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Obvious discussion will arise on the merits of the President's opposition in the campaign year. I suggest some of the following points be made:

-- An effort should be made to exacerbate Democratic differences. Gene McCarthy has severely criticized Ed Muskie for his strong support of the Vietnam war in 1968. McGovern has challenged Muskie to statewide debates in New Hampshire and has attacked consistently that Muskie is not liberal enough. Jackson thinks all the other Dems are too far on the Left -- he strongly opposes bussing and wants a stronger military as well as being strong on law and order. Making these points and other might help to bring to the public eye the squabbling among the Dems.

-- An impression should be conveyed of the Democrats in totally disarray -- a party who has no true leader and thus has so many presidential candidates as to make their party's leadership seem ludicrous. Portray the Democratic party as bankrupt of ideas as well as leadership; of not saying anything positive, but only attacking the President; of having not much vision but a great deal of partisanship. If they can't run their party, how can they run their country?
I would puff up Humphrey. You probably will be asked who the White House thinks is the most likely Dem candidate. Obviously, HHH would be our best opponent. He should be praised as a great Dem party leader -- one who has labored in the vineyards. Offer the opinion that Humphrey is a strong leader and would again be a strong opponent. This should obviously be done in a way which doesn't amount to an endorsement of HHH, but rather an observation that HHH is much better than the rest and much stronger politically than the press portrays him to be.

-- On the Anderson Papers, the question will be raised of credibility, and I think this ought to be turned right around and thrown back at the Dems. E. g., Muskie and others have been raising the questions of RN's credibility. I would say: "Talk about credibility; Ed Muskie, Hubert Humphrey and the other Democrats were silent when Lyndon Johnson took us into war -- they relished in their portrayals of Barry Goldwater as bomb-happy. Their silence while Lyndon Johnson escalated the war is well known. Yet now they are unanimous in their desire to cut and run. I would think that there is a problem of credibility when candidates change their positions for such obviously political purposes as the Democrats have done on Vietnam -- and with hypocrisy turn around and accuse someone else of credibility problems."
-- If an assessment is asked of the opposition, here are suggested brief replies:

**Ed Muskie:** Has the lead. A very undistinguished record; virtually untutored in foreign affairs; indecisive. Will come under strong attack from his opponents and will be then under heavy testing as a candidate. While seeking to convey trust, he is as divisive if not more so than any other Dems.

**George McGovern:** A loyal Dem who sincerely believes in his leftist views. Not a serious candidate and a stalking horse for Kennedy.

**Gene McCarthy:** Is a spoiler. Will further divide the Dems. Will probably run a fourth party because he thinks the party does not listen to him.

**Henry Jackson:** One of the brightest of the Dems; loyal, etc. Must do well in Florida where he is more in tune with them than Muskie. Unfortunately the Dems have gone to the left and will not nominate him -- too bad that the Dems no longer believe in strong national defense.

**Hubert Humphrey:** Muskie's chief rival -- will announce January 10. Strong organization in Florida. May upset Muskie. Will challenge Muskie in Wisconsin. Has more financial backing.

**John Lindsay:** How can he govern the country when he can't govern his city? Many of his municipal problems were self-created.