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THOUGHTS FOR ROMNEY'S SPEECH

While he should go on the attack against RN's critics, I think a spirited defense of the Administration would be useful. The defense however, should be selective rather than across the board. I.e., Romney should defend on our long suits.

- Should make the case for RN in foreign policy. The whole idea should be to picture RN as the heavyweight when matched up against any of the potential Dem candidates. Again: good points to make on Vietnam, SALT, etc.

But the main point is the thematic one of RN as leading America's foreign policy with "a golden hand." The sturdy, thoughtful, precise maker and executor of foreign policy.

- Domestic policy. There is a case to be made, but not so much a programmatic one as a symbolic one. The RN who didn't overpromise, who didn't bring bombast to his pronouncements, who simply went out to do the job that was needed. Result: a more stable society in the institutional sense, peace in our streets, etc.

- I would put in a good word for the Nixon approach of calm in place of charisma -- but would not overdo the style thing.
-- Hitting the opponents should be a central rationale for the speech, and if, as you say, names can be used, I suggest some of the following portrayals of the opposition. **Henry Jackson:** An able supporter of the President on foreign policy and renouncer of extremism in Dem ranks. But it ends there, for Scoop is an ADA liberal, bent on making the Federal government the ultimate decision point in our lives. His attacks on the President's handling of the economy have been just short of Demagogy -- not the best characteristic for a man of decent instincts, but who has been driven by a political party which has as its sworn purpose the destruction of Richard Nixon no matter what the cost.

**Ed Muskie:** Muskie would be one of the worst choices for President. He knows nothing about foreign policy (was swayed by Kosygin in the famous Moscow meeting), would be totally untrustworthy in the important discussions of foreign policy. He just can't swing it. He is temperamental and prone to follow the troops. He is really a non-entity fashioned by the liberal press into some kind of Democratic Moses. Query: What one thing can you point to that Muskie stands for or has accomplished? In short, he is a faceless man, a man utterly without the credentials to be President of the United States. Imagine him meeting with Chou En Lai?
Teddy Kennedy: Immature, aloof, doesn't know what hard times are. Quick on the trigger; irrational, incapable of being decisive in a crisis. He's like a little kid -- take away his rattle and he'll run crying to momma. The least likely person we would want to entrust affairs of state. Perhaps cite the example of Teddy's insult to Pakistani ambassador as a trait of Teddy the Tot.

George McGovern: A petulant, crybaby who sees nothing but the worst in his country. He wails and cries, loves the "kids" and will never say a bad word against them. A total joke as a candidate; he signed people's peace Treaty with North Vietnam. Imagine his credibility were he elected President and then asked to lead negotiations with NVN.

Hubert Humphrey: So characteristic of the worst in the Dem party -- the hack who cries when things go bad. He's probably never made an honest decision in his life, and probably never been held responsible for any decision made on his behalf. The Humphrey, New Deal, high-taxes, Vietnam candidate was beaten back in 1968 and deservedly so. He's in the hands of the unions, and if it weren't for George Meany, HHH would just be another homely face.

The Others: A bunch of amateurs playing the game. They are laughable when put up against the sturdy experience of RN. It is characteristic of the Dems today that they can't produce a President -- only a bunch of vice-presidential hopefuls; party hacks who are beholden to every pressure group and interest group which ever infiltrated the Democratic party.
The essence of the speech should be to show how, in contrast, every Dem is a tenor in a bass choir. Not one of them is capable of making the hard decisions RN has. Yet they run around the country with their "Chicken Littleism" -- a faint-hearted approach to American problems, holding the belief that America has lost its will. A bunch of hogwash which will be exposed in November of 1972 when the American public will realize it has a President to select.

Also suggest a few cracks at Congress dragging its feet -- setting the stage for RN versus Congress.
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If Ed Muskie looks behind him, he's going to see the pack catching up, for just as sure as George McGovern is a forlorn loser, Ed Muskie has deftly engineered himself away his lead in the Democratic presidential sweepstakes. MONDAY'S prediction of not too long ago is coming to pass; if Muskie looks like he's going to make it.

Item: When Muskie pulled into California last weekend to kick off his campaign, he found the prestigious California Field poll waiting for him with the news that Ted Kennedy led him among Democratic voters in California by a margin of two to one.

Item: Muskie now trails Ted Kennedy as the favorite of the Democratic leaders, and he's being squeezed by President Nixon in the latest Presidential poll trial heat.

Item: The latest Monitor poll of Democratic leaders shows that Muskie has "dropped back" over the last few months from his early lead in the eyes of over 90% of those polled. Even half of the Democratic poll was questioned as saying there was still a possibility of
a dark horse emerging. Bad news for the guy they said would walk away from the field in 1972.

Why the turnaround on Muskie?

Washington columnists, Evans and Novak, have reported that Muskie has lost ground through a series of errors and misjudgments. The political miscues have made Democratic governors disenchanted with Big Ed and this is precisely the reason such big state governors as Ohio's John Gilligan are going to run as favorites and pre-empt Muskie's stumbling participation in their primaries.

Muskie's position on the central issues are causing him trouble. His down-the-line support of forced busing to achieve racial balance is not seen as simply bad policy. While he has tried to cover himself on this issue, Muskie nevertheless has maintained that busing is a "useful tool" to achieve integration. — Supporting that forced busing
would rapidly bring the destruction of the neighborhood school concept. Being a strong advocate of busing is not going to help Muskie with the millions of parents who prefer their children's education to be peaceful instead of disruptive, and if Muskie continues to abet the systematic destruction of American education, the fat cats who are bankrolling Muskie better be advised that they have invested in a bear market.

Muskie's fares no better on other issues. His potulent rantings over President Nixon's economic initiatives have left him out in the cold during the economic freeze, out of touch with union rank and file. It has been generally acknowledged that his substitute suggestion of a consumer tax credit fell on its face -- a fact reported by liberal pundit, Joseph Kraft. Add these troubles to his heavy burden.

Vietnamese tardy embrace of dove feathers, and you have
a presidential hopeful in deep trouble.

As if to hasten his demise, Ed Muskie made (as Republican Hugh Scott noted) a "voyage from foot to mouth" on the sensitive issue of whether black citizens can play a role in Democratic political circles. Big Ed, who maintains that he's in favor of civil rights as much as anyone, enraged black leaders by telling them that although they have broken their backs for the party, they might as well forget about joining his ticket. The response of black leaders: "Who's going to dig our grave?"

Jet magazine, a prominent black publication promptly blasted Muskie: "Now the party's 1968 vice presidential candidate, a member of the Polish minority, would feel free to 'explode' the political aspirations of millions of black voters at the start of his intensive drive for the nomination was bullying." Jet suggested that Muskie "had killed the chance for the Democratic Party's
most faithful Black followers."

Too bad for Muskie, but several Black leaders wouldn't accept his if-your-black-step-back attitude. Black Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm has now announced she will declare for the Presidency on New Year's Day and enter at least three primaries — fighting Muskie in North Carolina, Florida and California, where he hoped he could again take the black vote for granted. Jesse Jackson, of Operation Breadbasket and another prominent black leader, accused Muskie of "racism" and opined: "Muskie is out... Muskie has no domestic plans, no economic programs, nor has he outlined programs for bringing people together... Muskie smells musty."

To sum up the insensitive and divisive Muskie position, political columnist John Roche said: "No one with a barefoot innocent wandering around an is the third black."
What should really make Mr. Ed nervous is that his rivals smell Ed blood and won't leave the nomination to the amateurish antics of the Downeast hero. Teddy Kennedy has seen what's happened and is clearly reappraising his own coy position. Teddy is not disappointed with Ed Mouskie because Ed's left-liberalism does not take in the satiric hot-pants radicals that make up his own constituency. Seeing McGovern fumble around like a fourth-string fullback will soon convince Teddy that he can't sit back and watch the Kennedy torch passed on to Ed Mouskie.

Kennedy's stepped up interest was confirmed recently when Teddy and Joan visited CANON IN ISRAEL, the de rigueur pilgrimage for Democratic presidential candidates on the make. The only thing that Kennedy is waiting for is to see what John (television profile) Kennedy is going to do. John, who put his heart
in Manhattan, has got to get into the primaries to prove himself, and before he gets too far, Kennedy will enter, scoop up the old Kennedy hands who were wet-nursing George McGovern, and blitz the Democratic National Convention carrying "the burden my brothers dropped." At least, that is how the Kennedy forces see it, and to get there, only Muskie stands slightly in the way.

As for Muskie, the scenario of the primaries are not hopeful for him. The first real symbolic test in New Hampshire is not going to be the cotton candy that Muskie had hoped for.

New Hampshire is Muskie country, it is in Maine's back yard, and not one seriously expects Muskie to be beaten.

Muskie is aiming at a high goal which he set for himself next March: he must match Richard Nixon's 79.5 margin in the 1968 New Hampshire primary before he can call it a victory. He must do more than 79% in
a state where he has everything going for him, then he is in deep trouble. Other Democrats are virtually conceding New Hampshire to Muskie and will show their faces only because of the tradition of the first New Hampshire primary.

If Muskie gets less than 40% of the New Hampshire vote, he is going to be limping into Florida where his refined Georgetown radicalism won't stand him in good stead. All Democrats will be on the Florida primary ballot unless they sign an affidavit saying they won't run for President, and they will be gunning for Muskie one way or the other. Add to this the standards Democrat hopes for the candidacies of George Wallace and Shirley Chisholm, and Muskie's going to want to swallow hard and cry for his mother. Scoop Jackson, who is aiming all his guns at Florida, will also be in Muskie's way and if he's dust settles, Muskie will no longer be Mr. Clean.
Wisconsin follows Florida, and Muskie will take his bleeding campaign to face feisty George McGovern whose sell-out-Vietnam views find favor among a great number of dovish Democrats in Wisconsin. Not only will McGovern be sure to give Muskie trouble, but Wisconsin's popular Senator, William Proxmire, is almost sure to make the run to parlay his vast home state support into a bargaining blcok he can take to Miami to broker the vice-presidential nomination for himself. In short: Muskie looks like he will be denied the Wisconsin victory that he so needs and McGovern must search for other primaries to get the victory he needs.

But the other primaries include Tennessee and North Carolina where George Wallace will again probably make the same attempt in the Democratic primaries. Asking

Southern Democrats to replace Ed Muskie over George Wallace is sure like asking the field to deliver the Steiners...
sermon. Muskie's pro-busing stance won't help him in Dixie, and he just might find it a good idea to get out to Oregon and California there Jackson, Lindsay and Kennedy will be waiting to ambush him. Oregon is a tough back yard, and his popularity in the Northwest is going to make Muskie's recovery somewhat difficult.

McGovern will have stuck it out to Oregon, Lindsay will be on the ballot, and Taddy will be waiting to pick up the pieces in California.

Henry Jackson's just might find it a good idea to get out to Oregon, Lindsay will be on the ballot, and Taddy will be waiting to pick up the pieces in California.

Having won victories and to get to the convention, Muskie will enter Miami Beach having had outrageous temper tested, his lightweight political positions aired, his amateurish staff creaked, his deficit budget stretched, and a left wing bawling after his marshmallow positions. Ed Muskie's not out of the race yet; he's got too much pride to pull out. But one thing is clear, Muskie's just taking it one day buck and the ride...
to Miami will not be an easy one for the guy who just weeks ago everyone said had it made.