

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
 Contested Materials Collection
 Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
3	65	12/1/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	Copy of a memo from Colson to Haldeman RE: Harris's latest analysis of Democratic candidates. 2 pgs.
3	65		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Sheet of notes relaying information on what demographics favor Muskie, Kennedy, or Humphrey within the Democratic Party. 1 pg.
3	65		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Notes on various candidates in the 1972 presidential campaign, including polling information from Harris, general strategies, and ways to keep anti-RN Republicans in check. 3 pgs.
3	65		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	An analysis of McGovern's campaign strategies, ways to counter them, and themes for RN to follow during the election season. 6 pgs.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
3	65	2/28/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Record of a conversation between Colson and Harris RE: polling numbers on Muskie and Wallace. Handwritten note added by unknown. 2 pgs.
3	65	1/11/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman presenting the latest polling data from Harris. 4 pgs.
3	65	11/19/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Strachan RE: Harris's reaction to a "New York Times" article written by a DNC staffer. 1 pg.
3	65	7/12/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: Harris polls comparing RN to various Democratic candidates for the presidency. 2 pgs.
3	65	5/4/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: polling data relating to RN's performance as president and the upcoming election. 1 pg.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
3	65	10/7/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Record of a conversation between Colson and Harris RE: poll figures from trial heats involving Muskie, Wallace, McCarthy, and RN. 3 pgs.
3	65	9/19/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: terms used by Harris in his poll reports. 1 pg.
3	65	3/16/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Record of a conversation between Harris and Colson RE: Harris's reporting of data and role in the campaign. 3 pgs.
3	65	10/28/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	White House Staff	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman presenting highlights from a meeting with Cashen, Lufkin, and Harris. 2 pgs.
3	65	4/3/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson "for the File" RE: Harris's advice for RN during the election. 4 pgs.

Harris Poll file

DETERMINED TO BE AN

ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ 12812-102

By *[signature]* NARS, Date *3/10/82*

December 1, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR H. R. HALDEMAN

The President asked me yesterday to talk to Dan Lufkin regarding the latest Harris Poll. I did so. Lufkin talked to Harris, which doesn't help with this one but keeps some pressure on for the future.

I am convinced that Harris will jab us everytime he can; it is somewhat significant that in yesterday's poll on the impact of the President's campaigning, Harris did not publish a positive/negative breakdown. For the first time he printed all four categories of response. This is one of the promises, you may remember, that we extracted from him.

Following my conversation with Lufkin, and at his request, I called Harris directly last evening. He gave me a very interesting analysis of the poll.

Kennedy, Humphrey and Lindsay all run strong with certain groups, badly with others. For example, Kennedy does poorly with older voters, Humphrey badly with younger voters. Lindsay does well in the suburbs, Kennedy does not. Kennedy runs very badly in the south and border states, Humphrey not so bad. Kennedy does well with the Catholics. In short, each of the three arouse strong support in certain areas but strong animosity in others.

What distinguishes Muskie -- and what causes him to run stronger -- is that he does not have the areas of opposition that the other potential candidates do. In addition to holding the Democratic strength, he also picks up Republican and Independent votes in the higher income brackets which the other candidates do not.

Muskie, while he benefits from not having the liabilities of the other candidates, also inspires no enthusiasm. The underlying poll data (interviewee impressions) show that his support is very soft. Harris describes it as "passable;" he is an accommodating candidate, no one is really excited about him either way.

From this Harris concludes that when the infighting begins Muskie's soft support will not hold up (Harris gave me some gratuitous political advice to the effect that we should continue to push Muskie to the left).

Harris further concludes that in any two-way race no candidate against the President could get more than 45-46% of the vote, except Muskie at this time but Harris does not believe that Muskie's support will continue at this level.

Harris is doing another analysis which will be released next week. It shows the President doing as well today as he did in 1968 with virtually every group and with each geographical area except in the middle west where the President's support is badly off from the 1968 levels.

Harris believes that the mid-west has been particularly affected by a recessionary psychology, farmer discontent and the GM strike. He regards this as a "special situation" and concludes that because of the basic Republicanism of the mid-west, we will be able to recover our support there.

The point of his analysis which he says he will make publicly (I will believe it when he does) is that the President is in very good shape when his present support is compared to his 1968 performance except in the mid-west where he believes that the damage will be repaired.

Charles W. Colson

~~Harold
Ball~~

Muskie
only Democrat

EMK + HHH getting Traditional
Dem strength -

Blacks
lower income
union

Vannoy,
does in
suburbs + older
bad in border
& states

Catholics (EMK better than
HHH)

EMK - young - / HHH with older -

Lindsay runs well with suburbs,
upper income
Young
Blacks -

Muskie - Muskie is soft - kind of passable -

runs well with over \$15,000

does well with all categories

EMK bad with old -

gets in heavier with traditional

Republican independents

accommodating, rather than inspiring

Muskie gets in
enthusiasm but
enemies -

Ra does well with groups after groups -

about where he was in 68 with

Border & states

everywhere else is the same

middle west is down - does

badly against all of them -

Warren

Low Hairing File

P Says I've spent these 4 years on what was America's most urgent need I'll do on domestic scene what I've done on Foreign level -

we haven't done as good a job on the Domestic side as I would like but how I can

overconfidence - lets people vote Democratic without worrying that their candidate who worries them without fear he might get elected - also keeps Republicans at home -
make point "many vote would decide the election"

P must NOT be strident ;
Keep on high plane -

also should not use the U.P. Candidate to attack McGovern -

shouldn't be Savage - disagree with

isolationist times

Personalize

Benny Goldwater can lead
the vicious attack Group -
Reagan

Rockefeller can take him on on Nat
Defense

Generally simplified answer -

If McG moves to center
Do we attack McG as a Pol
who just shifts with winds or
Do we hang him with original radical
positions -

RN is candidate for "change" (ground in foreign
Policy)
McG is bland

fundamental issue -

R should present McG's ground

if Mc6 goes to the center -

always promise to common - will
do so much more in next four -

Mc6 looks wrong when he talks

Bread & Butter issues - take take
& presume impact of his economic
proposals -

Lack of real credibility on economic
issues - just doesn't fit him

Draw Mc6 over on Economic
issues -

never let him suck us into his issues
on his ground -

This election is stranger than nearly any other in American history. It is possible for President Nixon to win the popular vote and lose the electoral vote assuming a minimum 60-40 Nixon victory in the South and a McGovern lead of 54-46 in the East, 52-48 in the Mid-West and 54-46 in the West. Nixon can achieve 50.1 percent of the vote and lose the election. This is a direct reversal of the prevalent situation in the 1930s in FDR's time.

McGovern can win in a five-prong campaign. He can use the theme that it is a time of deep change in America, a time to end hypocrisy in high places and a time to end the dominance of the rich and powerful in this country -- especially the dominance of big business. (When we recently asked which is more important, to crack down on big corporations who might evade taxes and cause pollution or to crack down on student, Vietnam and militant black protesters, by 58 to 39 percent the public answered back, crack down on big corporations.)

The five prongs of the McGovern campaign could be:

1. Tax reform with higher taxes for upper income people and corporations, coupled with lower taxes for lower income people (favored by an overwhelming 90-6 percent.)
2. Cut defense spending, favored by 59 to 30.
3. Legalize abortion, favored by 48-43. Significantly the following groups favored legalized abortion up to 4 months of pregnancy: \$15,000+, 62-33; college educated, 62-33; 18-29 year olds, 64-31; Independents, 58-34; Jewish, 72-19; 30-49 year olds, 51-42; union members, 47-43. However, catholics oppose abortion by 54-37 as do Midwesterners by 48-42. The 54-37 catholic opposition is very close to the current 54-36 lead of Nixon over McGovern on the vote. McGovern can claim to be taking a politically courageous stand on abortion and in the process firm up precisely the swing groups which can make the difference. McGovern could go further to show courage in taking an unpopular position by strongly advocating amnesty for draft evaders who fled the country, opposed nationwide by 58-33. However, such amnesty is favored by 18-29 voters 55-39; by Jewish 62-27; and by the college educated 49-46. He could do the same in an even more effective way by advocating and easing the penalties for the use of marijuana, opposed nationally 54-40.

However, such an easing of penalties is favored by \$15,000 and over by 49-46 percent. Independent voters 51-43; 18-29 voters 61-36; suburban voters 48-45; college educated 57-37; by Jewish 65-32%. In other words, a grave danger is that by taking what seems to be a stand designed to lose him votes, McGovern in fact can be firming up precisely those swing votes which will put him within striking distance of victory.

4. Draw out President Nixon and especially Vice President Agnew to make savage frontal assaults on McGovern, on protesters, amnesty, marijuana and permissiveness -- all of which would firm up the high income, the educated, the suburban, the young and the independent vote to go for McGovern. Then he could come in positively on abortion and defense spending to achieve majority support to go with these key groups.
5. He could make his bread and butter or pork chop appeal among the union vote and Catholic voters on the tax reform issue.

The five-prong strategy can be thwarted in these ways:

1. For Nixon to say that he has dared to try drastic changes abroad in the foreign policy and it has begun to work. He is not afraid of change at home as the price-wage freeze last August indicated. And now he wants to have the chance to do at home what he has done abroad.
2. Put an immediate freeze or crackdown right away on food processors, prices and profits. The public does not blame farmers for high food prices, they do blame food processors and the middle man. In addition, advocate four or five tough tax reform measures that are patently anti-business. This will thwart McGovern's prong of making business the whipping post.
3. Point up how defense spending has come down as a percent of the federal budget. Yet at the same time, point up that this has been done without decimating the U.S. defense shield and guard.
4. Lay off taking McGovern on the amnesty and marijuana issues.
5. Advocate desegregation in education and in other parts of our national life but also say that busing is the wrong way to do it because busing not only will harden the opposition to desegregation but will also delay other effective steps which can increase the likelihood of success for racial progress.

6. Openly advocate aid to parochial schools, but leave to others to use the abortion issue.
7. For union members take the line that in no way will we apologize for the price-wage freeze. Emphasize that the purpose of that freeze and the controls programmed to follow was to protect the pocketbook of the working man by cracking down on excessive prices so that wages and salaries would have some buying power. (Consistently over 80% would rather have price and wage restraint than to take their chances on unrestrained wages and prices.)

How Nixon Can Win

There are two key sets of groups that can overturn this election:

- One, the swing vote made up of independents, the college educated, suburbanites, the young and the \$15,000+ income group.

This group can be worked on by emphasizing that the President has changed the outlook in the world in four years from war to peace. (Note the President's rating on working for peace has gone from 38 to 74% positive among these groups since a year ago July.)

A second approach to this same group is to raise the hope that as much can be done in the next 4 years at home as has been done to produce a beginning toward peace abroad. Fundamentally, this swing group can be affected by an appeal that the quality of life can be improved at home through environmental control, consumer protection, racial and educational progress and welfare reform. Note: almost all of the front and center rhetoric of the campaign should be directed toward these groups.

- Two, traditional Democrats make up the second key group. These are to be found in the South which can be handled essentially quietly simply by having the Vice President campaign continuously but in a low key. He is enough of a symbol there to do the job. The second strand of traditional Democrats are the union members. Here the President must make a pledge to cut unemployment, but also not depart from the basic theme that it is better to get prices down to protect the worth of wages than to allow every man for himself on price and wage increases. A third Democratic group are Catholics who can be directly but quietly appealed to on the aid to parochial schools issue, but again not in a front and center way.

Basic Nixon Theme

The President should advocate over and over again that he stands four-square for change -- but change that works. The theme of change that works can be powerful for it opts the change mood of the country and at the same time points up the difference between the practical, pragmatic approach President Nixon makes as opposed to the pie-in-the-sky McGovern's easy promises.

Specifically the President should say that he has promised to work for peace and that he has moved toward a formidable means to achieve peace, but this has not been done through easy promises, but rather by dint of hard, tough negotiation. What is more, this is only the beginning; there is much more ahead. For example, there is a long road to go still on arms control. And we have only begun to take the long positive road to economic growth and the use of American resources in the world through expanded trade for peaceful approach and unbounded good for all of the people of the earth. These beginnings for peace have not been produced by America giving in nor by America begging, but rather through firm negotiations always from strength. We have sought out common areas of agreement with mutual benefit for both ourselves and the communists. But above all else, underlying all of the moves for peace has been the element of mutual respect.

Now, the beginnings made abroad are precisely what must be done in the next four years here at home. First and foremost, the state of the economy. The President got tough last August with the price-wage freeze and is being tough again this August with the food processer crack-down. We have made a start toward recovery of the economy; that is not yet good enough. There could be unbounded hope for economic growth at home in the next four years.

The President should advocate tough tax reform, not of the pie-in-the-sky variety, but change that works. There must be 4 or 5 concrete measures advocating. Warning should be served on business that it will be rewarded as an incentive to produce and grow and to expand, but there will be no incentive for business to fail to share the wealth with all segments of the American people.

The President should also pledge in the next four years to improve the quality of life, that we should stop attacking each other and should start attacking our common problems. These include air and water pollution,

adequate health care within the means of each family, expanded educational opportunity and progress toward achieving racial equality. A pledge can be made to dedicate the resources which formerly were used for war to improve the quality of life. These would be peace dividends for the American people.

Others may promise the sun and the stars, I'll pledge only to move us forward. Others may talk of sweeping change, I will pledge only to produce change that works. Others may talk of radical income distribution, I will pledge only an economy that works for better living standards for all and keeps open the doors of opportunity for initiative, competence and unstinting effort toward excellence to be rewarded. Others may talk of easy cuts in defense spending, I will only pledge arms reduction that also keeps the peace. Others may talk of telling America to go back home, but I say let us go out America to help ourselves and all the world find peace and a better life.

There is a basic morality at stake in this Presidential campaign. I say the next President must make a moral compact with the American people to achieve peace in the world and a chance to fight for a better quality of life at home. There is a call of greatness in that moral compact. It is not born of ringing words, but of hard won achievements step by step, piece by piece. But, greatness can never be yours to describe the easy promise, only the hard won results. The only change that counts is the change that works.

This election is basic and historic because the American people have a clear choice: between promise of forward progress that works or those who would come in with social and political experimentation, founded on protest, but in fact a retreat from America's role in the world and founded on catering to the fashionable fads of the moment at home. I pledge change, but change rooted in reality, not fantasy, change that changes people's lives for good, not change that ends up pitting one group against another.

I ask a simple compact: give me your trust; your help and a limitless world of hope lies ahead. Mistakes have been made and others will be made in the future. Change that works is not achieved without its failures, but I will not hesitate to try change that works, but always on a sound base. I know what it is to hew out progress for peace. I know it is not easy. I ask for a mandate of change that works. Give me your message. Give me your trust for another moral compact for four more years.

Caveats:

1. Do not go after McGovern directly or personally.
2. Defuse the tax reform and defense issues.
3. Do not make blatant appeals on what has been done or can be done for various groups.
4. Above all, do not defend the status quo.
5. Do not engage in savage attacks that can be accused of going for the jugular.
6. Always indicate an urgent sense that there is so much yet to do and so little time to do it.
7. Richard Nixon can win with the cleanest campaign in history.

(conversation may not be totally accurate -- bad connection)

Conversation with Lou Harris, February 28, 1972

C: .. yea, I'd be interested in the actual number...

H: I told him I'd kill him if he blew anything on this piece. He sure is _____ that Wallace is taking from the Democrats... You know what I think the other guys did? Did I tell you that? I think they're taking the '68 Wallace vote and when you do that you find that right here the President comes out with 24% and Muskie 17%. That's when you take the '72 Wallace vote it's a different vote.

C: Yea, it's more of a protest.

H: ^{wallace -} It's an anti-establishment vote. Those are the people who don't like anything about the establishment and let's face it, the President is the establishment. Here's the ... Nixon 42, Muskie 36, Wallace 10, McCarthy 8

C: So he does take a little away from the President, doesn't he?

H: Well, no. Muskie has a net loss of two.

C: No, Muskie has a net loss ... the President has a net loss of 2, Muskie has a net loss of 4.

H: Yea, 4 against 2. What it is, God it's a crazy quilt pattern -- McCarthy, but he's a crazy candidate, you know. And I'll tell you exactly where it is. It's in the West that he takes away from the President. McCarthy goes 13 percent. Of that, well, if you take it on the two way, the President is at 49 _____ 42, in a two way in the West. It goes down to , oh no, it's all out of Muskie, 42-27. Let's see, where does he take it from the President. In the South, it's Wallace. Oddly enough he gets 8 from the South and some of that's from the President and some from Muskie. The Mid-West he gets 9 and that's, 3 of that's away from the President. The East hardly at all, down one. But McCarthy's one of those unorthodox candidates who doesn't run on party lines. But see among the 15,000 _____ he only gets 7% there. He cuts 3 off the President. The young, they really chop up Muskie. He goes from 42 to 29 among the 18-20 year olds. In the 20-29 he goes from 45 to 35. They're Wallace on one side and McCarthy and the others just chopped to pieces. It's just fascinating. But I guess McCarthy always had an appeal once he's a college educated. He gets 9 percent; the President goes from 50% to 48, but Muskie goes from 38 to 31; Wallace goes from 7 to 8. A four way race Wallace is stronger than he is in a 3 way. I think the reason is it just busts party lines to hell. But, overall the President's 2 percent better. And my

is that it would turn out to be more than that. I think it would be a 10 point...

C: Before it was over it would be.

H: The President wins by 10 points. And, don't count McCarthy out. He's just crazy enough to do it. Incidentally, on that, a guide very close to Howard Stein if you want is Alan Greenspan. C: Oh really ?

H: Yea, he's on the board.

C: I guess I did know that. I'd forgotten it, however. That's damn helpful.

H: You might do some work on that. If you want to keep McCarthy in. And Alan would play ball I think.

C: Oh sure.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

CWC - FYI

January 11, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Latest Harris Poll

The latest Harris Poll was conducted December 28 through January 4 (ironically I urged this date upon Harris. I obviously did not know that the bombing was going to be resumed during the week after Christmas. My preference for the week was based upon the fact that we had a lot of good year-end stuff, good TV the week before Christmas and that we had really put the Congress down -- a point that was coming through in the media. I was also influenced by the Time "Man of the Year" Award. In any event, it turned out to be a very bad call time-wise).

On the trial heats it is Nixon 42, Muskie 42, Wallace 11. In a two way race, it is Muskie 48, Nixon 45. The Wallace vote, in other words, takes 2 away from Muskie for every one he takes away from us. Harris will not publish this information. He gives it to us for our guidance but agreed with me that it would be better not printed. It should be noted that all year long it has been the conclusion from the Harris data that Wallace was hurting Muskie more than us.

Harris will print the Muskie trial heat next week. We had discussed whether it would be better to wait awhile, but then we should get it out of the way, hopefully letting the President rise again in the polls the next time around. My thought was that it would be very bad to have this come out in February because people look at the publication date, they don't look at the date the poll was taken.

Against other candidates, our standing is relatively unchanged. It is Nixon 46, Humphrey 37, Wallace 12 and, in a two way race, Nixon 51, Humphrey 40. Against Kennedy, it is Nixon 45, Kennedy 39, Wallace 10, and, in a two way race, Nixon 50, Kennedy 41.

In the case of the Muskie gain, the big shift has taken place in the \$15,000 and over category -- the white professional upper middle class suburbanites. In early November, we were 53-37 over Muskie with this vote. Now it is 45-42. We only have a slight lead. This once again, has been all year long the most volatile group. It swings back and forth. Muskie is the only Democrat who can make inroads with this group and whenever he does he surges ahead in the polls. Neither the Kennedy-Humphrey or any of the others seem to be able to make any dent in this group which is critical to us and which is growing by leaps and bounds.

There was also a shift with the young people. Undoubtedly it was attributable to the bombing. We lost a little bit of ground in rural areas which Harris believes could be the bad attitude among small farmers at the moment.

Harris attributes all of this to the India-Pakistan situation, as to the handling of which we have a 28 positive and 48 negative rating. This is very low, particularly in a foreign policy area where we have come out the strongest in all of the Harris ratings. Significantly all of the other foreign policy ratings are down as well. Harris' theory is that when we are affected badly in one foreign policy area it rubs off on all others. On handling Vietnam it is 40 positive, 54 negative. Working for peace in the world is now 51 positive, 44 negative. It was in September 64 positive, 34 negative. In the foreign policy ratings, there are large "not sures" indicating there has been a real slippage here.

Harris does not believe, with the exception of the young voter, that the bombings caused the problem; he argues that it was India-Pakistan. Personally I disagree with him although he supports his case by pointing out that on handling Vietnam we did not show the same deterioration we did in all other areas. Harris believes that people got concerned over India-Pakistan, that maybe it would upset our initiatives with China and Russia and the general idea of achieving peace in the world. This is where he feels we were hurt. Also, the college educated, higher income groups would be much more sensitive to the sophisticated issues involved in the India-Pakistan controversy.

Just for purposes of comparison, in the over \$15,000 group the President beats Kennedy 57-32 and Humphrey 56-29. It is in this area that the entire difference with our standing, vis a vis, Muskie, can be found.

Also this is a group which does turn out to vote and which, as I pointed out, is an increasing share of the electorate. Hence, it can be critically important and there is a good lesson from all of this. That is, that Muskie is the one Democrat who can seriously penetrate this group.

On the positive-negative rating, we have dropped from 53-46 to 49-47. Harris will not feature this in a column but will bury it in statistics in a column relating to something else. It should be noted that this is not really much of a decline. All of the published Harris poll data of recent weeks has related to a combination of two polls. One taken the last week in October and one taken in the second week in November. We suffered a precipitous decline in between the two polls and rather than show us up one week and down the next, Harris, at my suggestion, combined the poll data. Hence, the 53-47 was really a lot better than where we actually were in mid-November. In the November poll, if that were broken out separately, we actually had about a 49-47 rating or just what we had in the latest poll.

There was some bright news on the economy. In all categories he showed significant improvement. For example, on the key question "Are the Nixon economic policies keeping the economy healthy", in July we were 22 positive, 73 negative. In November, 34 positive, 60 negative and now in the latest January poll, 38 positive and 56 negative -- still not good but the trend is coming up very well. In terms of keeping unemployment down we now get a 26 positive, 66 negative (in July it was 16 positive, 77 negative). For the first time in two years, a majority do not think that prices are rising more rapidly than before. In response to the question "Is the country in a recession?", today 49 percent say yes, 33 no. In November, it was 56 yes, 27 no. In August it was 62 yes, 24 no; In March it was 65 yes and 21 no. Again, the figures aren't good, but the trend is excellent. A majority feel now that there will not be a recession next year by a 35-31 score. This is a complete reversal of the response received to the same question last summer. The key question politically on the economy is "Are the Nixon economic policies doing more good than harm?" The reply to that is now 48 doing more good than harm, 27 doing more harm than good. Once again, a complete reversal from the position last summer.

Of passing interest, people by a 66 to 20 margin favor keeping controls for another year. Harris honestly believes that Muskie's rise in the polls

is a temporary 'blip'. The fact that he appears to have a lot of momentum (and in Harris' opinion does have a lot of momentum) has been getting a lot of publicity and doing very well in terms of his public image contrasted with an unsettling period in foreign affairs for us has brought him even with us again, but Harris does not feel it will last because on the issues and on handling the key issues we turn out much better.

Harris believes the following to be most significant:

Which candidates do you believe can do a better job with respect to the following issues?

	Nixon	Muskie	Wallace	None	Not Sure
Working for peace	39	34	8	3	16
Keeping the economy healthy	38	32	8	3	19
End to Vietnam fastest	36	30	11	4	19
Trust most personally as the man in the White House	36	33	9	4	18
Keep down taxes and spending	35	29	10	6	20
Race and civil rights	30	31	14	3	19
Solving problems of the poor	30	35	10	4	21
Crime - law and order	31	30	18	3	18
Air and water pollution	31	36	8	4	21
Health and education	34	34	9	2	21

NOTE: The foregoing was dictated by Mr. Colson over the telephone. It is very rough and rambling but at least gives the raw data of the latest Harris sample.

November 19, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Attached article in New York magazine

Lou Harris is incensed over the New York magazine article suggesting that he wrote a confidential report for Larry O'Brien. New York is printing a retraction.

The report in question was written by a staff member at the DNC and was a poll summary and analysis based on the Harris and Gallup polls. Harris was unaware of its existence until he read the article in New York. He has asked for, however, and been assured that he will receive a copy of it which he will immediately pass on to us. He insisted on a copy to be sure that no one was, in fact, using his name -- so the article has had a beneficial effect in that we will be getting a look at the Democrats strategy plan.

cc: Mort Allin

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065 Section 6-102
By *yw*, Date *3/10/82*
CONFIDENTIAL

July 12, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

SUBJECT:

Harris Polls *Full*

You have copies of the Harris polls on Kennedy for this week. Next week will be the Muskie trial heats, based on the same field survey of June 9-15. The figures are identical to May. In a 3-way race, the President trails Muskie, 42-40, Wallace gets 13, 5 undecided. But in a 2-way race, it's 46-46, 8 undecided. Harris intends to play this as "the President has closed the gap on Muskie's earlier lead" -- at least that's the way he's described it to me.

Harris points out that there is an enormous contrast between Muskie and Kennedy. The President still does well in the South, 40% to Wallace's 27 to Muskie's 26. But, in the West, Muskie beats us 51-43, in the Mid-West 49-41 and in the East 48-35.

Harris believes that the difference turns on the vote in suburbs and among independents. Interestingly, we do better against Muskie on the raw data than when the unlikely voters are eliminated (the opposite is true with Kennedy). This again illustrates that Muskie does best with high income, better educated suburbanites. In the \$15,000 per year and over category, the President beats Kennedy 52-36, but loses to Muskie 54-41. With the independent vote, however, the President beats Muskie 44-37 (on the last poll in May, Muskie won the independent vote 45-36 but he has offset this loss by increasing his lead in the suburbs.

Harris attributes Muskie's strength to the fact that he is bland, has a neutral image and does not really come across as a partisan Democrat. The lack of controversy with respect to Muskie is at this time his great strength, but will in due course tend to wear thin. The risk to him is that he will become boring and uninspiring.

Lou's close friend, Howard Stein, tells him that there is at least a 50/50 chance that McCarthy will enter the Presidential race as a fourth party candidate. As a result, Harris has done a 4-way poll showing the President at 37, Muskie 35, Wallace 12 and McCarthy 10.

By way of incidental intelligence, Lou says that the Kennedy people believe that Humphrey is absolutely dead as a result of the Kennedy/Johnson papers, that Muskie has been badly hurt but, that Kennedy has not been affected. I have to assume from this that they feel there is no ruboff from JFK to Teddy.

On the subject of the New York Times controversy, Harris believes we should layoff the issue as far as the press issue is concerned; as he puts it we have come out very well, that the real thrust has been against the Democrats and Kennedy and Johnson. He is in the field right now determining what the partisan fallout has been. Based on what he said I can pretty well surmise what he will come up with.

He advises that we should be careful not to appear to gloat over the Democrats' problems, especially LBJ, nor should we on the other hand appear overly concerned about the recent revelations. We should stay above the battle; he believes that the Pentagon Papers controversy will continue while the press issue fades and that our job is to keep the focus on the Democrats. Harris does not believe that the press issue is a gut issue, that it doesn't really affect people or motivate them. The feeling that they have been duped and deceived, however, is a strong emotional point that will endure.

~~SECRET~~

Harris
File

EYES ONLY

May 4, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Harris Poll

The Lou Harris seduction is now complete; I will fill you in on the details at your convenience. There are certain things which I have agreed to do, relatively painless.

Lou has agreed to act as a consultant, give us figures in advance, discuss results and releases with us.

He told me that he was not completely satisfied with the poll results which he got on April 12-15 which showed the President at 46% positive, 53% negative, 1% not sure. He, therefore, ordered his people in the field to poll again between the 18th and 25th of April. They came up with a 47% positive, 50% negative, 3% not sure. This will contrast with the March figures (not heretofore published) of 41% positive, 56% negative and 3% undecided, and is the best result we have had since January (48-50-2) and the same as November(47-50-3).

I have the complete results of the latest survey including the trial heats (copy attached). As you will see, we still fair badly against Muskie but well against McGovern and Humphrey. Harris suggests that we study those groups in which Muskie does significantly better than either McGovern or Humphrey in order to counter him in those areas (for example, higher income and professional groups). He also feels that the Muskie strength is not enduring and that it results from his being relatively non-controversial in the public eye, a condition that he feels will not last.

We discussed the forthcoming release of these figures and at least based on what Harris said, it will be written as a rather bullish report of the President regaining personal popularity.

I would like to fill you in on the other specifics.

Conversation with Lou Harris, October 7, 1971

H: Some pairing results.

C: Marvelous. This is on September 20 to 24.

H: No this is another one. This is one that's part of our other, the thing I put on. This is the 19th through 27. This was on...

C: Where did I get that?

H: That the other one. I did another one for my regular column and this is part of our domestic thing. That I put on. Incidentally I got a call from those guys the other day, Harper's assistant, Morey, who said that I should be sure that Ken Cole gets these results first and only Ken Cole and I said Chuck Colson not, and he said, well, there are matters of protocol. And I said what if the President asked for these. And he said, Oh God, give em to him. A little bit of bureaucracy there.

C: Oh yes, we have our problems

H: Well, I don't know when I will surface these, but at any rate, it's really striking. First, Nixon, Kennedy and Wallace. It's closer, Nixon 45, Kennedy 38, Wallace 11.

C: Not much though. That was 45 - 36.

H: Next is Nixon, Muskie, Wallace. This is a real socker. Nixon 47, Muskie 35, Wallace 11. Muskie's really starting to collapse.

C: That is absolutely wild, fascinating. Paul McCracken called me yesterday afternoon/^{he had had a call} from his friend Sindlinger. I don't know Sindlinger, is he any good?

H: Well, frankly we can buy him if we want to. I just have such an aversion to telephone surveys and Sindlinger's gone to DLJ and said I'd love to have Harris buy me and we could do it. I'd be interested in your views about it.

C: Well I'm going to find out a little more about it.

H: They use the Council of Economic Advisers a lot, I wonder if Sindlinger does.

C: No, not at all. Haven't used them at all period. In fact I asked Paul do you use him and he said no, we subscribe to his service, that's all. ~~NO~~ You said Muskie was going down like a ton of bricks.

H: Well, this would indicate that.

H: Apparently the more exposure you get to campaigning the less we create. He looks like Romney. And then Nixon-Lindsay...

(BREAK)

C: In a two way race, it is 50 Nixon, Muskie 40, 10 undecided? Holy smockers. You know, when you public that, it is a bombshell because it shows Kennedy giving us a tighter race than Muskie.

H: That's right. Kennedy finishes coming up and Muskie's come down.

C: Well actually in the last ...

H: It really puts Kennedy up as strong Kennedy. There's no question about it.

C: I've always felt he was, as you know.

H: My theory now that if its this early though that he surfaces and stays there it's, he's going to be awful vulnerable. In other words, he's only strong when someone else is a front runner. This is my theory.

C: Of course, I happen to have as one of my fondest hopes in life the Kennedy Nixon race only because I know we will beat him and I'm positive we will beat him and I have been, was in the 52 campaign in Massachusetts, 58, the 60 national and 62 Massachusetts. I've never been on a winning side of a Kennedy election and Goddammit I'm going to be. I won't fulfill my life's dreams until...

H: A full cycle. But this is rather interesting isn't it. Nixon-Lindsey, 50-31-11 and 8. Nixon Jackson, Nixon 54 Jackson 24, Wallace 13, not sure 9. Jackson just hasn't surfaced, and I'm not sure he ever will. Scoop, an old friend of mine, I'd say is kind of invisible. I think it's his personality.

C: What about...

H: McCarthy, I didn't get Humphrey in this one. McCarthy, Nixon 56, McCarthy 26, Wallace 10. McCarthy shows nothing but he'd be a spoiler.

C: You know for a trial heat for an incumbent at this juncture, this really is strong.

H: That's why the 19, god knows what will happen in '72 but I would say that we can't foresee, but I would say this talk tonight, the assurance people need that the President's right on track economically followed by improvement, what everybody thinks will happen. And then in November, if you can come in on Vietnam, because the first look I'm

working on now, you can get me at home. I'm working on the domestic thing. Vietnam is still their, the people are still holding their breath. Not that they're not sympathetic, they don't think he's on the right track, but until it happens, you know until we get the hell out, somehow you know the boys home, that's what it really comes to.

you

C: Lou, will/be able to publish these the week after, your approval poll goes the week after this coming week. . .

H: Yea, approval. I've got this leadership thing, I've got to make a speech in Houston the 25th and I wanted to use it but I'd like it to be in the column that morning. So this will probably be the first week in November. It's ridiculous.

C: Well, it's a good story anytime it goes. Lou, one thing, break these down a little bit the way you've done others so that, and bring them with you when you come down next week cause we might run through them with the President.

H: You think I should plan on that? What I may do is stay over night Wednesday night.

22
September 19, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR H. R. HALDEMAN

I talked this morning with Dan Lufkin, who had no idea the way in which Harris broke down the positive and negative ratings on his polls. He agreed with me completely that "only fair" would mean to some people a positive answer and to others a negative answer. To put all of the "only fairs" in the negative column will always distort a Harris poll. Lufkin told me he would get into it immediately to see if perhaps the adjectives could not be changed to "very good, good, poor, very poor". The break there would be a very logical positive negative break. I'm sure he will encounter resistance from Harris; on the other hand he owes him. I will report back to you when I hear from Lufkin, which he said would be some day next week.

Charles W. Colson

Ticker - Sent 25

File
with my
Harris
memo

March 16, 1971

HARRIS: To be frank about it, I would like to really make data talk in terms about what could be done with it politically.

CWC What I'm saying is that if you were working for - let's say you were working for us through the Republican National Committee - I wouldn't give a damn if you were doing work or studies for Democratic Senator _____, but if you were . .

HARRIS Mondale of Minnesota er something

CWC Yeh, but if you were on Muskie's payroll or Humphrey's or Kennedy's or somebody who is likely to be running against us, then there would be a real problem because in order for your data to be of value to us you would have to be working pretty closely with us - in order for you to work closely with us, we'd have to tell you what our problems are and you'd have to tell us what your analysis is and that would require

HARRIS a conflict - I agree, I agree. I hear Gallup is not interested in giving such interpretation, but I may be wrong.

CWC Well interpretation is what's really helpful.

HARRIS I agree, I agree. any of our clients the information we feel is sound is the ability of the Harris organization to read the data to tell us what we should do about it - it's useful. I've always felt over the years that is what people pay money for. You know, whether it is the telephone company or whatever - Well, let me do this - let me think about it - I probably will talk to somebody like Dan Lufkin and Bill Donaldson about this too, okay? It would be another world for us, really, from what we've been. But hell if Gallup is going to do it maybe we ought to do it too.

CWC How would this affect your syndicate?

HARRIS No prohibition in the contract with the Chicago Tribune or New York News.

CWC How long has the Tribune contracted for?

HARRIS Why just automatically renewed for two more years - last December, I guess, so ..

CWC Well you wouldn't have any consent on that score

HARRIS Well I might call up Wally Kerr (???) , you know Wally? He is the President of Tribune Corporation in Chicago now and ask his advice on it - I know he'd want to do it - you know I wouldn't mention who but I would want to find out who - you know that's my business but it's just the general principle - I have a feeling that - about 5 years ago I think there was more awareness of this - part of that was a possible conflict - I think part of that was where I came from and where I had been - I had been working for Kennedy and all that - but then somehow the lines have blurred for our whole field -the group we own there

CWC The question I would raise - I think which is the one you'd have to cope with-is a very real one and that is take the poll on "does the President inspire confidence" I don't remember seeing that one before but that's

HARRIS yeh, we sent it

CWC But not too often - that's a question that

HARRIS yeh, we ask it all the time - yeh, if you go back and check your ----- doesn't necessarily... polled out but it's been in a whole lot of other ratings.

CWC Yeh, but you see that one was the future this time andthe lowest figure -negative the answer would havea slight decline. Well then somebody says "J.C. this sonofabitch Harris - you know he is working with usand that sort of thing.

HARRIS I'll tell you what I tell all ourclients, We will not, when Cap Weinberger over at the FTC called and he said "do you do testimonials?" and I said "not at all" - you know, some 80% of these people's customers are

HARRIS I will not do that and never have.

CWC But what I'm talking about Lou is the situation where consider that one led with the most negative possible interpretation insofar as the President is concerned. It probably just as easily could have been the other way around.

HARRIS Yes, it could have been.

CWC Somebody ..let's say we set up a contract deal - somebody here would say, well, "the sonofabitch he went of his way....."

HARRIS Let me tell you ---all work with Kennedy when he was President when I did this - but I tell you I used to get my ears stretched before he died that year in '63 I can remember three or four cases he called up himself and just blasted my ears off - "what are you really doing to me here", you know. I'd say "Mr. President, that's it". "I can't help that, that's the way the facts are." Well, you don't have to write it that way, he'd say. He's complained. And I can see that sort of thing, you know.

CWC The problem I can see is a different one. The problem I can see is when we're - you don't have the full confidence factor going when it looks like something is loaded.

HARRIS Oh, I see.

CWC That makes it harder to get ..

HARRIS people to use these things

CWC yeh. You see, it's not the data - if the polls show - if people went down in the polls - so we went down - that's not the point - It's the way in which sometimes data can be presented. I can see problems arising in that -

HARRISyet the credibility of the column depends on the degree to which you did have balance - I've always maintained that is the essential conflict - you know, if you print good things about your client they all say, what the hell he's on the payroll.

Harris Poll

October 29, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR H. R. HALDEMAN

Henry Cashen and I met this morning with Lufkin and Harris. It was a two hour session with no holds barred. Harris is an arrogant egotist of the first order. I took a rather tough line. These two ingredients made for a very interesting and, at times, stormy session.

We were able, with Lufkin's assistance, to extract the following commitments:

1. The latest poll data will be released Monday showing a significant increase for the President. (I promised there would be no premature leak by us.) The late September polling brought him up from 48 positive, 49 negative (August) to 50 positive, 45 negative. In the poll completed last week, it is 54 positive, 44 negative. This is the highest approval rating and the lowest negative since February. Harris assures us that we will make this point. (Particularly significant is that the President went up 9 points in the Handling of the Economy and 7 points in his Handling of the War. The economy one surprised Harris.)
2. Harris has agreed to consider releasing the polls on a regularly schedule basis rather than simply when they go down (We don't have a commitment on this point, but I think we proved our contention to both Harris and Lufkin; and Lufkin promises me that he will get it straightened out.)
3. Henceforth, Harris will publish the results of the four categories: Excellent, Pretty good, Only fair, Poor. As you will see from the attached analysis of his late September poll, this will show that the vast majority fall under the only fair and good category. He will still use a Positive/Negative breakdown, but at least giving the four categories will help show the vast majority are fair to good.
4. On his next several polls he will use the phrase "Not so Good" interchangeably with "Only Fair," asking the question the same ways with the same people, to see if this affects the positive/negative breakdown.

Lufkin, much to Harris' dismay, has agreed to review the future figures with us.

In conclusion, I think we have made some limited progress, witness, the favorable release next week one week before the election, which I am convinced Harris would not have let out but for the pressures. I don't think Harris, however, will ever show us as favorably as Gallup. We went into the techniques very thoroughly and he is always going to get a higher negative rating the way he conducts the poll. My thought is that we should see how it goes for a few months and, if the situation does not improve, we might consider approaching the problem from the standpoint of the Chicago Tribune, which syndicates the poll. The Tribune, which is certainly friendly to us, could either insist that Harris shape up or terminate their contract.

Another thought, which I hinted at with Lufkin; we might think about drying up some of his commercial accounts. This is 90% of his business. His political polling is done to keep him in the news and thereby help his commercial business. It is a severe conflict because his public releases must always be sensational in order to get him the publicity that he needs to foster his commercial business.

He was very disturbed by the Thimmesch column and more of this is also bound to damage his credibility publicly as well as to keep him honest.

As a footnote, the attached is very significant in the fact that such a high percentage of people feel that the President is doing as good as he can do. This relates to my analysis of the Broder article; to wit, many people have concluded that the Presidency is an impossible job and this prevalent feeling is a problem to us in how effectively our leadership comes through.

Harris, by the way, told me that 27% is high and should be taken as a danger signal because it was the one category that increased the fastest (to a high of 352) during Johnson's decline. Harris said that it reflected the feeling that while Johnson was trying to do his best, he really wasn't able to lead as President. I question that conclusion along with most things Harris says but it is an interesting observation.

Charles W. Colson

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

EYES ONLY

April 3, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE

SUBJECT: Random Thoughts from Lou Harris

Harris believes that the President needs, between now and the election, to continually create "straw men". Meany affords us the best opportunity, but we've got to work at creating others -- deliberate enemies. The President is against those who plunged us into Vietnam but now want to sell out America's honor. The President is against those retailers who over-charge consumers. The middle man example in the food price issue is a perfect illustration. If there isn't a natural villain, create one so that the President can be the defender of the public interest against natural enemies.

Harris believes that the President should be forceful but not strident; that whenever he is strident, the President brings out the hostility of a latent anti-Nixon feeling which still exists with a large body of people, but that when he is deliberate, quiet, rational, forceful, he does not engender this latent hostility.

Harris believes that we should downplay the campaign throughout the year, make it as boring as possible. Harris believes that a bland campaign will help us in that we will benefit greatly from a low turnout. Also, people react better to the President if he does not polarize on gut issues. This does not mean that we should not address the issues; we should defuse as many as possible, but not arouse the passions of the electorate with a very divisive issue that might bring out our opponents (as with anti-labor legislation, for example).

Harris believes the key to our success is in avoiding having the American electorate act emotionally or precipitously with respect to the President's candidacy. He points out that as his pollsters question people, they get a better response after the questioning than at the outset. More people favor the President's re-election after they have been walked through the issues than when they are first confronted with the question cold, "Do you favor the President as against Candidate X?"

One of the President's strong points is that people think he is trying hard. He is beginning to develop a characteristic of sincerity, that he is really working at solving the problems. Harris advises that we should articulate everything we do rationally, calmly, quietly, and forcefully. Make people think, make people thoughtful. Do not provoke instant emotional reactions. The President's style has come through very

well as being deliberate. We should not let him go swinging or overreacting. If our opponent becomes strident, we should take it in stride. The more irresponsible the opposition becomes, the more the President is helped in being looked at as a solid, steady, strong and deliberate statesman. Be the "solid brick in the middle" Harris suggests. Ask people to think of the issues seriously.

In this same vein, we should turn the lack of so-called charisma into an asset, arguing that no one has the right to use the office of Presidency for the development of a personality cult, that personal promotion is not the measure of one's success as President. One cannot run the country through charm, rather through ability. Nixon's style is to be serious and dedicated, that that is more important than personal image.

Harris believes that Nixon's image is now being sharpened as a rational, thoughtful, deliberate leader, all of which can be destroyed if there is a spontaneous reaction or a sharp galvanizing of the opposition in the months ahead. Harris believes that if people are asked calmly and quietly to think through the choice for President, that the President cannot be beaten by any of the present Democratic Presidential candidates. If on the other hand, the election turns into

a heated, highly controversial, emotionally charged campaign, we will simply bring out enough anti votes to defeat us; there are just more of them than us and if we galvanize them, we (not the Democratic candidates) can beat ourselves. The key at the moment is to maintain the tone that we have presently achieved and to hold it throughout the election year.



Charles W. Colson