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February 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM:  CHARLES W. COLSON
SUBJECT:  Meany's Alleged Support for Muskie

Rockefeller's intelligence, which you reported to me, that Meany is lining up support for Muskie, I am convinced, is inaccurate. My own spies in New York (Brennan, for example), indicate the contrary. I think that Rockefeller simply wants to preserve his own "clout" with the New York unions and enhance his own importance to us. The fact is that our lines of communication in to New York (Brennan, Gleason, Calhoun, Van Arsdale) are better than Rockefeller's. Also, the loyalties of several of these people run more strongly to the President than they do to Rockefeller.

Apropos of this you might find the enclosed Riesel piece of some interest. I admit that I made a small contribution to it. Vic, however, has gotten intelligence from a variety of sources, all of which confirm the information I have been getting that, for the moment, Meany is very cool towards Muskie.
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MEMORANDUM FOR: H.R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES W. COLSON
SUBJECT: New Hampshire Politics

March 4, 1971

I have been picking up, through old friends and political acquaintances, a good bit of scuttlebutt out of New Hampshire. There is a surprising lack of enthusiasm in New Hampshire for Muskie. Many of the top Democrats are committed to him publicly, but underneath they show very little real excitement. The consensus is that he is by no means a runaway - notwithstanding the fact that he comes from a neighboring state.

Roger Crowley, Democratic candidate for Governor last time, and a conservative, is leaning heavily towards Jackson. He refuses to say he is against Muskie, but he is going around the state saying very positive things about "Scoop". The Manchester Union Leader is strongly anti-Muskie, as you would well imagine. Many Democrats seem to approve of the President's handling of the war.

McGovern had a reasonably successful trip with the intellectuals and the New Left, of which there is a significant bloc in New Hampshire. He will have that vote solid (could be as high as 25%). If any kind of boomlet develops for "Scoop", Muskie is in very serious trouble because the Democratic Party in New Hampshire has historically nominated rather conservative Democrats like Crowley and King.

The foregoing is just for your information. Some of it was, surprisingly enough, even reported in the Boston Globe this last week - the tenor being that Muskie is not really generating any enthusiasm.

The only line which our political operatives should get out at every possible opportunity is that Muskie will, of course, sweep New Hampshire because he is from Maine. People should expect that he will carry 90% of the vote. If he does much less as it would now seem, the letdown could destroy his national posture.
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