to take the extremely important underdog role -- an effective role I believe. I am referring to such things as the Hitler quotes, the "barbarism" in Vietnam, the charge that he's lied about POWs, etc.

A healthy dose of modulated anger would be good for the electorate and good for RN. For example, he might say: "My friends, I have served as your President for nearly four years, and I am not about to sit back and be compared to Adolph Hitler. It is a tribute to free speech that candidates can make such charges, but it is not a tribute to the political process to have the world watch the President of the United States equated with the most hated dictator of our time." A number of lines roughly like that would be effective, I believe.

Note: if any more anti-war hecklers become a visible problem and can be seen and heard on television, the President might effectively say: "I think the American people are tired of being called murderous and war-mongers. You have the right to question our policy, but don't you for one minute try to impugn the motives or the morality of the citizens of our country." Here, RN defends the public.

(3) One effective point is to rebut the moralism of George McGovern. This should be done by pointing out that no one has a monopoly on morality, and that it doesn't help the political process for the opposition candidate to suggest that only what he thinks is right and what everybody else thinks is wrong. RN might say that he may not agree with someone, but that he doesn't try to act morally superior or hide behind a shield of rectitude.

This point has turned up in a number of columns -- namely, reporters confessing chagrin at McGovern's pious morality. RN needs to make the point as well.

(4) It may sound incongruous, but I believe that RN must address an all-black audience during the campaign. Charles Bartlett had an excellent column pointing out that McGovern has taken the blacks for granted in a subtle attempt to get white working class Democrats back into the fold. RN addressing a black audience will have several effects. It will get excellent play and emphasize he is the President of all the people. If tuned to the black middle class -- rather than the "We Shall Overcome" overblown rhetoric of LBJ -- it can get votes, especially if RN goes right to the heart of the matter of those who denigrate blacks by lumping them together as all poor, ignorant, etc. It would also probably send McGovern scurrying to patch up things with the blacks and cause him, perhaps, to overreact and line himself up with a political posture which won't help him. Finally, it would exploit the frustration in the black leadership at being taken for granted by the Democrats and promote the emphasis that RN has done more for minority advancement than any other President.

(5) One of the things that keeps turning up in voter surveys in terms of dissatisfaction with McGovern is the fact that he is changing his tune on everything and promising something for everybody. It looks like -- and is -- crass expediency. It also confirms that McGovern is not anti-politician, but pure politician. RN can advance his cause by making a virtue of the fact that promises have not been wildly bandied about in his administration, and the reason for the turbulent 60's (a subtle reminder of what we had in those years) was the overblown rhetoric which could not be delivered in programs. This will posture RN as the one who is not the expedient politician who promises all things to all men. "We did not make promises we could not keep." In the Haynes Johnson survey, here is what an ethnic Democrat, who retired early because he was unemployed, and voted for McGovern in the primary, said: "Now I think he's (McG) more two-faced, like trying to tell people he's going to help them get jobs. They all like to do the promises, but he's gone beyond most of them, whereas Nixon knows what we've got to do."

(6) Hold the hands of Democrat defectors by telling audiences that what we have done in foreign policy is the same thing JFK et al. would have done.

(7) Emphasize domestic stability and the sense of pride and respect America now has for itself. McGoo is on the wrong side of the issue if he continues to think Americans hate themselves.

(8) When emphasizing the international turnaround -- cite things like: who would think that not only America, but Japan would be talking to China; East Germany with West Germany; North Korea with South Korea. The great sense of quietude and stability is like calamine lotion on chickenpox. Who was ever ashamed of serenity and goodwill?

(9) Do not underestimate how McGovern so effectively uses attacks on himself. It's not for nothing he gets elected in South Dakota. Here is what one of his close friends says: "There's nothing George likes better than to have them attack him as disloyal. Then he can get out his American Legion cap and dust off his Distinguished Flying Cross and really take them on." George has already done this, and you can be sure he's lusting for RN to even hint at his loyalty. This is why I believe RN must leave the attack to others.

(10) For God sake, let the word go out to all staff that the smallest mistake of judgment could foul everything. In 1968 the media played the innocuous mutual fund letter to a fair-thee-well. Let's not get nervous about things. Our opponents will desperately search for anything by which they can pin all the clichéd labels on us -- for once, let's protect RN from his friends. Let's also maintain our cool about McGovern's crowds. Goldwater had much better crowds than LBJ, and in 1960, JFK was mobbed in Ohio and RN was mobbed in Atlanta -- neither carried the state in which he was mobbed. Crowds are not determinative of momentum.

I regret to say that we must live with this double standard for the remainder of the campaign. I do not think there is anything we can do to prevent it. The question is how to deal with it in terms of Presidential tone.

● The wonder of television is that it ^{can} belie any editorial comment or criticism. For example, if, on the tube, the President is lofty, spirited, and uplifting, it is difficult for the commentators ^{to} make the public think differently. If Dan Rather says RN was "harsh" or "strident" and the television image is objectively not harsh, then Rather has been effectively rebutted. The voters ~~are~~ are not damn fools in this respect.

What will hurt is when the President takes to the attack -- say, ^{per} the Cassie Mackin report of last week -- and gets a label hung around him by the Rathers and Jarriels. If the image confirms the commentary, I fear we lose points.

~~When does this all fit in to the campaign itself?~~
^{Consequently,} if the label is effectively pinned on RN that he is divisive and polarizing, we will have handed George McGovern one of his most potent campaign issues. I believe this will be as central an issue as anything else in the campaign. The fact that McGovern has picked up ^{his} personal attacks more decisively this week is proof positive that the Democrats think they have the right combination.

The one thing that we cannot afford to do in the last three weeks of the campaign is to allow ~~McGovern~~ McGovern to make ~~the President~~ ^{RN} ~~the~~ campaign issue. He is desperately trying to do this and will ~~probably~~ ^{probably} for an opening. One of the basic components of the landslide margin in the current polls is, of course, the overwhelming support from Democrats. ~~McGovern~~ ^{About a third of this} is ~~soft~~ "soft" support, and many of these Democrats will be searching for a reason not to vote for RN. ~~McGovern~~ McGovern will try to ~~give~~ give them as many ~~reasons~~ reasons as possible -- the basic one which will be ~~that~~ "you cannot trust him; he is tricky, political," etc. *Let's not give them the opening.*

It is interesting that we have come full circle from the time of the primaries. McGovern was the white Knight, anti-politician. RN was the ~~quintessential~~ quintessential politician. Now, according to all polls, McGovern skidded because he turned ~~out~~ ^{out} to be just another politician while RN ^{is} perceived as statesmanlike and presidential -- a ~~man~~ man you could trust. But it is important to remember that if the ~~public~~ public was volatile enough to switch quickly from McGovern to RN on the ~~"politician"~~ "politician" issue, it can just as quickly switch back in a pendulum swing.

That will be McGovern's secret weapon -- try to rehabilitate himself ~~as~~ as an anti-politician (he began that ^{Monday} ~~Monday~~)

and ~~_____~~ when RN comes out on the stump, put the politician label on him as ~~_____~~ rapidly as possible. With the media's help, that could be done in a matter of days. ~~_____ and I~~

~~_____ have no doubt that the media will help as much as they can.~~

We are not inevitably locked into this scenario. ~~_____~~

Again, it is my opinion that the public will not buy the politician label for RN if, in fact, there is ~~_____~~ little in his image and tone which projects "politics." We can frustrate

the media on this ~~_____~~ account. And let us remember, too,

that once RN is out ~~_____~~ campaigning, the press may complain

about his lack of discussion of the issues, ~~_____~~ but that charge

is one which won't make a ~~_____~~ damn bit of difference ~~_____~~

~~_____~~ as I ~~_____~~ If RN is talking about ~~_____~~ what we perceive

to be important to the voting public, then we should not

be bound by what the gurus of the press ~~_____~~ think should

be said.

* * * * *

This brings me to the more crucial ~~_____~~ part of the analysis. If there ~~_____~~ are certain things the President should not do, what, in fact, should be the tone and content of his campaign effort?

First, I don't believe that the President should move out ~~_____~~ any of the attack material, and if so, only ~~_____~~

~~_____~~ by strong ^{positive} RN counter-positions. If

we are ~~_____~~ doing our job right on the staff level, we can

get the attack stuff out. ~~_____~~ so far, I think, without a

doubt, we have succeeded in hanging some uncomfortable labels on McGovern. His ~~own~~ efforts to wiggle off the fishhook are ~~proof~~ ~~that~~ we have hit ~~the nerve.~~ Moreover, the polls confirm that McGovern is tarred with the radical label. The job from the Vice-Presidential level on down is to keep that record of radicalism out front. I don't doubt our ability to do that.

But the Presidential level should be altogether different. I frankly think the President need not even concern himself with pointing out the radicalism in the opposition camp.

I say this, not because I think it is unfair for a President to do this, but because RN gets unfair treatment when he does it. ~~When~~ ^{IF RN did so,} the focus then comes back to RN's "tactics" rather than ^{to} the record ~~we~~ we want to surface to the public.

~~Instead,~~ there are a number of things the President can do as he campaigns to ~~maintain~~ keep Republican spirits high, prevent too much Democratic party slippage, and, in general, go into election eve with the feeling that a posture has been presented to the American public which maintains its confidence in the stewardship of ~~the~~ RN.

(1) ~~As I suggested in terms of remarks for the acceptance speech, I believe that one of the central issues of this campaign is the "good" America of RN versus the "corrupt" America of McGovern. I think McGovern has been absolutely stupid in the way he has been seen to side with~~

those who ~~tear~~ tear America down. The best way to exploit this is from the positive ~~side~~ side of ~~belief~~ ^{RN's} belief in a good country. I know ~~this~~ this has been a thematic favorite ~~of~~ of the President's, but I think it needs to be developed as a ~~slice~~ ^{more comprehensive} slice of the pie we are presenting this year.

You saw the ~~Yankee~~ ⁱⁿ Yankeelovich results ~~TIME~~ ^{on} TIME which said that McGovern's biggest misaalculation was the depth of bitterness and dissatisfaction among the voters. ~~75%~~ ^{And} 75% of those sampled said that they were sick and tired of hearing people attack American values. I don't mean here simply a few paragraphs on America being a ~~good~~ good country, ~~but~~ ^{but}

~~at~~ full speech should be developed on this subject, and I would think that it be one of the ~~first~~ first delivered.

The best contrast ~~of~~ ^{it} of the campaign will be the bitchy George McGovern ~~with~~ with his whining, whimpering, ~~crybaby~~ crybaby attitude matched against the strong confidence of RN. The people of America are not basically mean ~~minded~~ ^{reminded} minded and sour, but are, instead, people who respond to lift and optimism. McGovern erred in trying to harvest the bitter fruit when in fact there is, as the polls universally show, an almost serene satisfaction with the way things are. The desire is for ~~change~~ change, ~~sure~~ sure, but, damn-it-all, change which plays on the ~~goodness~~ goodness of America, not that which craps all over its institutions.

~~Handwritten scribbles at the top of the page.~~

2.) The President should ~~develop~~ develop, or ask to have developed for him, some basic lines which respond with calculated indignation to some of the pure bull that McGovern is throwing around. This is a chance for RN to take the extremely important underdog role -- an effective role I believe. I am referring to such things as the Hitler quotes, the "barbarism" in Vietnam, the charge that he's lied about POWs, etc.

A healthy dose of ~~modulated~~ modulated anger would be good for the electorate and good for RN. For example, he might say: "My friends, I have served as your President for nearly four years, and I am not about to sit back and be compared to Adolph Hitler. It is a tribute to free speech that candidates can make such charges, but it is not a tribute to the political process to have the world watch the President of the United States equated with the most hated dictator of our time." A number of lines roughly like that would be effective, I believe.

Note: if any more anti-war hecklers become a visible problem and can be seen and heard on television, the President might effectively say: "I think the American people are tired of being called murderers and warmongers. You have the right to question our policy, but don't you for one minute try to impugn the motives or the morality of the citizens of our country." *Here, RN defends the public.*

(3.) One effective point is to rebut the moralism of George McGovern. This should be done by [redacted] pointing out that no one has a monopoly on morality, [redacted] and that it doesn't help the political process for the opposition candidate to suggest that [redacted] ^{only} what he thinks is right and what everybody else thinks is wrong. RN might say that he may not agree with someone, but that he doesn't try to act morally superior or hide behind a shield of recititude.

This [redacted] point has turned up in a number of columns -- namely, [redacted] reportess confessing chagrin at McGovern's pious morality. RN needs to make the point as well.

(4.) It may sound incongruous, but I believe that RN must address [redacted] an all-black audience during the campaign. Charles Bartlett had an [redacted] excellent column pointing out that McGovern has taken the blacks for granted in a subtle attempt to get white working class Democrats back into the fold. RN addressing a black audience will have several effects. It will get excellent play and emphasize he is the President of all the people. If tuned to the black middle class -- rather than the "We Shall Overcome" overblown rhetoric of [redacted] LBJ -- it can get votes, especially if RN goes right to the heart of the matter of those who denigrate blacks by lumping them together as all poor, ignorant, etc.

It would also probably send McGovern scurrying to patch up things with the blacks and cause him, perhaps, to overreact and line himself up with a political posture which won't help him. Finally, it would exploit the frustration in the black leadership at being taken for granted by the Democrats and promote the emphasis that RN has done more for minority advancement than any other President.

(5.) One of the things that keeps turning up in voter surveys in terms of dissatisfaction with McGovern is the fact that he is changing his tune on everything and promising something for everybody. It looks like -- and is -- crass expediency. It also confirms that McGovern is not anti-politician, but pure politician. RN can advance his cause by making a virtue of the fact that promises have not been wildly bandied about in his administration, and the reason for the turbulent 60's (a subtle reminder of what we had in those years) was the overblown rhetoric which could not be delivered in programs. This will posture RN as the one who is not the expedient politician who promises all things to all men. "We did not make promises we could not keep." In the Haynes Johnson survey, here is what an ethnic Democrat, who retired early because he was unemployed, and voted for McGovern in the primary, said: "Now I think he's (McG) more two-faced, like trying to tell people he's going to

help them get jobs. They all like to do the promises, but he's gone beyond most of them, whereas Nixon knows what we've got to do."

(6.) ~~Hold the hands of~~ Democrat defectors by telling audiences that what we have done in foreign policy is the same thing JFK et al. would have done.

(7.) Emphasize domestic stability and the sense of pride and respect America now has for itself. McGoo is on the wrong side of the issue if he continues to think Americans hate themselves.

(8.) When emphasizing the international turnaround -- cite things like: who would think that not only America, but Japan would be talking to China; East Germany with West Germany; North Korea with South Korea. The great sense of quietude and stability is like calamine lotion on chickenpox. Who was ever ashamed of ~~such~~ serenity and goodwill?

(9.) Do not underestimate how McGovern so ~~effectively~~ effectively uses attacks on himself. It's not for nothing he gets elected in South Dakota. Here is what one of his close friends says: "There's nothing George likes better than to have them attack him as disloyal. Then he can get out his American Legion cap and dust off his Distinguished Flying Cross and really take them on." George has already done this, and you can be sure he's lusting for RN to even hint at his loyalty. This is why I believe ^{LRN} must leave the attack to others.

(10.) For God's sake, let the word go out to all staff that the smallest mistake of judgement could foul everything. In 1968 ^{The media} ~~the~~ played the ^{INNOCUOUS} mutual fund letter to a ~~fair~~ fair-thee-well. Let's not get nervous about things. Our opponents will desperately ~~try~~ search for anything by which they can pin all the cliched labels on us -- for once, let's protect RN from his friends. Let's also maintain our cool about McGovern's crowds. Goldwater had much better crowds than LBJ, and in 1960, JFK was mobbed in ~~OH~~ Ohio and RN was mobbed in Atlanta -- neither carried ~~the state~~ the state in which he was mobbed. Crowds are not determinative of momentum.