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MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN

Attached is what I promised you -- a draft of a Lasky piece on Muskie.

There are two caveats. The first two paragraphs were basically what the President dictated. The second caveat is that I am no writer or columnist. I think the meat is here, however, for you to apply your fine hand.

We want to circulate this very, very widely so it should really make its point very hard.

Charles W. Colson
"You have the God-given right to kick the government around -- don't hesitate to do so."

Edmund Muskie, Fall, 1968

This was the paternal advice given by Vice Presidential candidate Muskie to the New Left in 1968 -- advice the New Left took to heart and took into the streets in 1969 and 1970. Were this a slip of the tongue it could be dismissed as a meaningless faux pas.

But taken in context -- with the words and votes and actions of Senator Muskie since 1968 -- that comment begins to explain why his candidacy enjoys mounting enthusiasm on the far left of the Democratic Party -- that faction which holds the veto power over the 1972 nominee.

Selected by LBJ-Heir, Hubert Humphrey, as running mate to appease the unmollified, embittered elements of the Democratic Left, Muskie dutifully and dourly delivered his perfunctory pro forma defenses of the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy-Johnson firm line against Communist aggression. But he balked at the assignment; his heart wasn't in it. And the balance of his 1968 campaign was a calculated Muskie "apertura a sinistra" -- an "opening to the left" -- as the Maine Senator sent one unmistakeable signal after another to
the radicals in his party, that he "understood," that he was their man, that come November, win or lose, he would be back where he believed -- and where he belonged.

The history of the last two years has shown him a man of his word.

He has openly collaborated with Fulbright in every attack on the Nixon foreign and defense policies. His public outrage over the Cambodian incursion that cut American casualties to the lowest levels in five years and enabled U.S. withdrawals to continue was among the shrillest on the Hill. His wholesale endorsement of the McGovern-Hatfield, and Cooper-Church Amendments to tie the President's hands in Asia speak to the New Left louder than any words that Big Ed is "all right" on foreign policy.

At home every massive spending bill has had his stamp of approval. He was a leader in the forces that killed the SST. He has mounted a heavy personal assault on the auto industry -- demanding the kind of Draconian anti-pollution standards that would make Detroit a ghost town in 1976, but make Ed Muskie a New Left's pop hero in 1972.

When violence erupted at Jackson State, and black students were killed, Mr. Muskie jetted to the scene to be photographed with the black mourners. As they say in the New Left Caucuses, "we're not going to carry Mississippi anyway; a coalition of the black, the
poor and the young is going to carry the nation next time." So it is
that the same Senator Muskie who set a new speed record from the
Capitol to Jackson, Mississippi, was somehow nowhere to be found
at the funeral services for that white researcher who died in the
criminal bombing of the math building at the University of
Wisconsin.

Those who don't believe what they read in the papers should
look at the statistics -- an ADA rating of 95 percent; a COPE
rating of 100 percent. These are targets for even Democrat
Congressional radicals Ronald Dellums and Bella Abzug to shoot at
in the Ninety-Second Congress.

Yet, surprisingly, despite his left-radical voting record,
Muskie retains a patina of moderation -- perhaps due to the
delivery of his speeches and the man's personal appearances. (A
friend once told me of Bircher John Rousellot -- "he can make the
damndest and most radical statements in the most convincing
and pleasant way of any man I have ever seen!"

Even my esteemed colleague, William White, has argued
that it is still an open question whether Ed Muskie should be counted with
the Gale McGees and Scoop Jacksons -- or with the isolationist left-
radicals who dominate his party in the Senate.
The aftermath of the POW mission of mercy carried out by
Colonel Simons' herioc raiders should have given Bill the answer
to his question. Muskie's voice in the Senate rose well above
the choir of the Kennedys and McGoverns -- denouncing in even
harsher terms than they this "escalation" of the war, this "military
adventure," this "incursion" into little North Vietnam -- yes,
little North Vietnam that has engaged in systematic barbarism
toward captured American fliers unseen since the days of Tojo.

Someone once wrote, where a man's purse is, there his
heart will be. Newsweek has fixed the source of the big dough
coming in to fuel the national Muskie effort -- the Hollywood
cinema moguls.

It doesn't take genius to figure out why the cinema moguls
are suddenly moving into politics with their blue chips. The Nixon-
Agnew denunciations of filth on the screen and permissiveness in
society do not create the kind of social climate one desires when
making profits hand over fist on skin flicks. Just why Ed Muskie,
from conservative Maine, has suddenly become the beneficiary of all
this Hollywood lucre will be the subject of a future column.

The New Left has learned something from its defeats
at the hands of Nixon and its rejection by the millions in Middle
America. They are not about to take another flier, on a George
McGovern, say, only to watch him ground up in the treads of the
Nixon Juggernaut. The New Left has found a man they can depend upon in the Presidency -- to force a policy of bugout from Asia and the world -- and a policy bussing for the schools and suburbs. They have found in Ed Muskie, a man with the appearance and demeanor of a moderate -- and with ideas and views almost identical to their own -- the New Left has found its Man for All Seasons.

This is the horse they are now settling upon in the 1972 sweepstates; and Ed Muskie's candidacy offers the New Left the first best chance it has ever had to ride through an open door into the White House.
This reporter has never tried to disguise his distaste for the Democratic New Left and some of its more illustrious members in the U.S. Senate. Nor has this reporter been known as a particular enthusiast or admirer of one particular member of that group -- Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine.

The fact is, however, that Muskie is getting a bad rap and though it may surprise some of my readers to find me coming to his defense, in all fairness I must.

The story has been circulating in the corridors of the Capitol that Muskie is really not a liberal -- that he doesn't belong to the New Left group -- that he really is a middle of the road down easter.

It is being said that the Muskie who has consistently criticized President Nixon's handling of the war, who has joined with Fulbright and other doves in attacking every defense and foreign policy measure of the Nixon Administration, who has criticized the Son Tay rescue mission -- that this is not the real Muskie. The real Muskie is the man who in 1968 took the Johnson-Humphrey line, and defended the war in Vietnam.

Even my esteemed colleague, William White, has recently questioned which is the real Muskie -- the Muskie of 1968 or the Muskie who simply vies with the Kennedys, the McGoverns and all the other new isolationists in the conviction that what is most of all required is a
progressive retreat from the responsibilities of world leadership in favor of the creation of a more nearly happy domestic society?"

Those who are circulating the notion that Muskie is a moderate are no friends; it is his detractors and the reason is plain. The party machinery of the Democratic Party is squarely in the hands and control of the New Left -- just look to the primaries of 1968.

Way-out New Lefters like Bela Abzug and Ronald Dellums defeated bona fide Democratic liberals. And how about the money? George McGovern raised over $1 million in the 1970 campaign fund and judiciously parcelled it out to select, like-minded, extreme liberal, Democratic candidates around the country. The National Committee for an Effective Congress, an arm of the same New Left Democrats, pumped thousands into campaigns across the land. Let there be no mistake about it: the New Left of the Democratic party are in control of the money, the intellectual base and the machinery. No candidate who fails to dance to their tune can hope for the 1972 nomination.

To say that Muskie has not earned his credentials as a member of the New Left Club is just untrue. He can be criticized for many things but not for his failure to take the straight New Left party line.

In 1970 his ADA rating was 95%, his COPE rating 100%. He voted for the McGovern/Hatfield Amendment, he voted to cut off funds for the ABM, he voted for the Cooper/Church Amendment which would have tied the President's hands in trying to bring the war in Southeast Asia to an honorable end, he has voted against the Super Sonic Transport,
he joined the chorus of critics and doves in condemning the President's action in Cambodia -- an action which has clearly been proven to be the most successful single turning point in the war -- and in recent weeks he joined Fulbright and Kennedy in condemning as an "escalation of the war" our Government's mercy rescue mission to bring prisoners of war out of Vietnam."

And how about our domestic issues? Muskie voted against the D.C. Crime Bill, he has voted for every single increased appropriation over that sought by the Administration, he has been steadfast in his support of forced bussing and forced suburban integration. He will be right in the forefront during the next session in the battle for National Health Insurance on a scale broad enough to qualify it for socialized medicine. Not only by what he does but by what he says does Ed Muskie qualify as a member of the New Left Club.

(The sections of the D.C. Crime Bill are) "experiments in repression."

Washington Post July 22, 1970

The D.C. Crime Bill is "a simplistic, stopgap approach to crime."

Portland Press Herald 5/2/70
Muskie was paid $3008 for speech at Northern Illinois U, N.Y. Times, May 17, 1970.

"The ivory tower has been shattered," he said, "The basic problem of college presidents is to decide how institutions of higher learning can be made more relevant to the student."

quoted by Elmer Bertelsen, Houston Chronicle, 1/12/70

"You have the God-given right to kick the government around—don't hesitate to do so."

Louisville Courier Journal Sept 12, 1968

I may be a protester myself."

Look Feb 18, 1968

"... this(period) is going to result in some adjustment problems, including disorders, protests, and unfortunately, at times some forms of violence." Muskie went on to say that he felt the process of protest and change as a whole was a "healthy" development.

Baltimore Sun Oct 19, 1968

"It is little wonder to me, Muskie said, "that young people today are more concerned with the freedom to escape than with freedom to become involved, more conscious of the liberty to oppose than of the liberty to support and more familiar with the right to despair than the right to rejoice."

"Those who express instant and false indictments of students, faculty members and administrators must be repudiated and the answer must be plainly reported."

Kansas City Star, May 9, 1970
The contributors to Muskie's Presidential war chest reads like the New Left's Who's Who, including very prominent names from among Hollywood's leading cinema moguls. Newsweek recently reported that the movie industry accounts for the biggest single group of givers to Muskie's Presidential fund.

Ed Muskie, clearly the Democrats front runner for 1972, may be derailed between now and the Democratic convention. When the infighting gets tough, Ted Kennedy's money and organization could run him over. The one thing they won't hand him for, however, is his lack of liberal credentials. To the extent that his opponents are now attempting to force him over into the floundering powerless center of Democratic party, they will fail.

His record of loyalty to the New Left is impeccable. Muskie is shrewd and he will not be pried loose from his hold on the liberal wing which he and his advisors know full well is the key to the nomination.
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