

NOV 1 0 1972

11/9/72

26

Dear Js,

I've about a half hour before I have to get to something else. I've been wishing we were closer so we could chew the election over. I've not heard my belief in radio and TV and I haven't followed either the election or the post mortems enough to describe asax casually. From the reactions I got and didn't get to some of my letters, the hiring of Sheridan and his apparently complete non-productiveness, the defensive tone of the 'em campaign and other contributing things I've feared the worst. In fact, as I recall, this stems from the convention period. I was worried about the non-professionalism of the people and the work. I think it shows. With only decent old-time work, this could have been the dis-election that was, an historic ruin of the ruiners. Never has there been as vulnerable a bastard running as scared with the odds so heavily in his favor. Or running with such indifference to proprieties in such matters, like letting the voters see, etc.

One of the disturbing things to me is that this was done at the sacrifice of legislative and local seats, very atypical. Somebody wanted Nixon back in more than anything else, so much that less than normal risks would not be run. They were afraid he'd blow. I've felt for some time that he has to be flakey. He lost himself several times in the NYC area, as I told you, and it went unreported, so far as I know. He has also been covered by the media.

I think we are in for radical changes. I think the immediate announcement of changes in political posts is two things: getting rid of a few excessive liabilities, to make it look clean, like "leindienst, and bringing in the real hardheads for the authoritarian push (pronounced putsch). A few in the White House who are bound to be mentioned in the trial will go, and that will make that look clean. The Axmen Cometh.

This is all a complicated matter in which many forces figure. We agree on the selfish pursuits of China, USSR. As I think of it, I believe it was not intelligent selfishness. I think in helping fix such an administration on this country they did themselves a great disservice and in the long run hurt more than the commercial benefit can help. Ditto with VN. Leaning on those people is unconscionable. I can't pretend to have enough knowledge of China to have an opinion there, but with the USSR-I think this means that there is more power vested in the military-minded than I'd thought after Khrushchev. I have no recollection of USSR policy before being determined by bread and like considerations and think the opposite has been the case. So, I don't think the control in the decision was by the pols. A continuing Nixon presidency means increased military budget for the USSR. Particularly after McG's position on the US military budget.

What will happen to the Supreme Court is obvious. But the kinds of cases that will get to it are not, and I'll predict they will be the most repressive in our history. I'll not be surprised to see violence forced and subdued with force. Rizzo in the White House.

The intellectuals he trusted screwed McGovern. He has his own liabilities as a campaigner. But he can't do all his staff work and there was nobody feeding him the obvious lines for strong Nixon and Dem rival putdowns. As a result he never got to really attack, was always defending, and no matter how well that is done, it is not the way to win. Each of the attacks against him could have been handled in from a sentence to a graph, and with the effective answer to enough, others could have been ignored. The GOPs would have been defending, and that they could never have done to a vigorous attack. The Dems themselves, for example, never did anything with Nixon's past or the WC. They could have had The Two Faces of Richard Nixon on Videotape or film and used and used and used. On tape for radio. His record of personal corruption, not just that of his administration. Checkers has always been his Achilles heel and no opponent has ever realized it. There is nothing on which he could not have been ruined, had the effort been made, had the homework ever been done.

I think it is wrong to call this a personal victory for him because there was so little change in Congress and his margin was so big. If his victory had been personal, he'd have swept Congress with him, state houses, dog-catchers, etc. His was a reactionary vote, not even a protest vote. Bremer delivered him enough, if not in votes, in lack of that opposition. "ote dismal Schmitz showing. Not having Wallace running against him was enough. But with the Wallace support, he could have been beaten by a campaign that assumed he'd get the Wallace vote, a campaign that at the very least would have left the Democratic Party outlined at the convention. With this kind of dismal flop, I expect the old pros will move back in. It depends on many things. Save that she is a woman, I can see no reason for Westwood to hold that job, less for the black who got what McG wanted Salinger for, perhaps the biggest single personnel mistake (and I've no use for "lucky Pierre). These roles were too important for tokenism and had the tokens been principled they'd never have accepted them. They did nothing.

If in industry, commerce and other employment, of course there must be fairness, but in a political party, management should be based on competence. There was more for the minorities in a Nixon defeat than in a couple of token positions filled by the inadequate. Here the kids were a bad influence. Even kids should have realized this was a very unreal approach. Ditto for blacks, the last to be looking for tokens.

In short, there was a self-defeating party engaged in a self-defeating campaign, unable to exploit a dream issue, Nixon, and never able to fully exploit the subsidiary issues, although they tried. McG, knowing negotiations were going on, should have been claiming credit for what might flow, saying he alone was pushing the warmonger Nixon to it. With each such accompanied by a few choice selections in Nixon's voice on his returns from VN, it would have been zowie!

So, one of the things I'm really suggesting is that some of the water from the Watergate flowed into McG leadership unless there was incredible and total incompetence.

With this record, I'm all for a purge in Dem hq. But not a Bentsen type. These are dedicated losers. If there is still an election in four years, unless this happens, ~~were~~ the prospect of Agnew is too grim. Bad as Nixon is, he'd be worse. If it is by then possible to be worse than Nixon will have brought us.

Hope it is the other side of the moon that blocks signals. If so, I guess the one thing that can be said for it is that there mon't be too many more trips there!

Our best,

