

7/20/72 in earlier response to your  
17 comment on McG and his chances  
I8d planned to include a note of reg  
ret over the understandable but imma-  
nature and ~~I~~ as I see it self-  
defeating pseudo-radicalism of the  
Dem. reformers in making Salinger's  
position as part asst chief impos-  
sible so he had to withdraw. I have  
no opposition to a black man in the  
post but every opposition to an in-  
experienced man there only because  
he's is black. I have no liking for  
Salinger, but he is an experienced m  
man, a pro, and one of the best ex-  
perts on a tricky subject, Dirty-  
dickery. They need one very badly un-  
less the gains of the recent past  
are to be thrown away in pointless  
ideological futilities and exercises.  
The objective should be to win now,  
if with compromises the immature  
dedicated didn't expect to begin  
with those they should have recogni-  
zed as essential is any are to be ~~and~~  
achieved. The appointment of O'Brier  
of which I know no more, the TV station  
having celebrated it by going ~~and~~  
off the air, make that up in a dif-  
ferent way. They could use S's p.r.  
experience, too, and his JFK contacts  
not shared by the O'B who stayed too  
long before leaving LBJ. HW  
All the pseudo-radical talk about  
McG seeling out is irrelevant. Sup-  
pose he did, which I don't think. Is  
there still any possibility that as a  
sellout he would not be better than  
Nixon? So why engaged in all the  
turnoff doublespeak and discourage  
the more immature of the potential  
registrants who can be even more  
important in the next primaries and  
elections and be more effective in  
the elections with primary experience  
If enough of this is done for a not  
long period of time, it has the  
potential of being the closest thing  
possible to a revolution in the US  
and can bring about good changes only  
an overt revolution from the right  
can frustrate. I think.

JUL 21 1972