

SEP 18 1972

HW: The

~~That~~ attached Evans and Novak column has an angle I've not seen elsewhere -- that it was McG's staff which originated the hostility to Eagleton and were in fact so extreme about it that they even alienated the party regulars into supporting Eagleton. As you know, the common version is that it was the party regulars who persuaded McG to dump him. If E&N had not been so consistently hostile to McG and all he stands for all along, I'd be more inclined to credit their version.

Out here, anyway, the dumping of Eagleton has generated the typical sympathy for the underdog, so that even some of the people who drew back in horror at the first word he'd seen a psychiatrist are now saying he was tossed from the back of the troika. Even rightwingers are saying pore Tom. What can they lose? McG sounded pretty low key Saturday when he announced his choice of Shriver and went into his attack on the Nixon administration, and we're wondering if he's now appalled at the mistake he apparently made in allowing himself to be stampeded about Eagleton. His supporters out here are saying they can detect no effect on their youthful adherents, but admit it's too early to tell.

jdw6aug72



From the perhaps unfair opinion I've formed of Manckiewicz, I'm inclined to think that he was at fault and led the pack in seeking self-justification. I can't forget his abdication when Bobby told him to read the anti-EC books nor his comment, what difference does it make, after Bobby died, on the question of conspiracy. I've seen enough of him on TV when he and Braden had a joint show to get the notion that while pleasant and quite right he has an exalted concept of self, etc.

It's unfortunate that he was so close to the truth, but he was not. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action.

It's unfortunate that he was so close to the truth, but he was not. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action. He was a man who was not only a man of letters, but a man of action.

END

Nov 13 1972