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MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

Here is some basic information you wanted on the early primaries. Basically, it involves crossover voting and the like.

In New Hampshire, an individual has to vote on their party's ballot. Once they declare their party affiliation, they must vote on that ballot. They can write in names of other party candidates, but those votes don't count towards delegate apportionment. Note that in New Hampshire independents may vote in either party's primary. Pete McCloskey is getting the kids to register as independents to do this very thing.

In Florida, once a person is registered in a party, he can't vote in the other party's primary.

In Illinois when the person goes to vote, he signs an affidavit declaring whether he is a Dem or Republican and he gets that party's ballot and he can vote only on that ballot.

In Wisconsin, there is no registration. People go to the polls, get two ballots (one Republican and one Dem). They vote on one ballot and throw the other away. Thus, crossover voting is essentially allowed and it may be in our interest to have Republicans vote on the Dem ballot for HHH.

Note: per your question on whether we are O.K. in Illinois, I checked with Magruder. Jeb said everything is under control and that all districts will have slates running pledged to RN. Our machinery is deciding which delegates are running, and there is no chance that McCloskey (or Ashbrook) can slip in slates to beat us -- at least those chances have been minimized. All voting is for district delegates and there is not a statewide vote for a particular candidate.
MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THE 1972 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARIES

While it's not possible to make a rock-hard prediction of the full primary route for the Democrats, I think we have enough information to look at the first four big ones and give some idea of the scenario through Wisconsin.

The New Hampshire primary falls on March 7 -- after the withdrawal deadlines for Illinois, Florida and Wisconsin. Thus, anyone going into New Hampshire will at least have to go into Wisconsin and Florida (where Secretary of States have discretion as to who goes on the ballot) and possibly into Illinois (where the primary is opening up this year).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire is Muskie's. Jackson has pulled out because the polls showed him with nothing. That leaves Yorty and McGovern who at this point will be Muskie's only opponents. The key here is to insist that Muskie must do better than RN's 1968 showing to call New Hampshire a victory. Yorty will get around 20% with Bill Loeb's endorsement and McGovern a hard-core 15% based on some polling recently reported.

FLORIDA

I believe at this point that Florida is going to be an indecisive primary -- but one that still benefits Muskie. The Florida ballot will probably include: Muskie, McGovern, Jackson, Shirley Chisholm, George Wallace, Sam Yorty, Hubert Humphrey, John Lindsay and Eugene McCarthy.
The big story in Florida will probably be the poor showing of Scoop Jackson. It's long been my feeling -- supported most recently by Evans-Novak and several polls -- that Jackson is going nowhere. In Florida, his appeal will be lost under Wallace's frank hard-line appeals in the northern part of the state.

Shirley Chisholm, McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will split the libs and blacks in Florida. Humphrey will probably have a small bloc by virtue of his endorsement by Miami mayor David Kennedy, Yorty a fringe, and Muskie picking up 25-35% -- enough for a close margin of victory. If there's no big victory there for Muskie, at least there's no great loss either.

ILLINOIS

Illinois is opening up its primary for the first time -- allowing presidential hopefuls to have their names alongside the candidates for convention delegates in each Congressional district. No one has yet planned to run anybody in opposition to the delegates in Chicago -- still Daley's. But both McGovern and Muskie plan to run delegates in other districts and conceivably could pick up about as many delegates as will Daley. Yet, I can't picture Daley giving up total control of his delegation and thus think that he will try to get a majority so he still has control in Miami. Nevertheless, Muskie has an excellent opportunity to get committed to him upwards of 35% of the Illinois delegation.

WISCONSIN

All early primaries eventually lead to Wisconsin on April 4 where the Secretary of State has discretion as to who goes on the ballot and affidavits of non-candidacy are required to get off the ballot.

It looks promising for Muskie right now. McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will all probably be on the ballot along with Humphrey, Jackson and Shirley Chisholm. The liberals will again divide the kids and the left. Humphrey has some residual strength in Wisconsin but surely not enough to win more than one or two districts. Jackson has no source of strength in Wisconsin and I call it a wash for Scoop.

So again, it looks like Muskie, with at least one article I read giving him as many as 8 out of 10 districts. He will, of course, have great strength in Milwaukee and wherever else large Polish enclaves exist. Plus, there is something about the solid Ed image that sells in Wisconsin.
A Wisconsin victory for Muskie, added to earlier leads in the first primaries makes a solid position for Big Ed going into the others. It will really almost go by default to the extent that his opponents will not be able to muster significant showings through Wisconsin. And if no large candidate emerges to oppose him, Muskie will reap enormous psychological victories in Wisconsin, probably loosen up some money, and be on his way to other primaries.

After Wisconsin, a brand new analysis will be necessary. Things will have changed sufficiently to let us make some final plans. More will then be known about EMK and we can start giving some thought to the Southern primaries as well as Oregon and California.

Please note, per Tab A, that the various dates of the primaries still makes them crowded and hopefully confused -- enough so that even though Muskie is winning, he won't have the nomination locked up via the primaries and that a bloody Miami is still possible. For example, the Florida primary comes after the withdrawal deadlines for Illinois, Rhode Island, Massachusetts (subject to change), Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Nebraska.

And by the Wisconsin primary, the withdrawal deadlines for Nebraska, Tennessee, Indiana, South Dakota, North Carolina and Maryland will have passed. Thus, every one of those primaries are likely to be littered with names -- even if candidates are withdrawing after Wisconsin. And it's to our benefit to keep those primaries crowded (even to the extent of asking Republican Secretaries of State to keep Democrats on the ballot) so as to make each of Muskie's victories indecisive.

My recommendation: Higher ups should give some immediate attention to this information and sanction our ongoing analysis here. No one really seems to be giving serious attention to what is happening in the other camp (at least in terms of slogging through all the state laws), yet what happens with the Dems is, for now, equally important as what happens to us.
Rhode Island follows Wisconsin and is insignificant in size and impact. Massachusetts, for now, is scheduled next. Governor Sargent recently vetoed a bill which would have given EMK control over his delegation, and now it is winner take all, making the big delegation a valuable one. Our intelligence, however, shows that EMK's people are introducing new legislation which would push the filing deadline into March instead of February, thus giving Teddy maneuvering room should he want to run. If he does, he will go after Massachusetts first and have a good start towards the nomination.

Pennsylvania now is a district by district vote, but their law is in the legislature, and it still might change. It's hard to guess what will happen considering the expected fight between Shapp, Rizzo and the machine boys, and we still simply don't have enough information to make a prediction.

Indiana comes next on May 2 and is marginally important. Vance Hartke is talking about running, and if so, will cause the others problems. Lindsay has been there and he may get Gordon St. Angelo's support and try for a comeback after Wisconsin aiming at the constituency that made RFK popular in 1968. It's too early to call.

Ohio is also on May 2, but a Gilligan favorite son bid is predicted which will limit the impact. Look for Gilligan getting his fingers burned a la Jim Rhodes.

North Carolina is also on May 2, and that could be a most important primary vis 'a vis the South. Moreover, Tennessee follows North Carolina on May 4. Together, these two primaries will tell a great story for us and might be Scoop's last gasp.

North Carolina and Tennessee are important to those candidates who intend to take more of a centrist Dem line -- the old FDR coalition. Muskie, Jackson, Mills, Chisholm and Wallace will probably grace those ballots. Lindsay and McGovern have no choice but to go on the Tennessee ballot if they are in Wisconsin (secretary of state discretion). Humphrey may be there as well, and he needs a good showing to be credible.

Muskie's support is good in North Carolina, and Scoop is devoting great attention there. But Wallace will give them headaches as he will in Tennessee, and William Anderson might be in Tennessee to confuse things. I give North Carolina to Muskie -- the right being split by Wallace, Jackson and Mills if they are all there. Chisholm will take the blacks and some liberals and McGovern might get 10 votes.
If Muskie wins North Carolina after having won Wisconsin, he has a strong argument for saying he does well in all sections of the country -- it will help him immensely.

Tennessee's too hard to call right now. Muskie's organization and strength there is not legend, and Wallace will have strong support. Tennessee will most likely have on its ballot all those who were on the Florida ballot and maybe more. That makes it look more like Florida -- a toss-up with little national impact and no convincing delegate support picked up.

Note: Wallace should not be discouraged in these primaries because he will detract from the others. Keeping Muskie's margin down in the South is important.

Nebraska, West Virginia, and Maryland are the next three, but are hardly kingmaker in character. Nebraska will be the most contentious with a heavy ballot, but who will pay attention with Oregon two weeks away?

Finally, to Oregon, where everyone will be on the ballot. They can't get off. Even Teddy will probably be on that ballot. This could be a fun and games primary. Even if Teddy decides he wants in, he's not all that popular in Oregon (cf. McCarthy vs. RFK in '68), and he's way behind Muskie in the polls. In fact, Muskie is leading with an extremely comfortable margin in Oregon.

Now Oregon is supposed to be Scoop's back yard, but he's not doing too hot there, running last in recent poll. The vote will be split every which way, and right now I pick Muskie even if he only gets 40%. That won't hurt him, because he will have come into Oregon with a substantially successful primary record. Oregon can only be the saving grace for other candidates -- maybe Lindsay or Jackson, or even McCarthy again. But don't count on it. The final prize is in California.

If there is any hunger for the nomination by any Democrat, he will go into California with every thing he's got. California is "winner take all." That's why Humphrey has really made serious moves there, and why I think he is going to make California his make or break state. He has financial backing and old ties there. And while the cats are away, HHH just might make some headway stumping the Golden state.
But it's not that easy. Lindsay will probably make one last fling in California. Muskie will pour on the steam. Jackson, by now will have lost his taste. I predict he'll be out by California (remember, you saw it here first). McGovern can't pass up California if he's come this far (unless Teddy goes for it). McCarthy shouldn't be expected to do too much there. The real light is EMK. The filing deadline is March 24 -- enough to get off ballots in other states, but to get in California. If Wisconsin makes it look like the liberals have had it but that RN still might be beatable, then EMK might swoop up the Kennedy torch and run for daylight.

Without Kennedy, California becomes fair Muskie game. Humphrey could make a good showing, and Lindsay and McGovern will split the left. I would again pick Muskie. If Kennedy is in, I give the state and all its delegates to him.

The last three primaries, New Mexico, South Dakota and New Jersey are on the same day as California, June 6. All attention will be on California and those other three states will just be a matter of who splits the delegates.

What this all means is that Muskie goes into convention with the most primary delegates and the best showing in the primaries. But it will be the delegates not selected in the primaries and the delegates controlled by favorite sons that still hold the balance at the convention. At that time all the IOU's will come in.

The important thing for Muskie is his primary momentum and his ability to something decent in the South. If he showed this, I think he has the nomination. But I don't think he will get it on the first ballot. I think there will be hedging on the first ballot with a comfortable lead to Muskie. But even if it takes two or three ballots, it still comes out Muskie.

That's the scenario I see now, but it can change tomorrow. I repeat: On the morning of April 5, I think we can make more solid judgments on how things will look from there. But until then, we are going on gut instincts.

This information needs to be digested and periodically reviewed. Thought must be given to what we want our Republican Secretaries of State to do in the various states. And finally, an ongoing strategy to exacerbate Democratic differences has to be evolved out of what we know.
MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Kevin Phillips has called to my attention a most interesting fact which should cloud, to some degree, the Democratic primaries, and which seems on the surface to strengthen the hand of Senator Muskie. The fact:

The filing deadline for no fewer than 13 primaries falls on or before the date when the Florida primary takes place. In no fewer than six of these 13 primaries -- Presidential candidates are (Wisconsin, North Carolina, Tennessee, Nebraska, Oregon, as well as Florida) or can be (Pennsylvania) filed without permission of the candidate himself.

In all these six primaries, the names filed in the Presidential primary are those of "generally advocated and national recognized" Presidential candidates. What does this mean:

a) Anyone active in the Florida primary for the Presidential nomination (as of now probably Chisholm, Jackson, Muskie, Lindsay, McGovern, Wallace and Harris) is almost certainly going to be filed in all those other six or seven primaries as well -- since Florida comes after the filing deadlines of all of them, and since they will be "active" candidates when that deadline passes.

b) Lindsay and Chisholm and McGovern and the left candidates do not have any "choice" as to whether they go into Tennessee, North Carolina and Nebraska. If they go into Florida -- then they will automatically be "filed" in the others; and Lindsay and Chisholm and McGovern will surely wind up with a string of ignominious defeats before they get to Oregon.

c) The likelihood is high then, that the primaries are going to be something of a mess, and that secondary candidates -- even when eliminated -- cannot help but have their names dragged through until at least after Oregon.
d) Unless Pete McCloskey withdraws immediately after New Hampshire -- he will automatically be filed in Tennessee (March 9 filing deadline), Nebraska (March 10) and Oregon (March 14) -- where it is certain he will be administered a massive defeat. Even if McCloskey does well in New Hampshire (say 15%-30%), it would seem that he himself could see this as his apogee, and then "stand down" immediately saying he had made his point -- instead of taking his inevitable bad beatings in the Tennessee and Nebraska primaries, even before Oregon.

e) In both Oregon and Nebraska, just who is on the ballot is the sole decision of the Secretary of State. In both cases, he is a Republican (Clay Myers of Oregon, up in 1972) and Alan J. Beermann in Nebraska). We should decide ourselves just who we want filed in the Democratic primaries -- do we want "George" or not in the Democratic primaries -- and then get the word to these Secretaries of State.

f) Without having done much analysis, I would think at this point that Muskie whose strength is much broader, whose recognition is wider, would be the beneficiary of these cluttered primaries, or perhaps Jackson -- if Wallace is kept out.

But if Muskie, as the centrist, between the extremes, as the front-runner and best-known was in all these contests, he is going to build considerable momentum for a victory in California, which would cinch his nomination, as of now, it seems to me.

g) If the left takes a string of beatings as it seems Harris, McGovern, Lindsay and Chisholm will certainly do in the "mandatory primaries" of Florida, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Tennessee and Nebraska -- before Oregon even comes up on May 23 -- it would seem that by the time of Oregon they would be forced to unite behind one of their number in Oregon -- or get whipped again. The "drubbing" of the left, which would seem inherent in the shaping up of these primaries, might well produce the kind of bitterness that would result in a fourth party.

(Note: If Lindsay is doing the same analysis as here, it would seem almost certain that he would want to hang back until after the Florida deadline, February 10, to announce. Also, Hubert would seem to have a vested interest in staying out of these "mandatory" primaries, where he, too, would see likely to get beat. But if Hubert wants to go into Wisconsin (filing deadline January 31), he has to go into all of the six "mandatory" primaries, since all their deadlines come after Florida.)
h) The California deadline is April 7. By the only New Hampshire Florida, Illinois and Wisconsin will have taken place -- Wisconsin just three days before!

At this point, the Left -- in the persons of Harris, Chisholm, McGovern and Lindsay -- will have to decide whether they will go into the California primary. As will Edward M. Kennedy. If both Kennedy and Lindsay go, of course, that makes for a split in the Left vote, and perhaps or probably a victory for Muskie.

The above is a very sketchy analysis based on the deadlines for filing and the dates of the primaries themselves. At this point in time, it seems to me we should have an experienced, professional analyst looking over these maze of dates and regulations in the primaries, to give us some kind of accurate scenario over what each candidate is likely to do -- in light of them.

Buchanan

cc: Attorney General Mitchell
    H. R. Haldeman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Primary Date</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>January 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>January 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>January 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>February 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>February 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>March 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>March 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>March 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>March 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>April 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 19, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN

SUBJECT: THE 1972 PRIMARIES AND THE DEMOCRATS

NEW HAMPSHIRE:

Candidates have a filing deadline of February 3 for a primary on March 7. To get out, the candidate must withdraw within 10 days of receipt of candidacy, i.e., by February 13 (assuming the filing is complete on February 3). This leaves enough time to also file an affidavit taking his name off the ballot in Florida (which has a withdrawal deadline of noon, February 15).

So, for example, if McGovern sputters and wants out after New Hampshire, he can do it in time to get his name off the Florida ballot and almost all the others as well.

New Hampshire Secretary of State -- Republican -- Robert L. Sturk

FLORIDA:

Candidates are placed on the ballot by a bipartisan committee -- selecting generally advocated and nationally recognized candidates for the office of President. February 10 is the filing deadline and noon, February 15 is the deadline for filing their withdrawal affidavit. The primary date is March 14.

Assume someone is on the ballot in Florida and sticks it out through election day on March 14. This will commit him to the Wisconsin, Nebraska and Oregon primaries for sure. It will also commit him to the Illinois, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania primaries if he had filed for them and possibly to the North Carolina primary (a strange primary which is outlined below).
What this means is that as early as Florida, candidates will be committing themselves weeks ahead, unable to avoid at least having their names on some more ballots.

Florida Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Richard B. Stone

ILLINOIS:

The information is sketchy right now, but in essence Illinois is now going to allow persons running for the Convention delegation to have listed next to their names the name of their favored Presidential candidate. The delegates are elected out of Congressional districts.

Daley will run his slate -- "uncommitted" delegates (though committed to him) in at least the seven districts in Chicago. As for now, only McGovern and Muskie have indicated running their people in other districts -- Muskie in perhaps 16 and McGovern in perhaps a dozen.

The Illinois primary is before Wisconsin and after Florida. The filing deadline is January 3 and the withdrawal of a candidate must come by January 8. So a candidate could pull out of Illinois without committing into the other primaries.

I can’t imagine Daley giving up anything in Illinois if he can help it. I would guess that he will try to control at least a majority of the delegation, thus squeezing out some of the other candidates. It really all depends on Daley. If he doesn’t try to pick up all the marbles, then Illinois becomes a fairly important primary. There will be too many delegates to pass up.

Illinois Secretary of State -- Republican -- John W. Lewis

WISCONSIN:

The filing deadline is January 31, and the candidates will be placed on the ballot by an 11-man bipartisan committee -- selecting all nationally recognized candidates. Then the candidates -- if they want out -- must file an affidavit of withdrawal by February 29 for the primary on April 4.
If a candidate sticks it out through the Wisconsin primary he is committed to having his name on the ballot in Tennessee, Nebraska, Maryland and Oregon (all states where names are put on the ballot at state's discretion), and in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Indiana if they have previously filed in those states. All these states have withdrawal deadlines before the Wisconsin primary.

My guess is that virtually all the hopefuls will stick it out through Wisconsin, hoping they will catch fire somewhere. This is perfect for us because then it commits them to at least being on the ballot in four more states -- Tennessee being the most important addition since Florida -- even if they no longer profess candidacy.

Wisconsin Secretary of State -- Republican -- Robert Zimmerman.

PENNSYLVANIA:

The primary is on April 25 with a filing deadline of February 15. The withdrawal deadline to get off the ballot is February 22.

A candidate may be nominated via petition in order to have his name placed on the ballot, and his consent is not required. Only some delegates are elected in the primary. I doubt that any candidate's name will be entered there without his consent. However, some candidates may choose to run there without publicly consenting. For example, I can envision Humphrey having his name entered in the Pennsylvania primary while publicly disavowing it. It would be a logical place for Humphrey because of the strong old-line machine which could get the vote out for him.

I have a gut feeling, however, that Humphrey will be in most of the primaries from Florida onward -- and if he does marginally well, he may pull out all the stops for the last primaries on June 6 -- California, South Dakota, New Jersey and New Mexico.

Pennsylvania Secretary of State -- Democrat -- C. Delores Tucker

INDIANA:

Primary is on May 2; the filing deadline is March 23. A person getting on the Indiana ballot must withdraw by March 27th to get off. Thus they can get off after the New Hampshire and Florida primaries, but not after the Wisconsin, Rhode Island, Massachusetts or Pennsylvania primaries.

Indiana Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Larry Conrad
OHIO:

The Ohio primary is May 2 and the filing deadline is February 2. A candidate must withdraw if he wishes "any reasonable time before the ballots are printed." That is subject to interpretation, and there is no telling how that withdrawal date would come down.

However, I don't consider Ohio crucial at this time. John Gilligan is going to play the James Rhodes game and run as a favorite son and control the delegation. I don't foresee him opening it up to the others. He obviously wants to broker what he can in Miami. Maybe he will learn what Rhodes did -- you can sometimes get your fingers burned doing this.

Secretary of State -- Republican -- Ted W. Brown

NORTH CAROLINA:

The North Carolina State Board of Elections will list the generally advocated individuals on the Presidential ballot by February 21. To get off the ballot in North Carolina does not require any action. To the contrary, in order to stay on, the candidate must file a notice of candidacy and $1000. If the $1000 is not given within 15 days of listing of candidacy, their name will be withdrawn.

The conclusion in North Carolina is simple; it really becomes like the other primaries to the extent that any candidate who does not want to get on the ballot there will not, even if he is a candidate in some other state. And by this reasoning, we simply cannot tell in advance with any degree of certainty who will be on the ballot. So scratch North Carolina as one of those primaries where certain candidates have to run.

North Carolina Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Thad Eure

TENNESSEE:

Another state where the names will go on the ballot at the discretion of the Secretary of State. This will be done by March 9 for a May 4 primary. To get out of the Tennessee primary, a non-candidacy affidavit must be filed 10 days after March 9 -- which would allow time to get off this ballot after the Florida primary.

Of interest in Tennessee is the possible candidacy of Congressman William Anderson (of Tiger Cage fame). Wilbur Mills might take a
crack, and old George will surely file in Tennessee. Note that Wallace is talking about going into both Dem and Republican primaries, and I have no doubt he will. It could be rough for us as well as for the Dems.

I consider Tennessee along with North Carolina as important Southern and border primaries -- for us as well as the Dems. The showings in those two states may well tell us what kind of strengths the eventual nominees are going to have in the South and border states.

Tennessee Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Joe C. Carr

OREGON:

Oregon is the next big primary, coming on May 23 with a filing deadline of 5:00 p.m. March 14. The names will be placed on the ballot by the Secretary of State at his discretion. The key thing about Oregon this time is that a candidate cannot withdraw his name from the ballot even with an affidavit.

My guess is that Oregon is going to be chock full of Democrats -- most of them having been committed there simply by having appeared on the Wisconsin and Florida ballots.

Note that a research firm in Oregon found Scoop Jackson running behind Muskie, McGovern, McCarthy, Kennedy and Humphrey. Jackson was getting 7.8% -- a poor last. That's interesting because Oregon is Scoop's back yard in the same way that New Hampshire is Muskie's back yard. It may cause us to reassess the Jackson strength. Moreover, Teddy Kennedy's weakness in Oregon may also urge us to get him on the ballot there where he can't get off.

Oregon Secretary of State -- Republican -- Clay Myers

CALIFORNIA:

The primary date is June 6 and the filing deadline for candidacy is April 7. Once a candidate gets on the ballot he cannot withdraw -- making two big primary states in a row where the candidate cannot withdraw.

California Secretary of State -- Democrat -- Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
OBSERVATIONS:

I think it is inadvisable to predict right now how the various primaries will boil down. I think by the time of the Florida primary, we should be able to make some better judgments. However, in the meantime, some logical scenarios can be drawn up.

New Hampshire will be a throwaway one way or the other. If Muskie wins big, it doesn't mean much. However, I don't think his margin will be too high, and that he will be bloodied up somewhat. Yorty will blast him from the right and McGovern from the left. Jackson's presence in New Hampshire likely will do little more than establish some name identity for him. Bill Loeb will support Yorty.

Florida might well be indecisive with the winner getting 25-35% of the vote and Wallace being right up there with a chunk of the Florida primary. Some of this might depend on a loyalty oath, but then such things never held back old Gawg. With McGovern, Chisholm, Jackson, Lindsay, Muskie, McCarthy and now probably Humphrey in the show, Florida will be a toss-up. No decisive victories in Florida, unless Wallace comes through with a win on the strength of Northern Florida.

Illinois will not be a crucial primary because I think Daley is smart enough to do what he can to control most of the voting for delegates. But Wisconsin is the next one, and that, I believe, becomes the first serious primary where we can start perceiving a trend. And right now, I think it looks promising for Muskie. McGovern, Lindsay and McCarthy will all probably be on the ballot. Throw in Shirley Chisholm and that just totally confuses the left. Jackson is nowhere in Wisconsin, and that leaves most of the chips for Big Ed (though it has been noted that HHH might start his big push in Wisconsin).

Muskie can concede Madison and some other areas to the left, but I see most of the rest going to him -- especially the ethnic rich Milwaukee area. Humphrey might be the main problem right now, but I don't think Hubert will make much of an effect in Wisconsin. If Muskie does well in Wisconsin, money will loosen up, and he may try to get a bandwagon psychology going for him.

Rhode Island is insignificant and Massachusetts primary law is now perfectly suited for Teddy to control the delegation. The Massachusetts primary is now moot.
Pennsylvania is next, and it is a district by district type of thing. It depends just how much Shapp can control his own show -- which I doubt very much because of Rizzo. With all the battling, no one is going to pick up anything of significance in Pennsylvania. No bets there.

That brings us to Indiana, which holds its primary on May 2nd. Indiana is of marginal importance. It could be the state where Lindsay tries to revive himself after a setback in Wisconsin. He may get the support of Gordon St. Angelo, and if he does, he'll aim for the same constituency that made RFK popular in Indiana. I expect that Jackson, Muskie and some others will also be in Indiana, but it just simply is not a central primary state.

Ohio is also on May 2, but I see a Gilligan favorite son bid, and thus no real action in Ohio -- i.e., one with no psychological impact on the other races.

But North Carolina is also on May 2, and that could be a very important primary vis 'a vis the South. Moreover, Tennessee follows North Carolina on May 4. Together, these two primaries will tell a great story for us. It may be one of the last gasps for our friend Scoop.

North Carolina and Tennessee are important to those candidates who intend to take more of a centrist Democrat line -- the old Roosevelt coalition and maybe the Kefauver rhetoric. Muskie, Jackson, Mills, Chisholm, and Wallace will almost certainly be on these ballots. Lindsay and McGovern will have to be on the Tennessee ballot if they go through Wisconsin -- they have no choice. Humphrey, I would guess, should try to make some showing in one of these states to prove he has some appeal to the South.

Muskie has good support in North Carolina, and Scoop has been spending a great deal of time there. But George Wallace is going to be there to give them all headaches as he will in Tennessee. And William Anderson might be in Tennessee to confuse things -- especially in his home district.

I think Muskie would win North Carolina -- the right will be split by Jackson, Wallace, and Mills, if he's there. Shirley Chisholm will take the Blacks and some liberals and McGovern may get 10 votes there if he sticks with it. If Muskie wins North Carolina after having won Wisconsin, he has a strong argument for saying that he can do well in all sections of the country. This helps his road to the nomination immensely. It's too hard to call Tennessee right now. But Muskie's
organization and strength there is not legend, and George Wallace might be the big story there. The trouble with Tennessee is that every soul on the Wisconsin ballot goes on the Tennessee ballot and that makes it start looking more like Florida -- a toss-up with little national impact and no one picking up convincing delegate strength.

Nebraska, West Virginia, and Maryland are hardly kingmaker states. Those are the next three primaries, and I don't expect they will titillate Eric Sevareid. Anyway, Mandel will probably call the shots in the Maryland primary -- at least he's trying.

Finally, to Oregon, where everyone will be on the ballot. They can't get off. Even Teddy will probably be on that ballot. This could be a fun and games primary. Even if Teddy decides he wants in, he's not all that popular in Oregon (cf. McCarthy vs. RFK in '68), and he's way behind Muskie in the polls. In fact, Muskie is leading with an extremely comfortable margin in Oregon.

Now Oregon is supposed to be Scoop's back yard, but he's not doing too hot there. The vote will be split every which way, and right now I pick Muskie even if he only gets 40%. That won't hurt him, because he will have come into Oregon with a substantially successful primary record. Oregon can only be the saving grace for other candidates -- maybe Lindsay or Jackson, or even McCarthy again. But don't count on it. The real prize is in California.

If there is any hunger for the nomination by any Democrat, he will go into California with every thing he's got. That's why Humphrey has really made serious moves there, and why I think he is going to make California his make or break state. He has financial backing and old ties there. And while the cats are away, HHH just might make some headway stumping the Golden state.

But it's not that easy. Lindsay will probably make one last fling in California. Muskie will pour on the steam. Jackson, by now will have lost his taste. I think he'll be out by California. McGovern can't pass up California if he's come this far (unless Teddy goes for it). McCarthy shouldn't be expected to do too much there. The real light is EMK. The filing deadline is April 7 -- three days after Wisconsin. If Wisconsin makes it look like the liberals have had it but that RN still might be beatable, then EMK might swoop up the Kennedy torch and run for daylight.
Without Kennedy, California becomes fair Muskie game. Humphrey could make a good showing, and Lindsay and McGovern will split the left. I would again pick Muskie. If Kennedy is in, I give the state and all its delegates to him.

The last three primaries, New Mexico, South Dakota and New Jersey are on the same day as California, June 6. All attention will be on California and those other three states will just be a matter of who splits the delegates.

What this all means is that Muskie goes into convention with the most primary delegates and the best showing in the primaries. But it will be the delegates not selected in the primaries and the delegates controlled by favorite sons that still hold the balance at the convention. At that time all the IOU's will come in.

The important thing for Muskie is his primary momentum and his ability to something decent in the South. If he showed this, I think he has the nomination. But I don't think he will get it on the first ballot. I think there will be hedging on the first ballot with a comfortable lead to Muskie. But even if it takes two or three ballots, it still comes out Muskie.

That's the scenario I see now, but it can change tomorrow. I repeat: On the morning of April 5, I think we can make some solid judgments on how things will look from there. But until then, we are going on gut instincts.

This information needs to be digested and periodically reviewed. Thought must be given to what we want our Republican Secretaries of State to do in the various states. And finally, an ongoing strategy to exacerbate Democratic differences has to be evolved out of what we know.