

7/20/72 in earlier response to your
17 comment on McG and his chances
I8d planned to include a note of regret
over the understandable but immature
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 man,
a pro, and one of the best experts
on a tricky subject, Dirty-dickery.
They need one very badly unless the
gains of the recent past are to be
thrown away in pointless ideological
futilities and exercises. The objective
should be to win now, and with
compromises the immature dedicated
didn't expect to begin with those
they should have recognized 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 different
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. Suppose
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