Richard Nixon Presidential Library
Contested Materials Collection
Folder List

Box Number	Folder Number	Document Date	No Date	Subject	Document Type	Document Description
6	58	10/28/1970	☐	Campaign	Memo	From Finch to RN RE: visit to California. 2 pgs.
6	58	8/10/1970	☐	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Haldeman to Finch RE: Lou Harris. 1 pg.
6	58	9/21/1970	☐	Campaign	Memo	From RN to Finch RE: potential meeting with Harris Poll owner Danny Lufkin. 1 pg.
6	58	9/21/1970	☐	Campaign	Memo	Copy of a memo from RN to Finch RE: potential meeting with Harris Poll owner Danny Lufkin. 1 pg.

Box Number	Folder Number	Document Date	No Date	Subject	Document Type	Document Description
6	58	9/25/1970	☐	Campaign	Memo	From John A. Wells to Flanigan RE: previous telephone call and the 1970 election. The second page of the memo is absent. 4 pgs.

Finch

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT October 28, 1970

From Bob Finch

Subject: Talking Points - Presidential Visit to California

I POLLS

Consensus of Spencer Roberts, DMI, Field, Muchmore and Dorothy Corey.

1. Reagan six to ten points ahead - which would be a victory margin of 500,000 to 800,000 votes. (Give a working equation of about 80 to 90,000 votes for a point in the rest of these rundowns).

2. Murphy four to six points behind.

3. Evelle Younger still favored but O'Brien closing fast. (Present margin looks like 200,000).

4. Great voter confusion over the two Flournoys. Incumbent Hugh Flournoy is still four points ahead in all polls in the Comptroller's Race. Pat Brown, Jr., is holding a slim two point lead over Jim Flournoy (he is the Black).

5. Rafferty is still ahead in the race for Superintendent of Public Instruction but Riles has come on strong and closed the lead from three to four percent.

(In this past week - when I have been in and out of here - I endorsed Rafferty and Jim Flournoy. (I felt I had to do this - endorse Jim Flournoy as well as I did not want to be in position of being anti-Black since Riles is a Negro.

II ISSUES

1. In all polls, unemployment leads other issues in California. Considerable television in this last few days of people lined up collecting unemployment insurance -- Unruh making this major issue.

Considerable coverage that over 800 people showed up (lined up) for 40 advertised jobs reading meters for the Metropolitan Water District in Los Angeles.

II ISSUES (Continued)

2. Closely following the economic-employment issue is the "social" issue -- crime/welfare. Has been highly accentuated by the murder of the Santa Cruz doctor and his family; the bombing of the church at the policeman's funeral in San Francisco; the burning yesterday of the Bank of America at the Irvine Campus, etc. etc.

3. The third item in all polls is pollution, environment and "quality of life."

III RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. In urging Murphy's re-election, come down hard on your personal relationship and longstanding friendship; your confidence in him as a man; as well as the fact that he supported you on the issues.; that you know him to be a man of integrity, compassion, a hard worker.

2. It is very important to refer to his family -- for the first time this last week they are bringing his daughter and his son into the campaign.

   The Tricia Nixon spots have been most effective - she talkes about having worked in his office, tells how she feels about him, etc. and this has had quite an impact.

3. The President should predict confidently that we will retain control of the Legislature and that he is "optimistic" about increasing our strength in the Congressional Delegation.

4. Unlike any other state I have been in (32 states) it appears we will have the highest turnout of voters in California. Estimates range from 70 to 80 percent. Our problem is to make sure it is our vote that turns out. The unions did the best job in the history of the state in increasing Democratic registration. Now they are trying to get that vote out with union dollars - they are paying precinct people to get their vote out. The President's remarks should be tailored to get out our vote; not encourage theirs.

5. Come down hard on peace in this generation theme -- and that Murphy has supported you -- this theme has gone over very well out here.

# # # # # # # # #

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 10, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. FINCH

The President would like you to develop a relationship and establish a contact with Lou Harris. This can be done through our supporter Danny Lufkin of New York who is now part owner of the Harris organization. The President suggests that you have Harris and Lufkin down to lunch sometime soon just to get acquainted and establish a relationship whereby you can keep in touch with Harris - perhaps suggesting questions to them from time to time and getting insight from them.

H.R. HALDEMAN

CONFIDENTIAL

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 21, 1970

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR

Bob Finch

FROM THE PRESIDENT

In your travel around it occurred to me that on some occasion you might have a talk with our friend in New York who owns the Harris Poll. Perhaps a direct talk with you and Harris and him participating (his name is Danny Lufkin) might pay some dividends.

On the other side of the coin it might be well to do some effective work in discrediting Harris since we know that as the campaign date approaches he will be out to hammer us down.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 21, 1970

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR

Bob Finch

FROM THE PRESIDENT

In your travel around it occurred to me that on some occasion you might have a talk with our friend in New York who owns the Harris Poll. Perhaps a direct talk with you and Harris and him participating (his name is Danny Lufkin) might pay some dividends.

On the other side of the coin it might be well to do some effective work in discrediting Harris since we know that as the campaign date approaches he will be out to hammer us down.

HIGHLY ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM September 25, 1970

To: Peter M. Flanigan

From: John A. Wells

Following our telephone conversation of last Wednesday morning, I collected (without disclosing persons or purposes) such information as was pertinent and available. Yesterday morning, of course, the New York Times carried a front-page story by Bob Semple under a Washington dateline headed A 'Neutral' Nixon Is Reported To Favor Buckley Over Goodell. The story was so detailed that, as is usually the case concerning Time's front-page top political story, everyone here is assuming reasonable accuracy. The Governor and his campaign people are not happy about the prospect of more direct and less "subtle signals," to use Semple's phrase, evidencing Buckley support by the White House.

You stated that you would be interested in my evaluation of the Buckley campaign in terms of its effectiveness and his electability and my views on the desirability of more direct action, e.g., Vice President's attendance at a Buckley fund-raising party in New York and activities by Tom Evans.

My immediate reaction, expressed to you, was that Buckley will not win, and that it would be undesirable from any Republican point of view for the White House to indicate support for him. After some fact-finding and fuller consideration, my views to the same effect are much stronger.

May I assure you that I have kept confidential your call and the information you gave me. Although I am fairly close to the Governor's campaign on an advisory basis, this is my only possible bias, and I have tried to consider this question in the context of the President's best interests in New York now and in 1972.

I do not believe it would be in the best interests of the White House to go further in endorsing Mr. Buckley for the following reasons:

1. All indications are that Buckley will not beat Ottinger, so there is no good reason to incur any political exposure. The chances of a

Conservative Party is small, with a narrow manpower base. Its state-wide enrollment is about 80,000. It is controlled by two brothers-in-law, Bill Mahoney and Kieren O'Doherty, who like it the way it is. The residual party strength on Election Day and the ability to identify and get out the vote is not there. Buckley will do very well, but he will not, in my judgment and on the basis of the present situation, come reasonably close to Ottinger.

I estimate that, assuming a state-wide vote of 6 million, the returns on November 3 (and Ottinger's margin could be substantially larger) will be about as follows:

Ottinger	-	2,500,000
Buckley	-	2,000,000
Goodell	-	1,500,000

2. Endorsement of Buckley, who is not the official Republican candidate, would be contrary to the President's past policy of going with the candidate chosen by the Republican Party at a convention or in a primary. Last year, the White House endorsed Marchie for Mayor against Lindsay on this basis.

3. A major reason for Goodell's unpopularity with some (far from a majority) of New York Republicans was his non-supportive actions and statements in the 1968 presidential campaign. For the President to oppose him now might seem a small act of personal vengeance. Then, too, the President has many times said that the Republican Party is big enough for everyone (vide his attitude toward Javits in 1968), and I am sure that he believes thatproposition and is correct in that belief.

4. Governor Rockefeller, as the leader of the Republican Party in New York, supported Senator Goodell for renomination. There were good reasons for this decision, which was necessarily made in late 1969; the polls showed Goodell was by far the strongest candidate at that time, no political leader likes to admit that he made a mistake on the original appointment (assuming he did), and there would have been a divisive, state-wide primary fight by Goodell and perhaps other contestants if the Governor had attempted to dictate the nomination of a replacement.

Another reason, of course, was that the Governor (like the President) realizes that he must have the broadest possible middle base extending

as far as feasible to the conservatives on the right and the liberals on the left. (See Scannons and Wattenberg's new book which is excellent on this point.) The Governor originally elected as a "liberal" has always stayed as close to the middle as possible, but with the drift of the whole body politic being to the right (but much less so in "liberal" New York) he needed a symbol for those liberals, particularly in New York City, who had supported him in 1966 and previously. Goodell is the anchor on the liberal side, he is the symbol, and he cannot be cut adrift.

Goldberg's best chance is to push Rockefeller to the right and grab more of the liberal middle. He knows this. The New York Times this morning (Friday) has a story by Clayton Knowles (p. 47) headed Goldberg Links Governor and Buckley. Knowles wrote that Goldberg said yesterday that "Governor Rockefeller supported the White House in its reported acceptance of, even preference for, James L. Buckley for the United States Senate.

Having opted for his renomination, the Governor must now support Goodell and is doing so and will necessarily continue to do so. It would be most unfortunate -- and the Democrats and the newspapers will have a field day -- if the White House supports Buckley. It will appear to many that this is a confrontation between the President and the Governor. It will seem that Bill Buckley has more standing with the President than Nelson Rockefeller. The Governor doesn't deed this, and looking forward to carrying New York for the President in 1972, the President doesn't need it either.

5. In the event of such a confrontation, the principal emphasis of the state-wide campaign might well shift from Rockefeller v. Goldberg to the Ottinger-Buckley-Goodell contest. This could jeopardize the Governor's re-election. To the extent that a White House endorsement weakens Goodell, it also increases his "drag" on the Rockefeller-led Republican line. The gubernatorial contest is close, either man is probably up or down by a few points. The polls are far from reliable, since the pollsters this year are being kidded as never before by the voters, and this is particularly true of the Jewish voters in New York City.

Conclusion

I respectfully suggest that the White House should not move another inch further toward supporting Buckley than it already has and should let nature take its course in New York. I believe that the President's most important interest in New York's 1970 election is the re-election of

Governor Rockefeller. In the President's book Six Crises he points out the importance to the national party of governorships and, in fact, it was the loss of Republican governorships in the Eisenhower years which was the reason for Vice President Nixon's defeat in 1960.

# # # #