

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	44		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Typewritten notes RE: various campaign participants. 3 pgs.
47	44	11/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Report from Khachigian titled "Political Memorandum, Why McGovern Lost. 13 pgs.
47	44	11/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Draft from Khachigian RE 'Political Memorandum, Why McGovern Lost.' 22 pgs.

DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD (NIXON PROJECT)

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [Doc 22]	Notes	"Milton Vorst who is..." [typed]	n.d.	c (mix)
N-2 [Doc 23]	Memo	Khachigian to Staff Secretary, re: Plans and Preferences for second term, with attached [2] draft copies [attached to cover memo, Kha- chigian to President, 11/10/72]	11/10/72	c (mix)
N-3 [Doc 24]	Memo	"Political memorandum: why we govern lost" [attached to cover memo, Kha- chigian to Buchanan, 11/7/72]	11/7/72	c (mix)
N-4 [Doc 175]	Memo	Draft copy of N-3, attached to N-3 case file, with "ideas for memo on why we govern lost," n.d.	11/7/72	c (mix)

FILE GROUP TITLE

BOX NUMBER

FOLDER TITLE

November [1972] [10/2]

RESTRICTION CODES

- 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.
- 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- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

Collection: Kenneth L. Khachigian

Box Number: 7

Folder: November [1972] [1 of 2]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
22	Return Private/Political
23	Retain Open
24	Return Private/Political
175	Return Private/Political

Milton ~~Viorst~~ Viorst who is distinguished by his interview with George McGover which produced McGovern's comment comparing Ho Chi Minh favorably ~~to~~ to George Washington -- ~~Viorst~~ Viorst, whose range and thus danger, does not extend out of Washington to ~~xxx~~ more than _____ newspapers.

Mankiewicz whose ~~predictive~~ ~~journeys~~ journeys into the ~~predictive~~ mode show about the same ~~prescience~~ prescience as Mank the politician whose predictions of a triumphal McGovern worried Republicans enough to ensure that ~~McGovern~~ McGovern was indeed ~~thoroughly~~ thoroughly defeated. If the REpublicans ~~did~~ had not had a Frank Mankiewicz in the McGovern high command, they would have had to invent one.

Not EVEN any mea culpa

Mr. Kraft could fully spend the rest of his life trying to explain away his errors -- but the only safe prediction is that Joe Kraft will make more, yes, errors.

The problem with the crystal ball brigade ~~is that~~ is that it wants to write history before it happens.

Would justifiably provoke RN to say: "Who are those pundits and why are they saying those terrible things about me?"

One ~~wh~~ ~~wishes~~ wishes at times that he was really as abrasive as he is accused of ~~being~~ being -- in that case he could make his partisans happy by hoisting up the ~~oh-so-~~ wrong columns, editorials and television commentaries in a beaming the same manner that/Harry Truman once held up that premature Chicago Tribune front page and say: "I told you so!"

John Kenneth Galbraith, who, it will be recalled, said durin g the Tet Offensive of 1968 the Saigon Government would fall within a "fortnight." Webster's will either have to change~~s~~ its definition of that word or Galbraith might have to eat it.

Hobart Rowen, whose self-described ~~is~~ "Marxist rev~~o-~~lutionary" son married George McGovern's daughter -- is always ~~quick~~ quick to predict the worst form Mr. Nixon's ~~is~~ policies, but then~~when~~ ~~why~~ why wouldn't he; blood is thicker than water, they say.

Harriet Van Horne, whom one reads in the evening much for the same reason ~~one~~/asks for arsenic in ~~her~~ his hors-d'oeuvres (sp?), surely has ~~a~~ pad-locked her ~~door~~ door by now against the invaders. Harriet, are you still there, or have you been ~~done~~ done in by the ~~"~~"Bloody Assizes?"

Mr. Chuang Tse-tung, head of the table tennis delegation from the PRC during visit in Rose Garden on April 18, 1972 said:

"This time last year the U.S. table tennis team, headed by Mr. Steenhoven, made a friendly visit to China, and today, in the warm spring season, ~~was was~~ when flowers are in full bloom, the Chinese table tennis delegation is here on a reciprocal ~~is~~ visit."

"Warm spring season!" "Flowers in ~~full~~ full bloom!"

Omigosh -- tricked by diplomacy again.

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM
WHY MCGOVERN LOST

A massive effort must be taken after the election to head off the liberal establishment effort to detract from RN's election victory. That effort will take many tacks -- such as RN didn't bring in a Congress; people voted against McGovern not for Nixon, etc. However, the liberal apologists will push one line extra hard: the defeat was not for the ideas of left-liberal movement but rather for the bearer of those ideas.

They will argue that liberalism is still viable -- that we still need busing, and all the other liberal schemes, and that they need only wait until they get a standard bearer who won't make the same mistakes McGovern did. The following analysis serves to debunk that viewpoint, and, it seems to me, should be put out as much as possible to counter all the opinion contra. This memorandum focuses on why McGovern lost -- any analysis of the high points of the RN victory should be taken up in a separate memorandum.

THE CENTRAL POINT TO MAKE

To those who argue that McGovern had bad strategy and bad tactics and that he made too many mistakes to run a good campaign, we have one basic response: the tactics of the liberal movement are the logical outgrowth of the liberal ideology. That is, don't blame McGovern per se, blame the philosophy. Elitism, close-mindedness, moral righteousness, viewing things as good versus evil and the penchant for overstatement are all

fundamentals of the liberal-left political ideology. If McGovern ran a bad campaign -- don't blame his strategy because the strategy is the ideology. The personal flaws of McGovern were bred of the flaws of his political philosophy.

Thus, McGovern could change his mind on central issues, and then with a straight face defend his credibility. This hurt his standing with the voters, but being trained in the narrow view as he has, he sees his position only in moralistic terms, or, as PJB put it, as the true believers.

People rejected the McGovern philosophy pure and simple. If the questions of his credibility and wishy-washyness arose, it was only because of his approach to public policy -- one in which he could cut aircraft carriers back from 16 to 6 and still maintain with a straight face that this would not affect the strength of the sixth fleet. That is the underlying problem with the left radicals, i. e., that the wild things they propose really won't disjoint things important to citizens or voter blocs.

But there are other things to look at in terms of what McGovern did wrong, and I'll take them in sequence.

THE PARTY REFORM

It is not for nothing that the Democratic Party reform was promulgated under the "McGovern Commission." This is where we underestimated McGovern. Immediately, he saw the potential of these guidelines -- they

served his purposes perfectly. The reforms brought precisely those people into the process who would directly further his candidacy. Moreover, it was only McGovern at that point who saw that the complexity of the rules would be baffling to those who did not know them, and he hired the fellow who knew the rules best to be his delegate counter -- Rick Stearns.

His opponents did not see soon enough the potential of having a tight solid base which could bring victory in a field of many candidates. Therefore, McGovern moved quickly to pre-empt the party's left wing, and knowing that and with tight organization and his left flank protected, he could conceivably get the nomination. To that extent the liberal-left issues were winners for McGovern in the early stages of the game.

PRIMARIES

McGovern made it through the primaries with skill, luck, and, later, with a little help from his friends in the media. New Hampshire was a Muskie disaster, and McGovern was clever in making his loss out to be a victory. McGovern's first score. McGovern was wiped out in Florida in what should have been the first test of the McGovern political philosophy -- but it was not reported that way. It was said that McGovern never expected to win Florida. Nevertheless, his views on gutting the space program, support for massive busing, and a few other positions surely were important in the Florida defeat.

Next came Illinois where McGovern wisely worked more on getting a foothold while avoiding a direct test with Muskie. This strategy -- a good one -- brought him to Wisconsin which he targeted from the beginning as his strongest state with the youth-lust and an excellent organization. There the tight-knit support for his radicalism and an excellent youth turnout gave him a victory. Moreover, the Republicans helped by crossing over for McGovern and Wallace. If only Democrats had voted, HHH would have won. Yet Wisconsin was the key for McGovern and most importantly it knocked Lindsay out and gave McG an unexposed left flank.

From Wisconsin on, it was not very difficult for McG. He took Rhode Island because there was only about a 10% Democrat turnout -- and the tight organization, getting the liberals and doves out, did it again. Then came Massachusetts and Pennsylvania with Muskie mercilessly caught in between HHH and McG. By this time the press was necking in the back seat with McGovern, and Massachusetts was a cinch while HHH kept Muskie at bay in Pa. Again, the organization also went to work in Pa. to pick up some delegates -- what proved to be a good strategy for McG; he nickel-dimed his opposition. Throughout, McGovern was assisted by low voter turnouts coupled with his zealots going to the polls in droves. April 25th served to put Muskie over the side -- a hapless victim on a fast track.

Through Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, and North Carolina, in my judgment, the press effectively protected McGovern. He didn't do real well in any of these states -- except Ohio -- yet they only said it was because he didn't try. Yet, by then they should have known that the McGovern ideology was like death in those states. Moreover, in Ohio he was basking in the media glow which did not mention his radical positions at all, but rather how he represented "the alienated and discontented." That left McG free to use his excellent TV spots to bilk the voters of their support. They only saw a nice guy on the tube, not a radical.

Nebraska was the beginning of the end for McGovern. For the first time, his opposition began to hammer effectively at the McGovern leftism. Abortion, amnesty, pot, welfare and defense all became problems. It was too late for HHH to have much of an impact, but the seeds were planted. The threat that Offutt Air Base in Omaha would be closed by McGovern was the first big hit.

By this time in Oregon and California, McG had the only effective organization and a huge public relations advantage. The media was busy explaining why they were wrong about the early primaries, and in deference to McG were giving him every break possible. Michigan and Maryland were in between, but McG avoided media setbacks because the Wallace shooting knocked everything else off the front page. Yet those two states were another hint that McGovern represented the wrong side of the political spectrum. That story was lost in the Wallace tragedy.

By the time McGovern got out to the West Coast, the regular Democrats found out that they were in the process of being had by McGovern. But it was too late. The Dem party had been infiltrated by the McGovern guerillas, and there was no time for pacification. (Maybe the fact that McGovern seemed to think more of the Communists in Vietnam than their opponents colored his political strategy: he was the Viet Cong of the Democratic party).

Thus, McGovern won the California, South Dakota, New Mexico and New Jersey primaries all on the same day -- a tribute to irreversible momentum. (As McGovern said that night: "I can't believe I won the whole thing" -- neither could his fellow Democrats who probably swore that night that they would do anything to try to stop him.) But California was the true turning point in the 1972 presidential campaign and it turned on issues, not on McGovern's personality or bad tactics.

McGovern saw a 20 point lead in the polls drop to 4%. In short, he was devastated by the HHH one-man shredding machine. The issues caught up with him, and HHH was able to articulate them in his hammering staccato fashion as no other figure in American politics could do. Those three national debates -- which could not be filtered by the writing press or Frank Reynolds and his gang -- were the real Waterloo for McGovern. Vast attention was given to the welfare plan, the defense plan, the Vietnam bug-out, the fact that McGovern had voted against Jewish interests. HHH

was vicious and relentless and he did for us what we could have never done for ourselves. Moreover, he did to McG what Rockefeller did to Goldwater: he labelled McGovern.

Luckily for McG the next primary was New York, and he couldn't lose it because there was no preferential vote -- only delegate selection. Thus, the small left-wing delegate machine moved on, aided and abetted by only a little over a 10% voter turnout.

THE MEDIA IN THIS PERIOD

McGovern got more than his share of breaks from the press in the early days. They covered for his radical positions by writing tons of essays on populism and anti-politicians and alienated voters. Moreover, McGovern's staff was being given the kid-glove treatment. Stories followed on the McG "wunderkinder." Caddell (whose poll information has been so spectacularly bad, yet universally praised) was made out to be Gallup and Harris rolled into one. Stearns, Grandmaison and Pokorny (who Sidey eulogized with the prairie sod in his ears) were "master strategists" -- and oh so young! Mankiewicz was quoted from coast to coast -- the man with the quick wit and fast repartee (in my opinion Mankiewicz is an absolute political lightweight who covered up with a quick wit -- he gave monumentally bad advice).

These "kids" began to believe their press clippings and probably thought it was a good time to screw the old-liners. I would guess that the boys in

the clubhouse didn't appreciate either their treatment or the stories they read about the "kids." Their duty was to win elections and not worry about ideology. The McG people believed that winning elections was a part of the ideology -- that the two were intertwined, and that their radicalism was the wave of the future. But give the devil his due -- the organization worked well and played the delegates and the convention states like violins.

THE CONVENTION

The Convention also had to be quite harmful to McGovern. By this time McGovern was tarred on the issues, but it was too late to stop him -- he really had it wrapped up after California. Nevertheless, the leftism was fully exposed on national television, and the shock for some probably has not yet worn off. The spectacle of the abortion people, the libbers and the homosexuals was too much. McGovern was seen, finally, to be the radical that his positions made him out to be, and this hurt.

Then came the compromises -- putting the abortion, women's lib, and other minority planks over the side -- along with George Wiley and Gloria Steinem. It was time to kiss and make up with Daley, though Daley would resist. But the sum total was a picture of just another politician, one who would make deals to win and compose his principles -- or at least certain principles.

But McGovern walked out of that convention a radical. For all intents and purposes he could not escape that label through November. It was not because of mistakes in his strategy or flaws in his tactics and it was not George McGovern the man or personality. It was his position on the political spectrum -- he was on the left, and he believed in his ways.

EAGLETON

I think the death blow was already delivered before the Eagleton affair. It only confirmed everything which had already been building up against McGovern. Those who argue that Eagleton was the turning point don't know what they're talking about. Eagleton was extremely important in terms of harming McGovern's credibility and trust. But even before Eagleton the seeds were planted -- Eagleton merely made it harder for McGovern. Without the Eagleton affair, McGovern would have still been weighted by his positions.

Blaming the Eagleton affair will be a liberal cop-out and a McGovern staff cop-out. Eagleton did not make McGovern lose a 20 point lead in the California balloting. We have got to stop the myth of the Eagleton thing before history writes that it was this and only this which cost McG his crack at the Presidency. It just ain't true. There was a Gallup after the Dem convention and before Eagleton which saw RN gaining three points. McGovern was already on the way down.

RADICALISM -- THE FATAL FLAW

Hubert Humphrey was always thought to be a radical. He had radical ideas, like McGovern. But the people around HHH were not radical. He had pols all around him -- cigar-chomping boys who prowled the back rooms. McGovern was surrounded by radicals -- all those damn hippy kids and free love adherents, etc. McGovern's politics were caught up in the culture of the "movement" and only made his radicalism seem worse.

These were not flaws of the man or his tactics -- again, they were basic defects of the radical liberal movement. McGovern thought that the kooky people around him were logical extensions of his new politics, of the coming home of America, and of the revolutionary basis of his candidacy. I would think that McGovern never did see what was wrong in saying that Henry Wallace was still "right," that the Soviets would treat him as a "friend" and not test him; or question why the Rubin and Hoffman endorsements were bad.

His friends -- Galbraith, Schlesinger, Steinem, et al. -- all came from the closed club of liberal intelligentsia which saw the historical movement through its own narrow vision. These were not casual campaign mistakes, they were the most profound of judgmental errors. McGovern misread the mood of the country and refused to admit it because liberal intellectuals always think they have a monopoly on wisdom. (I'm quite serious about this -- I never knew a liberal college professor who was otherwise, and McG is a former college professor)

THE CAMPAIGN

The campaign itself was marred by the same fundamental flaws of ideology. I don't believe at all that it was a tactical error for McGovern to campaign in the early days on Vietnam and some of the most leftist positions. I think he believed that his surrender policy in Vietnam (he was actually to the left of the Viet Cong in his proposals) was the right position and probably the politically expedient position. The income redistribution plan and some of the other way-out ideas were still in his speeches in early September, although not explicitly. And throughout, there was Vietnam, where McGovern grew to higher reaches of sell-out. He dumped his \$1000-per-person plan for a \$4000-per-four-persons plan and gave out detailed explanations of how this would work.

Basically, I don't think that McGovern forsaked his radicalism. He simply tried to make it sound not all that bad in the campaign. Sure, he made some stupid mistakes, but the singular mistake was the belief that he could sell to the steelworker in the fall what he spoonfed to the students in the winter -- a disrespected political philosophy.

Finally, the McGovern campaign tactics and language were classics in New Left politics. The pure smear, the overstatement, the disruption, the Hitler analogy, the fostering of discord and the planting of fears -- all permeate the liberal ideology. When liberals disagree, the first charge

they make is "fascist" or "Hitler." It is reflexive. It is the formbook liberal tactic -- to many liberal politicians, the ideology imbues the form -- the substance is the form. And in the end you cannot fault McGovern for his tactics without really faulting his ideological base.

NOTES

It might be said that McGovern lost the election because of the way he won the nomination. He sold his soul to the left and had little inclination to seek salvation. That massive political error cannot be laid alone to ineptitude -- it is no less than a major misreading of American values and the cultural ethos of our country.

The polls showed over and over again that the public resented McGovern "running down America." And while Haynes Johnson traveled the country talking about alienation, he missed the fact that Americans are basically at peace with themselves, satisfied with their lives, and optimistic about the future. What he saw was good old American skepticism -- the "show me" attitude -- and he mistook it for a penetrating anomie and social listlessness,

Not only did the polls show McGovern misreading the country's mood, they also showed that McGovern misread the public's perception of the correct position on the issues. Harris found out in the summer that the President had the preferable position on 15 out of 16 issues. This shows an unusually high perception of McGovern's radical views -- moreover, this was

a huge jump over the period in the primaries where McGovern was viewed as benign. This confirms that McGovern was hurt deeply by HHH's efforts in California and that that was the most harmful point in the McGovern candidacy.

It was not that McGovern played the wrong strings -- he was playing the tuba in a string orchestra. He was out of syncopation; out of tune; and blaring fortissimo while the public wanted pianissimo.

In a nutshell, McGovern was wrong from the start. His radical politics took a good shellacking from the American public -- a deserved repudiation of alien ideas. Let's not blame it on his political amateur standing -- after all, he did some quite intelligent politicking at times -- let's put the blame where it belongs: on the elitist, leftward movement in America which was born of Kennedy, raised in the Great Society and cut down by the grocer's son who saw the excesses and called 'em like he saw 'em.

Ken Khachigian

Political Memorandum

11/7/72

Why McGovern Lost

11/6/72

MEMORANDUM FOR PAT BUCHANAN
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN
SUBJECT: WHY MCGOVERN LOST -- POLITICAL ANALYSIS

A massive effort must be taken after the election to head off the ~~media~~ ^{liberal establishment} effort to detract from RN's election victory. That effort will take many tacks -- such as RN didn't bring in a Congress; people voted against McGovern not for Nixon, etc. However, the liberal apologists will push one line extra hard: the defeat was not ~~for~~ ^{ideas of} for the left-liberal movement but rather for the bearer of those ideas.

They will argue that liberalism is still viable -- that we still need busing, and all the other liberal schemes, and that they need only wait until they get a standard bearer who won't make the same mistakes McGovern did. The following analysis serves to debunk that viewpoint, and, it seems to me, should be put out as much as possible to counter all ~~the~~ ^{contra.} the ~~opposite~~ opinion. This memorandum focuses on why McGovern lost -- any analysis of the high points of the R^N victory should be taken up in a ~~separate~~ ^{separate} memo, which I can draft up if desired.

THE ~~MEMO~~ CENTRAL POINT TO MAKE

To those who argue that McGovern had bad strategy and bad tactics and that he ~~made~~ made too many mistakes to run a good campaign, we have one basic response: the tactics

of the liberal movement are the logical outgrowth of the liberal ideology. That is, don't ~~blame~~ blame McGovern, *per se*, blame the philosophy. Elitism, close-mindedness, moral righteousness, ~~viewing~~ viewing things ~~as~~ as good versus ~~evil~~ evil and the penchant for overstatement are ~~all~~ all fundamentals of the liberal-left political ideology. If McGovern ran a bad campaign -- don't blame his strategy because the strategy is the ideology. The personal flaws of McGovern ~~were~~ were bred of the ~~flaws~~ flaws of ^{his} political philosophy.

Thus, McGovern could change his mind on central issues, and then with a straight face defend his credibility. This hurt his standing with the voters, but ~~being~~ being trained in the narrow view as he has, he sees his position ~~only~~ only in moralistic terms, or, as PJB put it, as the true believers.

People ~~rejected~~ rejected the McGovern ~~philosophy~~ philosophy pure and simple. If the ~~questions~~ questions of his credibility and wishy-washiness arose, it was only because of his approach to ~~public~~ public policy -- one in which he could ~~cut~~ cut aircraft carriers back from 16 to 6 and still ~~maintain~~ maintain ^{with a straight face} that this would not ~~affect~~ affect the strength of the sixth fleet. That is the underlying problem with the left radicals, i.e., that the wild things they propose really won't disjoint things important to ~~citizens~~ citizens or ~~voter~~ voter blocs.

But there are other things to look at in terms of what McGovern did ~~wrong~~ wrong, and I'll take ~~it~~ ^{them} in sequence.

THE PARTY REFORM

It is not for nothing that the Democratic Party reform was promulgated under the "McGovern Commission." This is where we underestimated McGovern. Immediately, he saw the potential of these guidelines -- they served his purposes perfectly. The ~~reforms~~ reforms brought precisely those people ~~into~~ into the process who would directly ~~benefit~~ ^{benefit} his candidacy. Moreover, it was only McGovern at that point ~~who~~ ^{who} saw that the complexity of the rules would be baffling to those who did not know them, and he hired the ~~fe~~ ^{fe}llow who knew the rules best to be his delegate counter -- Rick Stearns. ^(soon enough)

His opponents did not see ^(soon enough) the potential of having a tight solid ~~base~~ base which could bring victory in a field ~~of~~ ^(many) candidates. Therefore, McGovern moved quickly to ~~pre~~ ^{pre}empt the party's left wing, and knowing that ~~he~~ ^{and} ~~with~~ with tight organization and his left flank ~~pro~~ protected, he could conceivably get the nomination. To that extent the liberal-left issues were winners ~~for~~ for McGovern in the early stages of the ~~game~~ game.

THE PRIMARIES

McGovern made it ~~through~~ through the primaries with ^{skill} ~~skill~~,
~~and~~ luck, and, later, with a little help from his
 friends in the media. New Hampshire was ^a ~~the~~ Muskie disaster,
 and McGovern was clever in making his loss out ~~to~~ to be
 a victory. McGovern's first score. McGovern was wiped
 out in Florida in what should have been the first test
 of the McGovern political philosophy -- but it was not
 reported that ~~way~~ way. It was said that McGovern never
 expected to win ~~Florida~~ Florida. Nevertheless, his views
 on gutting the space program, support for massive busing,
 and a few other positions surely ~~were~~ were important in
 the Florida defeat.

Next came Illinois where McGovern wisely worked more
 on getting a foothold ~~while~~ while avoiding a direct
^{test} ~~test~~ with Muskie. This strategy -- a good one -- brought
 him to Wisconsin which he targeted from the beginning as
 his strongest state with the youth-lust and an excellent
 organization. There the ~~tight-knit~~ tight-knit support
 for his ^{radicalism} ~~liberalism~~ and ^{an} excellent youth turnout gave him
 a ~~victory~~ victory. Moreover, the Republicans helped by
 crossing over for McGovern ~~and~~ and Wallace. If only Democrats
 had voted, HHH would have won. Yet ~~Wisconsin~~ Wisconsin was the
 key for McGovern and most importantly it knocked Lindsay out
 and gave McG an un^{ex}posed left flank.

From Wisconsin on, it was not very difficult for McG. He took Rhode Island because there ~~was~~ was only about a 10% Democrat turnout -- and the tight organization, getting the liberals ^{and doves} out, did it again. Then ~~came~~ came Massachusetts and Pennsylvania with Muskie mercilessly caught in between HHH and McG. By this time the press was ~~necking~~ necking in the back seat with McGovern, and Massachusetts was a cinch while HHH kept Muskie ~~at~~ at bay in Pa. Again, the organization also went to work in Pa. to pick up some delegates -- what proved to be a good strategy for McG; he ~~nickel-~~ nickel-(sp) dined his opposition. ~~Throughout~~ Throughout, McGovern was assisted by low ^{voters} turnouts coupled with his zealots going to the polls in droves. April 25th served to put Muskie over the side ^{-- a hapless victim on a fast track.}

Thfough Ohio, Indiana, ~~Tennessee~~ Tennessee, and North Carolina, in my judgment, the press effectively protected McGovern. He didn't do real well in any of these states -- except Ohio -- yet they only said it was because he didn't try. Yet, by then they should ~~have~~ have known that the McGovern ideology was like death in those states. Moreover, in Ohio he was basking in the media glow which did not mention his radical positions at all, but rather how he represented "the alienated and discontented." That left McG free to use his excellent ~~TV~~ TV spots to bilk the voters of their support. They only saw a nice guy on the tube, not ~~a~~ a radical.

Nebraska was the beginning of the end for McGovern.
For the first time, his opposition began to hammer effectively
at the McGovern leftism. Abortion, amnesty, pot, ~~and~~ welfare
and ~~and~~ defense all became problems. It was too late
for HHH to have much of an impact, but the seeds were planted.
The threat that ~~the~~ Offutt Air Base in Omaha would be
closed by McGovern was the first big hit.

By this time in Oregon and California, McG had the
only ^{effective} organization ~~and~~ and a huge public relations
advantage. The media was ^{busy} ~~was~~ explaining why they were
wrong about the early primaries, and in deference to McG
were giving him every break possible. Michigan and Maryland
were in between, but McG avoided media setbacks because
the Wallace shooting knocked everything else off the front
page. Yet these two states were ^(another hint) ~~the~~ ^{that}
McGovern represented the wrong side of the political spectrum.
That story was lost in the Wallace ~~tragedy~~ tragedy.

By the time McGovern got out to the West Coast, the
regular Democrats found ~~out~~ out that they were in the process
of ~~being~~ being had by McGovern. But it was too late. The
Dem party had been infiltrated by the McGovern guerillas,
and there was no time for pacification. ^(Maybe the) ~~fact~~ fact
that McGovern seemed to think more of the Communists in
Vietnam ~~than~~ than their opponents colored his political
strategy: *he was the Viet Cong of the Democratic
party).*

Thus, McGovern won the California, South Dakota, New Mexico and New Jersey primaries all on the same day -- ~~in~~ ^{a tribute to} irreversible momentum. (As McGovern said that night: "I can't believe I won the whole thing"-- neither could his fellow Democrats who probably swore that night that they would do anything to try to stop him.) But California was the true turning point in the 1972 presidential campaign and it ~~was~~ turned on issues, not on McGovern's personality or ~~his~~ bad tactics.

McGovern ~~was~~ saw a ~~20~~ 20 ~~point~~ point lead in the polls drop to 4%. In short, he was devastated by the HHH one-man shredding machine. The issues caught up with him, and HHH was able to articulate ~~them~~ them in his ~~hammering~~ hammering ~~staccato~~ staccato fashion as no other figure in American politics could do. Those three national debates -- which ~~could~~ could not be filtered by the writing press or Frank Reynolds and his gang -- were the real Waterloo for McGovern. Vast attention was given to the welfare plan, the ~~defense~~ defense plan, the Vietnam bug-out, the fact that McGovern had voted against Jewish interests. HHH was vicious and relentless and he did for us what we could have never done for ourselves. Moreover, he did ~~to McG~~ to McG what Rockefeller ~~did~~ did to Goldwater: *he labelled McGovern.*

Luckily for McG the next primary was New York, and he couldn't lose it because there was no preferential vote -- only delegegate selection. Thus, the small left-wing delegate machine moved on, aided and abetted by ^{only a} a 10% voter turnout.

little over

THE MEDIA IN THIS PERIOD

McGovern got more than his share of breaks from the press in the early days. They covered for his radical positions by writing tons of essays on populism and anti-politicians and alienated voters. Moreover, McGovern's staff was being given the kid-glove treatment. Stories followed on the McG "wunderkind." Caddell (whose poll information has been so spectacularly bad, yet universally praised) was made out to be Gallup and Harris rolled into one. Stearns, Grandmaison and Pokorny (who Sidey eulogized with the prairie sod in his ears) were "master strategists" -- and oh so young! Mankiewicz was quoted from coast to coast -- the man with the quick wit and fast repartee (in my opinion Mankiewicz is an absolute political lightweight who covered up with a quick wit -- he gave monumentally bad advice).

These "kids" began to believe their press clippings and probably thought it was a good time to screw the old-liners. I would guess that the boys in the clubhouse didn't appreciate either their treatment or

the ~~mainstream~~ stores they read about the "kids."

~~Their~~ Their duty was to win elections and not worry about ideology. The McG people believed that winning elections

~~was~~ a part of the ideology -- that the two were intertwined, and that ~~the~~ their radicalism was the wave of the future.

But give the devil his due -- the organization worked well and played the delegates and the convention states like violins.

THE CONVENTION

The Convention also had to be quite harmful to McGovern.

By this time McGovern was tarred on the issues, but it was too late to stop ~~him~~ him -- he really had it wrapped up after California. Nevertheless, the leftism was fully exposed on national television, and the shock for some probably has not yet worn off. The spectacle of the abortion people, the libbers and the homosexuals was too much. McGovern was seen, finally, to be the radical that his positions made him out to be, and this hurt.

Then came the compromises -- putting the abortion, women's lib, and other minority planks over the side -- along with George Wiley and Gloria Steinem. It ~~was~~ time to kiss and make up with Daley, though Daley would resist. But the sum total was a picture of just another politician, one who would make deals to win and compromise his principles -- or at least ~~some~~ certain principles.

But McGovern walked out of that convention ~~the~~ a radical. For all intents and purposes he could not escape that label through November. It was not because of mistakes in his strategy or flaws in his tactics and it was not George McGovern the man or personality. It was his position on the political spectrum -- he was on the left, and he believed in his ways.

EAGLETON

I think the death blow was already delivered before the Eagleton affair. It only confirmed everything which had already been building up against McGovern. Those who argue that Eagleton was the turning point don't know what they're talking about. Eagleton was extremely important in terms of harming McGovern's credibility and trust. But even before Eagleton the seeds were planted -- Eagleton merely made it harder for McGovern. Without the Eagleton affair, McGovern would have still been weighted by his positions.

Blaming the Eagleton affair will be a liberal cop-out and a McGovern staff cop-out. Eagleton did not make McGovern lose a 20 point lead in the California balloting. We have got to stop the myth of the Eagleton thing before history writes that it was this and only this which cost McG his crack at the Presidency. It just ain't

true. There was a [redacted] Gallup after the Dem convention and before Eagleton which saw ^{RN gaming} [redacted] three points, [redacted]. McGovern was already on the way down.

RADICALISM -- • THE FATAL FLAW

Hubert Humphrey was always [redacted] thought to be a radical. He had radical ideas, like McGovern. But the people around HHH were not radical. He [redacted] had pols all around him -- [redacted] cigar-chomping [redacted] boys who prowled the back rooms. McGovern [redacted] was surrounded by radicals -- all those damn hippy kids and free love adherents, etc. McGovern's politics were caught up in the [redacted] culture of the ^{"Movement"} [redacted] and [redacted] only made his radicalism seem worse.

These were not flaws of the man or his tactics -- again, they [redacted] were basic ^{defects} [redacted] of the ^{radical} liberal movement. McGovern thought that the kooky [redacted] people around him were logical extensions of his new politics, of the coming home of America, and of the revolutionary basis of his candidacy. I would think that McGovern [redacted] never did see what was wrong in saying that Henry Wallace was still "right," that the Soviets [redacted] would treat him as a "friend" and not test him; [redacted] or [redacted] question why the Rubin and Hoffman endorsements were bad.

His friends -- Galbraith, Schlesinger, [redacted] Steinem, et al. [redacted] all came from the closed club [redacted] of liberal intell ^{igentsia} [redacted]

~~which~~ saw the ~~historical~~ movement through ~~it~~
 own narrow vision. These were not casual campaign mistakes,
 they were the most profound of judgmental errors. McGovern
 misread the mood of the country and refused to admit it
 because liberal intellectuals always think they
 have a monopoly on wisdom. (I'm quite serious about
 this -- I never knew a liberal college professor who was
 otherwise, and McG ~~is~~ a former college professor)

THE CAMPAIGN

The campaign itself was marred by the same funda-
 mental flaws of ideology. I don't believe at all that
 it was a tactical error for McGovern to campaign/on ^{in the early days}
 Vietnam and some of the most leftish positions. I think
 he believed that his surrender policy in Vietnam (he was
 actually to the left of the Viet Cong in his proposals)
 was the right position and probably the politically
 expedient position. The income redistribution
 plan and some of the other way-out ideas were still
 in his speeches in early September, although not explicitly.
 And throughout, there was Vietnam, where McGovern
 grew to higher reaches of sell-out. He dumped his
 \$1000-per-person plan for a \$4000-per-four-persons plan
 and gave out detailed explanations of how this would
 work.

^{as}Basically, I ~~don't~~ don't think that McGovern forsaked his radicalism. He simply tried to make it sound not all that bad in the ~~campaign~~ campaign. Sure, he made some stupid mistakes, but the singular mistake was the belief that he could sell to the steelworker in the fall what he spoonfed to the students in the winter -- *a disrespected political philosophy.*

Finally, the McGovern campaign tactics and language were classics in New Left politics. The pure smear, the overstatement, the disruption, the Hitler ~~analogy~~ analogy, the fostering of discord and the planting of fears -- all permeate the liberal ideology. When liberals disagree, the first change they make is ~~to~~ "fascist" or "Hitler". It is reflexive. It ^{is} the formbook liberal tactic -- to many liberal politicians, the ideology ^{imbues} permeates the form -- the substance is the form. And in the end you cannot fault McGovern for his tactics without ^{really} faulting his ideological base.

NOTES

It might be said that McGovern lost the ~~election~~ election because of the ~~way~~ way he won the nomination. He sold his ~~soul~~ soul to the left and had little inclination to seek salvation. That massive political error cannot be laid ~~alone~~ alone to ineptitude -- it is no less than a major misreading of American values and the cultural ~~ethos~~ ethos of our country. ~~.....~~

The polls showed over and over again that the public resented McGovern "running down America." And while Haynes Johnson traveled the country talking about alienation, he missed the fact that Americans are basically at peace with themselves, satisfied with their lives, and optimistic about the future. What he saw was good old American skepticism -- the "show me" attitude -- and he ~~misread~~^{ook} it for a penetrating anomie and social listlessness.

Not only did the polls show McGovern misreading the country's mood, they also showed that McGovern misread the public's perception of the correct position on the issues. Harris found out in the summer that the President had the preferable position on 15 out of 16 issues. This shows an unusually high perception of McGovern's radical views -- moreover, this was a huge jump over the period in the primaries where McGovern was viewed as benign. This confirms that McGovern was hurt deeply by HHH's efforts in California and that that was the most harmful point in the McGovern candidacy.

It was not that McGovern played the wrong strings -- he was playing the tuba in a string orchestra. He was out of syncopation; out of tune; and blaring fortissimo while the public wanted pianissimo.

In a nutshell, McGovern was wrong from the start. His radical politics took a good shellacking (sp?) from the American public -- a deserved repudiation of alien ideas. Let's not blame it on his political amateur standing -- after all, he did some quite intelligent politicking at times -- let's put the blame where it belongs: on the elitist, leftward movement in America which was born of Kennedy, raised in the Great Society and cut down by the grocer's son who saw the excesses and called 'em like he saw 'em.

ideas for memo on Why McGovern lost

McG lost because of the way he won!

-- said that it is McGovern's tactics -- the way he runs the campaign, not the liberal ideology. This is their way of ~~x~~ blaming McG without blaming leftism -- But his tactics are a logical outgrowth of ideology -- the elitism, ~~x~~ close-mindedness, excessive moralism, etc. In the case of the ~~the~~ extreme left procedures are part of the ideology -- here is step by step of how McG won nomination, how he lost election.

-- Begin with ~~xxx~~ party reform -- here is where McG smart politician -- ~~for~~ few others saw the potential of having a tight, solid base to win a victory in a widespread field of candidates ~~x~~ -- won primaries by dumb luck -- New ~~Hxx~~ Hampshire (Muskie error and ~~xxx~~ media help -- after all, Muskie ~~xxx~~ won) -- Florida, Wallace, zip for McG though great interest in race ~~is~~ -- Illinois, a handful (if we realized we should have known by then he would nick ~~the~~ dime his opposition to death) -- Wisconsin, won because of Repub. ~~xxx~~ crossovers to McG and Wallace, otherwise HHH -- Rhode Island - won with something like 10% vote turnout ~~is~~ -- Mass. and Pa. -- McG won one and HHH the other -- Muskie sandwiched unmercifully -- Mass was obvious, ~~is~~ low turnout but heavy student and left-wing vote; Pa -- vote for delegates, and thus McG's tight organization victorious. -- Indiana HHH --

*Lindsay out: "left"
for
himself*

Muskie virtually out.

Ohio -- by that time, media ~~is~~ love affair was on, McG
getting~~g~~ noth~~ing~~ but good press -- new face, clever ads --
no one knew where he stood and again good org. -- HHH old
face. Ohio hurt. -- Tennessee -- zip for McG --
North Carolina, zip for McG -- Nebraska, McG~~is~~ won , but for
first time and indicator of HHH attacks, big McG lead was
cut in the last days -- first time HHH started on military,
abortion~~s~~ and related issues -- ~~xxxx~~ Avoided W^{est} Va, except
for del~~eg~~ate votes (no loss could be had thus) -- Maryland
and Michigan same day -- wash because of Wallace, but started
to show how in two Democrat states, McG was not wave of future --
evaded busing issue in ~~Mich~~ Mich, but would catch up later --
Oregon, ~~is~~ foregone conclusion for McG, overwhelming buildup --
Only now do any Democrat~~s~~ realize what happening to them --
they were infiltrated and found the guerillas too late (maybe
the premier lesson ~~is~~ for McG from Vietnam war) -- Finally
Calif., N.J., New Mexico, and South Dakota (I can't believe
I won the whole thing -- and unfortunately for McG, neither
could other Dem~~s~~ who decided they couldn't swallow him and
would start ag~~ain~~st him although too late -- but Calif.
was turning point in terms of McG v. RN on the whole campaign. --
McG saw a 21% poll lead drop to 4% on election day -- for the
first time in campaign, issues caught up -- and HHH was
abl~~e~~ to articulate them in his hammering stacatto fashion in

three national debates -- That was the real Waterloo for
McG just as California was for Goldwater --New York -- ~~xxxx~~
obvious, the leftists were in control and only about a 10%
turnout again -- sure thing for ~~McG~~ McG.

* * * * *

McG won because he was organized and Rick Stearns
who ~~him~~ helped write the rules also ran the organization.
Meanwhile the press started writing about populism and
McG being the "anti-politician" -- covering the leftism
in their purple prose -- Moreover, all those syrupy stories
about the McG ~~was~~ wunderkinder -- Caddell (whose poll information
has been so spectacularly ~~wrong~~ wrong but universally praised) --
Stearns, Pokornny (with the prairie sod in his ears); Grandmaison,
Mankiewicz (who is the dumbest pol I believe we have ever
faced -- good wit but lousy strategist) -- They started
to believe they were superior to all the oldliners who
probably resented this because they worked hard but
~~was~~ only ~~him~~ laughed at. -- Yet the org was still there, and
played the rules like violin -- as good as Barry did in 1964 --
but Barry actually represented his party more than McG did
his. --

Convention -- the leftism was fully exposed on national
television, ~~xxxx~~ but the sheer momentum would not deprive
McG -- ~~he~~ he was dead before the balloting -- the spectacle
in the media -- queers, abortionists, women's lib,

Then the ~~the~~ political acts -- putting the libbers, the welfare people and othess over the side -- screwing everybody on the miniority planks -- this ~~was~~ was printed in a rash of articæes after convnetion and it took hold -- finally, McG was seen to be a politicaian just like the rest -- the desire to ~~be~~ kiss and make up with Daley etc. ~~xxx~~

Eagleton affair ~~xxxx~~ merely confirmed what was building ~~up~~ up -- ~~the~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ served the purpose of dramatizing evarything that was wrong with McG and proably caught the press at a time when they were fed up with the way Mc^G ~~had~~ had been given the sweetheart treatment -- the warts were there and it was time to show them, with a vengeance.

But ~~xxxx~~ through it all, the left-readādalism showed through -- the welfare and defēnse plans, the taxing, theabortion, amnesty and pot positions -- he could not escape them (and he would have been better off ~~if~~ if he didn't try to keep compromising and swithcing ~~on~~ this was the worst thing he ~~could~~ could have done) -- but ~~xxxx~~ this was a minor flaw in tactics; it was the basic radicalism of the positions which went to the core ~~of~~ of gut Democrats. HHH always talked like a radical but all those pols around him showed ~~xxx~~ he was ok, but McG~~s~~ not only talked like a radical , but had radicals around him --

-- youth vote -- took it for granted; arrogance and elitism of left was the reason McG acted this way -- his downfall with youth; he left them somewhat -- but it is what left-wing has always attempted to do, ~~xxx~~ win over hard-core in private and in primaries and then ignore them in Fall to get the big ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~ one.

Then the campaign -- he chose to campaign for weeks on the issues of the left -- Vietnam (where he was truly crushed; this probably hurt him equally with other issues); tax loopholes; redistribution -- and he sometimes backed off, but ~~xxxxxxxx~~ tried ~~x~~ to still believe in it -- e.g., substitute \$1,000 per person with ~~\$x000~~ \$4,000 per family (big deal).

Finally, the language and tactics -- in the end, pure New Left -- indduendo, smear, overstatement, disruption, fostering discord, planting fears -- it was a classic in the way New Left ideology permeates form -- the liberal ~~xxx~~ substance is the liberal form -- you cannot attack McG's tactics without attacking his ideology.

Also notes: Polls showed that people thought McG was running down America; didn't buy his defense plans, his tax plans; his foreign policy and isolationism; and basically found themselves to ~~x~~ his ~~w~~ right -- also they viewed McG as to ~~x~~ far left -- polls showed time after time that ~~Mc~~ ideology was a major weakness.

Americans did not think they were sick or racist or warmongering
or heartless towards poor -- Magoo was pulling at wrong strings --
there might be ~~xxx~~ things wrong with U.S. but George wouldn't
ever admit it was a good country and would never admit
for example that North Vietnam was a bad country ~~no~~ -- the
fatal left-wing flaw -- lack of consistency and moral
fervor "only I am ~~w~~right and everyone else is wrong").