10/29/72 WG Agnew was in Issues & Answers, McG on Meet Press, each for hour. No question asked on Meet Press and Avoided when McG introduced. Cameup with Agnew, who was ugky and looked full of hate. He was handled easily by reporters who either felt they could or should not push him and expose lies and distortion (and non-responsiveness) or just didn't know the fact. Inclined to think latter but not entirely. His inconsistencies and double standards were pretty obvious. (Example: he was asked how come his side says it is so bad for McG. to recommend a $1,000 break for the needy and not bad for Nixon to long and loudly espouse 2 1/2 times as much, so he was allowed to get away with saying McG recommmended 6 1/2 times $1,000, and when it was pointed out that it is common practise for Senators to introduce bills by request without supporting them, and that McG had said he did not recommend this, Agnew was permitted without challenge to lie and say it was McG's bill and he supported it.) Watching both I got the idea that they represent the extremes of ~~xxxxxxxx~~ of politics, Agnew the disciple of open crookedness and not eschewing it, an extreme man who can speak softly, and McGovern the excess of honesty, compounded by a professorial approach that presume higher than normal intelligence and comprehension and avpids the simple formulation that drives points home. He missed much because he could not encapsulate it in a simple, comprehensible way, and he had many such opportunities. I think it is probable that a large part of that part of the electorate that is paying attention doesn't understand. He also does not attack, and his campaign is one requiring it as his opponent is vulnerable to it. Nowehre was this more visible today than on the ear and "peace" (where Agnew also was allowed to lie and pretend Thieu represents "democracy" and the end product of free and fair elections, our style). I have yet to hear McG refer to Nixon's early record on the war or to claim credit for the new "peace" as he should have before ot was reported. Agnew said straight out that Rodgers would not sign anything Tuesday. Asked he gave direct answer, "no". Incredible that Meet Press panel (editors and John Chancellor) ignored this question. Can't imagine it if it had been Dems who'd done dirtiness. Or Old Mr. Nasty Spivack, who specializes in dirty loaded questions to "liberals". But then isn8t the Post virtually alone in bringing news out? Agnew spent much of his time in direct attack on it.

OCT 3 1 19
2.