

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>
40	1	11/8/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Letter	To: President Nixon. From: Maurice H. Stans. RE: Campaign buget. 3 pgs.
40	1	10/10/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Bruce Kehrli. RE: Vermont Royster comments. Memos attached. 10 pgs.
40	1	10/3/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Bruce Kehrli. From: Bill Safire. RE: Final six-week posture comment. 1 pg.
40	1	10/4/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Bruce Kehrli. From: Ron Ziegler. RE: Presidential posture during next six weeks. 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>
40	1	9/30/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Bruce Kehrl. RE: Campaign. 1 pg.
40	1	10/10/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Tod R. Hullin. From: Raymond Caldiero. RE: John Gavin. Forwarded to Gordon Strachan. 2 pgs.
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Dwight Chapin. From: L. Higby. RE: Governor Rockefeller call to Haldeman re: Monday visit. 2 pgs.
40	1	10/12/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Clark MacGregor. Through: Fred Malek & Jeb MacGruder. From: Barbara Franklin. RE: Status report--Women's surrogate program. 4 pgs.
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Boggs' District. 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>
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Charles Colson. RE: Proposed schedule attached. 1 pg.
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Charles Colson. RE: 8:15 meeting. 2 pgs.
40	1	10/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Meeting with Chotiner. 4 pgs.
40	1	10/19/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Bruce Kehrli. RE: Political analyses for campaign trips. 30 pgs.
40	1	10/19/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Field operations report by Malek. 17 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>
40	1	10/16/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Clark MacGregor. From: Fred Malek. RE: Canvassing results. 16 pgs.
40	1	10/20/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Charles Colson. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Campaign advisement. 3 pgs.
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Key States and Senate races. 10 pgs.
40	1	10/13/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Gordon Strachan. From: L. Higby. RE: States campaign. 1 pg.
40	1	10/18/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: H. R. Haldeman. From: Gordon Strachan. RE: Key States and Senate races. 2 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>
40	1		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	List of states. 4 pgs.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: _____

TO: *Joan*

FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

in Campaign

26

H

November 8, 1972

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Here is a preliminary report on the fund-raising efforts in your campaign.

The campaign budget, which was originally fixed at \$40,000,000, gradually crept up to \$43,000,000, and I suspect that by the time all of the bills are in it will amount to as much as \$45,000,000. In addition, we should have a reserve fund of \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 to take care of continuing legal expenses, final reports, necessary refunds, and other items which ought to be provided for.

Our fund-raising was inhibited by a series of events that we did not face in 1968:

1. The many investigations and legal matters related to the Watergate and its aftermath occupied more than half of my personal time during the last fifteen weeks of the campaign, which made it impossible for me to be wholly effective.
2. The continuing lead of 25 points in the various polls during the campaign caused many people to assume that we would not need much money to win.
3. The Democrats kept up a constant barrage of statements from the beginning of the year until election day to the effect that we had more money than we needed, and these statements were frequently printed in the press, and even sometimes repeated by individuals working on our side of the campaign.

Despite all of these serious handicaps, I believe I can tell you that we have raised enough money to pay the campaign costs in full and have room to move, unless there are major surprises still to come in the unpaid bills.

The President
page two

There will be one notable change, however, from 1968. As a result of the circumstances I have described, a larger proportion of our contributions will have come from individual contributions of larger amounts. The small contributors who normally might have given in greater numbers were apparently influenced by the Democratic propaganda to the effect that we didn't need money. Nevertheless, we will have had at least 500,000 contributors.

I congratulate you on a perfect campaign and a magnificent win!

Sincerely,

Maurice H. Stans

MHS:AC:ft

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 10, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI *BK*
SUBJECT: Vermont Royster Comments

The comments contained in the attached memorandum (Tab A) from Ray Price to the President by Vermont Royster were staffed to Ziegler, Moore, Safire, Colson, Chapin, Ehrlichman and Buchanan. Ehrlichman did not respond and Colson claimed that his response was covered in a previous memo, but the others are included at Tab B.

To summarize, none of those contacted felt that the speech proposed by Royster was a good idea. All thought that the President should maintain the robe he now wears -- the Presidential robe. There were, however, some interesting comments from Dick Moore on other possibilities for speeches between now and the Election. You should read Moore's memorandum in its entirety. As for the memorandum to the President, recommend that it not go in.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 29, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT *RSP*
FROM: RAY PRICE
SUBJECT: Vermont Royster

When I talked with Royster yesterday, he mentioned that he'd written me a letter the day before but not mailed it because he hadn't been able to pin the ideas down satisfactorily on paper -- but the essence of the ideas was this:

The only thing McGovern has going for him is when he puts on his ministerial robes. When he talks defense, budgets, economics, etc., he unravels. But when he puts on his ministerial robes, and jumps on us about Watergate or the wheat deal, when he talks honesty, integrity, etc., he registers.

Vermont has a "vague feeling" that you would help yourself if you would put on your "ministerial robes" and give an "uplifting" kind of speech -- not about taxes or the budget or Vietnam, but "I think that a President, when he gets things flopping around under him like the Watergate, has to let people know that he personally is for honesty, integrity, etc. That kind of uplift speech would be a good thing."

He's not at all sure that the speech should directly address Watergate, etc. (though he feels it would have been better to have jumped in immediately, and declared, in effect, that that's the sort of thing "up with which I will not put," to borrow Churchill's famous phrase -- anyone who runs a big organization is going to have things like that happen, but the important thing, when they do, is to get on the side of the angels, quick).

This might, he suggests, be handled not in a speech but rather in a press conference, with the TV cameras.

In general, he feels that the only thing the campaign needs now is "a little spiritual uplift" -- something that shows a real concern for people, for the future, for integrity -- something that goes beyond the programmatic and gets to ideals, to principles, and again, to deep concern.

#

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 4, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE KEHRLI

FROM: DICK MOORE *Mu*

SUBJECT: Presidential Posture During Next Six Weeks:
"In general, the only thing the campaign needs now is 'a little spiritual uplift'--something that goes beyond the programmatic and gets to ideals, to principles, and again, to deep concern."

At this stage, it can be argued that the campaign does not "need" anything new, that if the President continues to concern himself with presidential affairs, he will win easily. Indeed, McGovern may even hurt himself by getting more desperate as the President stays more presidential.

Nevertheless, I agree with Mr. Royster that the one element which the people are looking for and waiting for is a major expression of the President's aspirations for America, through and beyond his second term and the nation's 200th Birthday.

Having just had occasion to review the President's speeches and statements of the past four years, it occurs forcefully to me that few really recall the number and quality of the inspirational talkswich he has given.

Now, as he goes before the American electorate for the last time, and as he faces the culminating years of his political life and leadership, I think a major re-statement of his vision for America and the principles which will keep it great will be the most important single thing he can do. However, there is still time to decide the wisdom of such a course, as well as the timing and the format.

For the present, the most important thing is to keep the options open and be prepared to deliver such a message at the right time and place -- or it may even be a series of two or three messages.

On the timing, consider this: In 1940, Election Day was November 5. Yet FDR did not announce until October 18 that he was going to make five campaign speeches beginning October 23. This was before TV or jet planes, yet in those five speeches he had the country quoting "Martin, Barton and Fish" (which was first uttered October 28 at Madison Square Garden), and had succeeded in undercutting Willkie completely on the one inroad he was making, the war issue. ("I have said this before but I will say it again and again and again".)

My point is that unless there are fairly drastic developments of some kind, RN does not have to announce any specific campaign plans until at least October 20, and the last ten days will be more than sufficient time to penetrate the minds of America with whatever major theme he wishes to express.

With those dates in mind, it is still necessary to crystallize the options now and to take whatever steps are needed to take the position to exercise those options on short notice.

One of those options, for example, would be a major address on network television on which the President sets forth his vision of hopes for America and restates the principles which should continue to guide the American character and spirit. This should probably be scheduled during the week between October 23 and 28. It could be a Fireside Chat from the Oval Office, or it could be delivered at a major rally in a forum like Madison Square Garden. I realize that the President does like to read speeches at a rally. In this instance, however, there are some excellent precedents for doing just that, namely, the President's acceptance speeches at the National Conventions in 1960, 1968 and 1972, all of which had such powerful impact. (FDR's five speeches in 1940 were all delivered from scripts at major rallies.)

Another approach might be three or even four 15 minute personal statements each delivered in a difference city in a symbolic part of the country, the South (Atlanta), the East (New York), the Midwest (Cleveland or Chicago) and finally the Far West (San Clemente on Election Eve). In each case the nighttime "Fireside Chat" could be preceded by a midday motorcade. During the afternoon, the President could be in his hotel working on his speech and then deliver it during prime time from the local television studio.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

Each speech could begin with some local regional references, but the major portion would be devoted to a high level subject. One might be the search for Peach, another the America of tomorrow, a third, The American Spirit of Character, and the Election Eve address would probably emphasize the democratic process and the obligations to vote for a better future.

A third format could be a series of three or four radio speeches.

Whatever the format, a message of inspiration and uplift can be important for several practical reasons, such as the following:

1. We can expect that our opponents will have some success with an anti-landslide theme ("I hate to vote for McGovern but I am afraid of what Nixon will do if he has a landslide.") An eloquent statement of the reasons why a mandate is so important in the current state of the world could undercut this landslide argument to a considerable degree.
2. We can expect to hear and read that RN is taking the votes for granted and will ~~not~~ be content to win a negative victory based on McGovern's inadequacy rather than on the Nixon leadership. This is a displeasing concept which could cost votes. An inspirational and affirmative appeal by RN in the closing days can undercut and even negate the argument that he is content to "back into the Presidency".
3. The second term will be the culmination of RN's service to the nation, the last time he will ask the voters of America to entrust their future to him. From a historical sense (and that is usually good politics) it will be appropriate and reassuring for him to go to the people with a personal statement of his beliefs and his hopes for America.
4. Because they lack any other real issue, we can expect the McGovernites to increase their emphasis on the issue of integrity and to intensify their charges of cynicism. Although the Watergate case has not caught on as a voting issue, the repetition of charges about this, the so-called grain deal and ITT will necessarily have some effect on doubtful voters. The kind of approach which Mr. Royster suggests can have a very important effect in defusing this entire issue.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

5. I have a theory that some Democrats can vent their feelings by "voting" against McGovern in the Gallup Poll, or by telling their friends that they are going to vote against him, and they may mean it at the time. But in many such cases, the actual breaking of a lifelong habit, or overcoming a long-time antipathy toward RN, may become difficult to do at the moment of truth in the voting booth. This problem gets reinforced in the closing days by pressure from union leaders, or from their peers generally. For example, many people who were mad enough to say they ~~are~~ were going to vote for Wallace ended up reverting to the Democratic candidate at the final moment.

In the closing week of the campaign, I think these are the votes we are most likely to lose. By the same token, they are the votes we might be able to retain by an inspirational appeal by RN in the closing days.

6. This kind of appeal will encourage workers to get the vote out.

RECOMMENDATION:

For at least two more weeks (unless there is some unexpected turn of events) I think the President should maintain his present posture and pattern of presidential activities, emphasizing "event" more than talk. But starting now, we should be preparing speech material and examining locations and logistical matters, so that we may be in a position to make whatever moves we think wise in the final ten or twelve days.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: BRUCE KEHRLI
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN
SUBJECT: Presidential Posture During
Next Six Weeks

While the President should not go out on the attack -- for the simple reason that he could not say, "I disagree with McGovern" without being accused of slashing -- I do not think he should make any speeches which produce a lead such as "In a major address today, President Nixon defended his Administration against charges that it is the 'most corrupt in American history'." Better by indirection than direction.

Buchanan

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. BRUCE KEHRLI
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN 
SUBJECT: Presidential Posture
During Next Six Weeks

My response to your October 2nd memorandum (received October 3) is as follows:

1. McGovern is more effective with his ministerial posture - but it is only a matter of small degree. His credibility - ministerial posture - was hurt so badly in the post convention fiasco, I wonder how effective it is today. The righteous quality was very precious and once it is tarnished the possibility of regaining it is slight. (Remember the day Romney was brainwashed, he was finished. Remember the time Muskie cried - he had had it!)

We should keep McGovern the issue and the best way to do that is to force him to speak to the key issues. On issues, we have him.

2. When the President "gets things flapping around him like the Watergate", he should ignore them. A speech is not the answer - nor is it a time for an "uplift speech". The President doesn't tell people he is for honesty and integrity - hell, everyone believes he is for honesty and integrity - don't raise doubt by even mentioning it. Let the aides do the dirty work. The President should be aloof of scandals - that is what has saved him to date. You can't panic when the dirt is thrown.
3. "...get on the side of the angels" — that is so easy to say, but the angels have a better view than some of us mortals. You can't jump on any side without the facts - that's why the Watergate

2.

had to be untangled in its painful way. The answer is when you can't be on a side, get above it.

4. Spiritual uplift, concern for people, for the future, etc. - ideals, principles; deep concern.

New York: "What I want for the youth of the country..."

Los Angeles: "...and let me say it's a long way from Whittier to Washington."

Washington: "This SALT agreement is only a first step."

POINT: Uplift, vision, principle, concern - get it across by using it in daily remarks. Aim for the news clips. The problem is we need to get the portion of the talk alluding to these points or qualities isolated by the media. How - maybe by putting out a statement of 150 words which hits the same point - maybe the President even reads that portion of his speeches.

I feel, for some reason, the next great speech the President gives will probably be in the spring - or sooner - if there is an important reason for him to give one. The second inaugural won't be great. Why? Because! The second inaugural is something the President has to do - not something he wants to do! The President rallies in the crunch.

I believe that our non-campaigning approach is right - to hold to the plan is the problem.

"A little spiritual uplift" at some point is probably in the coming. How about the Presidency - Part Two. Play off the first address of 1968 - look at it now with the benefit of four years in office. Call it the next four years.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 3, 1972.

MEMORANDUM FOR: BRUCE KEHRLI
FROM: BILL SAFIRE
RE: Final Six-Week Posture Comment

Most people think all politicians are a little crooked. Therefore, I do not think a speech by the President wearing "ministerial robes" is appropriate. Nothing would be worse from our point of view than a ringing protestation of honesty and integrity, because it would be defensive and show that McGovern's getting to us. We would then be keying the campaign to his battleground.

We should press our strength and his weakness. The central speech of the campaign should be on the peace theme: Nixon's view of how to build the peaceful world order, the need for strength of arms and strength of character, how to keep the peace in the next generation, and then -- interestingly -- the domestic meaning of peace. Peace will mean less inflation, which means more freedom of the paycheck. More tax money spent on services rather than arms, which means no new taxes needed. More freedom for young people no longer under the shadow of draft. More and better jobs and business as, for the first time, we show what peacetime prosperity can mean.

Very hopeful speech, which people need, and quite credible, as Nixon is considered surefooted in foreign affairs.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 4, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: BRUCE KEHRLI
FROM: RON ZIEGLER R3
SUBJECT: Presidential Posture During Next Six Weeks

The following is in response to your memo requesting comment and recommendations on this subject:

I think at least in part, the comments referred to in your memo of October 2 are somewhat overstated -- the suggestion that there is a vague feeling that the President would help himself if he were to put on his ministerial robes and give an up-lifting kind of speech. My feeling is that the President, as President, need not don any other robe than the one he wears -- the Presidential robe.

My view is that the President clearly outlined the differences between himself and McGovern in his acceptance speech, and that for the next five weeks he should not attack or respond to McGovern charges, but talk instead about what he has accomplished, why he has sought to accomplish it, and what he intends to achieve in a second term. This, I believe, is our most appropriate posture.

I do feel at some point however -- and this is where I agree with the comments in the memorandum -- that it would be worthwhile for the President to speak about his conviction of morality in government and the high caliber of performance he expects from his people. This fact would, I believe, put into context the events that inevitably happen in any large organization: you can't guarantee against incompetence, but one can weed it out when it is found. I would stress, however, that the focus of these remarks should not be defensive. Rather the emphasis should be on his convictions about ethical behavior, and the tone should be inspirational, rather than judgmental.

To conclude, I would say that a general expression by the President of his concern over the need for integrity and the need for principles -- an expression of his deep concern for people and their future -- could be a plus.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 30, 1972

H
FD
10/10

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI BAK
SUBJECT: Campaign

The September 30 News Summary contained the following notes:

1. Sindlinger warned "RN's big lead could boomerang against him" as apathy, voter psychology and Dem disenchantment with McGovern are ingredients which could lead to a "spontaneous" turn to McGovern as late as election day itself. Sindlinger indicates 55% plan to vote.

It was requested that the above -- especially the underlined portion -- be passed along to all hands by Dole and MacGregor. Gordon Strachan will follow-up here, making sure that this point is made at the Committee.

Sgt Reiner
10/2
Will
for APL
10/3

2. Also, in reaction to the above it was noted that we need a major get out the vote drive.

According to Gordon this is in the works.

cc: / Gordon Strachan
Alexander P. Butterfield

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 30, 1972



ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI B4K
SUBJECT: Campaign

The September 30 News Summary contained the following notes:

1. Sindlinger warned "RN's big lead could boomerang against him" as apathy, voter psychology and Dem disenchantment with McGovern are ingredients which could lead to a "spontaneous" turn to McGovern as late as election day itself. Sindlinger indicates 55% plan to vote.

It was requested that the above -- especially the underlined portion -- be passed along to all hands by Dole and MacGregor. Gordon Strachan will follow-up here, making sure that this point is made at the Committee.

2. Also, in reaction to the above it was noted that we need a major get out the vote drive.

According to Gordon this is in the works.

cc: Gordon Strachan
Alexander P. Butterfield

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

(P) *TS*
TOPS

Date October 10

For Gordon Strachan

From **Ted Hullin**

Revised
**Committee
for the Re-election
of the President**

1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 (202) 333-0920

OCT
PAC

October 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. TOD R. HULLIN
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO JOHN D. EHRLICHMAN
By C.

FROM: RAYMOND CALDIERO

SUBJECT: John Gavin

John Gavin has not declared for the President as of the moment, due to the fact that as President of the Screen Actors Guild he must be non-partisan. This does by no means reflect his views, as Mr. Gavin is 100% behind the President, and has been helping us a great deal behind the scenes.

Since Mr. Gavin has just been elected for a second term as President of the Screen Actors Guild, and his feelings for the President are stronger than ever, we just may be able to get him to declare his support publicly.

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: DWIGHT CHAPIN
FROM: L. HIGBY
SUBJECT: Governor Rockefeller
Call to Haldeman re:
Monday Visit

Governor Rockefeller called Bob this afternoon to discuss with him the problem he is having with regard to the fact that the President is going to Nassau County but is not going to Suffolk County. He has talked to Swank, his Chairman down there who is just about going out of his mind and they think they've worked out a compromise that they would like to propose. It is as follows:

Instead of having the President land at Idlewild International Airport, have him land or at least have him take off from McArthur field. This field is very close to Suffolk county, apparently. He says there's a hangar there that he could set up with a big screen. Prior to the President's arrival he would have other speakers speak and have a band going, etc. The President could then arrive, just before his departure and slip in the back door, give the same five-minute speech he gives in Nassau County and then slip out the door with his departure being shown on the big screen.

He indicates that the entire thing would not take more than fifteen minutes. He said that he has real problems, otherwise, with Suffolk County and indicated that this is something that really means a lot to him.

I told him that Dwight Chapin was one of his staff would be getting back in touch with him, so they are expecting a call back.

On a different subject, Bill Safire just called saying that since he is from New York he would very much like to make the trip with us. I told him that Chapin would (once again) probably be getting in touch with him.

LH:kb

M. Haldeman X

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

October 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MacGREGOR

THROUGH: FRED MALEK
JEB MAGRUDER

FROM: BARBARA FRANKLIN

SUBJECT: Status Report -- Women's
Surrogate Program

The Women's Surrogate Program which you approved on August 19 has been implemented and is running very well. The following have been done:

1. Staff - Margaret Hodges is the coordinator/scheduler; Carole Buchanan is the public relations/press contact; and Marcia Myers is handling the Tour Desk operation.

Three new people have been added to the advance staff to handle this program, and Jon Foust is currently using an average of 12 people per week (6 people with the teams in the field and 6 people working on the next week's trips) to advance the women surrogate teams.

2. Briefings - The initial briefing of women surrogates was held on September 13 and featured an overview of domestic and international issues by Messrs. Ehrlichman and Haig. A second briefing held on September 18 covered women's rights, drugs, and the environment. The highlight was a drop-by by the President.

Each team receives additional briefing prior to every trip.

3. Kick-Off - The program was officially kicked-off at a Washington press conference featuring Barbara and Clark MacGregor on September 19. CBS carried it nationally the next day.

4. Campaign Trips - As of today, eight teams have been in the field and have covered nearly 50 cities in 22 states. Reports from the field are excellent and media coverage has been exceptionally good. The schedule of trips is at Tab A. Samples of media coverage are at Tab B.

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

WOMEN'S SURROGATE SCHEDULE - REVISED 10/5/72

STATE	SUGGESTED AREAS	DATE	TEAM	ST. DIR. ADV.	SCHEDULER CONTACTED
<u>October 3-5</u>					
WASHINGTON	Spokane Seattle-Tacoma-Everett	10/3-5	Hodgson Ehrlichman Flanigan		
OREGON	Portland				
MINNESOTA SOUTH DAKOTA WISCONSIN IOWA	Bemidji-Rochester-Minneapolis Sioux Falls Milwaukee Des Moines	10/3-5	Kleindienst Ruckelshaus David		
VIRGINIA SOUTH CAROLINA GEORGIA	Richmond - Norfolk Columbia-Greenville-Spartanburg Atlanta - Columbus	10/3-5	Stein Klein Brooks		
<u>October 10-12</u>					
NEW JERSEY DELAWARE MARYLAND	Entire State Wilmington Towson	10/10-12	Rogers Bush Klein		
MAINE MASSACHUSETTS RHODE ISLAND	Portland Springfield-Worcester-New Bedford Providence	10/10-12	Richardson Train Brown		
OHIO INDIANA	Columbus-Newark-Zanesville Cincinnati-Dayton Indianapolis - Ft. Wayne	10/10-12	Shultz Weinberger Hitt		

WOMEN'S SURROGATE SCHEDULE - REVISED 10/5/72

STATE	SUGGESTED AREAS	DATE	TEAM	ST. DIR. ADV.	SCHEDULER CONTACTED
<u>October 17-19</u>					
ILLINOIS	Rock Island-Moline-Bettendorf Springfield-Decatur-Davenport Peoria-Champaign-E. St. Louis Rockford-Wheaton-Wheeling Township	10/17-19	Butz Rumsfeld Bentley		
ARIZONA NEW MEXICO COLORADO	Phoenix - Tucson Albuquerque Denver - Pueblo	10/17-19	Kleindienst Ruckelshaus David		
<u>October 24-26</u>					
MICHIGAN	Grand Rapids - Kalamazoo Muskegon - Battle Creek Flint - Saginaw - Bay City Lansing Escanaba-Marquette-Sault. St. Marie - Traverse City	10/24-26	Rogers Rumsfeld Knauer		
NEW YORK	Buffalo-Staten Island-Nassau Co. Albany-Schenectady-Troy Syracuse - Rochester	10/24-26	Romney Brown Franklin		
NEBRASKA KANSAS MISSOURI	Omaha - Lincoln Kansas City St. Joseph-Columbia-Kansas City	10/24-26	Richardson Weinberger Train		

WOMEN'S SURROGATE SCHEDULE - REVISED 10/5/72

STATE	SUGGESTED AREAS	DATE	TEAM	ST. DIR. ADV.	SCHEDULER CONTACTED	T AI
	<u>October 31-November 2</u>					
KENTUCKY TENNESSEE LOUISIANA	Louisville - Lexington Memphis - Nashville New Orleans	10/31 - 11/2	Hodgson Shultz Flanigan Brooks			
FLORIDA	Tampa - St. Petersburg Orlando - Daytona Beach Jacksonville	10/31 - 11/2	Shultz Hodgson Kleindienst Stein			
ALABAMA NORTH CAROLINA	Birmingham-Mobile-Montgomery Highpoint - Greensboro Winston-Salem					
TEXAS	San Antonio Beaumont - Port Arthur Amarillo El Paso	10/31 - 11/2	Romney Bush Ruckelshaus			

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN S
SUBJECT: Boggs' District

There is no Republican candidate for Boggs' district, according to Dent. In the redistricting Boggs' district was made so safe that David Treen, who had tried to defeat Boggs previously, decided to seek the Congressional seat in the adjoining district.

There will be a special election held for Boggs' seat. This would probably be held in February or March.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Proposed Schedule Attached

The attached is a very rough cut at events which have been ~~scheduled~~ ^{To} over the remaining days of the campaign that would keep the President busy on things he ought to be working on as President.

For your information, I have just talked to Bryce Harlow who is away on vacation. He couldn't concur more strongly with the Colson/Haldeman position. As he put it, "we have a winning game; we should do nothing to upset it. Campaigning can only galvanize the enemy and bring out the wrong voters." He thinks what we are doing and planning to do is a perfect pace for the President to keep.

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON *W.C.*
SUBJECT: 8:15 Meeting

There were 11 people at the 8:15 meeting and 11 different opinions on Topic A. MacGregor is absolutely furious that I raised the subject and was as angry as I have ever seen him. Ehrlichman was downright sullen.

Rumsfeld is very strongly on our side. Klein, Weinberger and Stein all felt that the President should get out and do more provided the events are "Presidential." Ehrlichman continued to make the point that there are innumerable opportunities for "Presidential" campaign appearances but when pressed couldn't name a specific single one. The big argument comes from MacGregor that our 1 million volunteers need to be charged up and need to know that the President is working and campaigning.

Another point was that by getting the President out campaigning, we will knock Segretti, Watergate, etc. off the front pages. That is absolute bullcrap.

In short, there was no consensus on anything except that I was the skunk at this morning's lawn party.

Tommy Meskill gave me the best advise that I have had in this campaign -- Meskill is an extraordinarily successful politician who has turned around the State of Connecticut. He said that the people of his state -- and he spends a lot of time in touch with them -- all have great respect and admiration for President Nixon. The State is Democratic, however, and most of the Democrats in the state have voted against Nixon 4 times when he has been a candidate. Meskill believes that a sure fire prescription for blowing Connecticut would be to remind the Democrats of the old Candidate Nixon, whom they did not like. Meskill said that naturally he would like to have Nixon in Connecticut but that the smartest thing we could do would be to keep him totally occupied in the White House.

I don't know where the breaking point is -- 5 appearances 6, 7, 8, 9. I do know that any overt sign of intensive campaigning will be interpreted as being smoked out and will galvanize the opposition. My own feeling, strongly confirmed by Sindlinger, is that there are a lot of Democrats who are probably going to sit this one out. They can't stomach McGovern and they can't bring themselves to vote for Nixon. The key issue is -- and I don't have the answer -- by going on the hustings intensively, do we bring those people out and, if so, how in the final analysis are they going to vote?

Our people are going to vote no matter what we do. Extensive campaigning will create excitement for what is now a dull Presidential campaign. Our people are going to vote as they always do because they have a winner and because Republicans generally do turn out and vote. The question is what happens to that 50% of the Democratic vote that is not now with McGovern.

In my view, intensive campaigning will rejuvenate the McGovern camp, will bring us head to head with them on the networks every night, will energize partisan Democratic loyalties, will remind millions of people of the Candidate Nixon and will turn a landslide into a horserace.

Let the media bitch like hell that we are hiding in the White House. We can build Presidential events here that counters that and go out on the hustings just often enough so that they can't make this case stick. Our original plan of Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, Ohio, Denver and LA covers the country; This interspersed with radio speeches and a last minute nationwide appeal to the people to vote.

Maybe you should ask the President to watch the Connally speech again. Connally's speech frames the issue in this campaign brilliantly. It talks about the bi-partisan Presidential tradition. Nixon on the hustings is only going to take away from the mood and tone of the Connally message.

Bear in mind what you are dealing with -- MacGregor like every campaign manager in history is under intense pressure from the partisans who are working in the vineyards. Connally blows hot and cold. Last week he told me we were doing exactly right keeping the President in the White House and using surrogates. Mitchell has been listening to the partisans and Ehrlichman I can't explain. I can only say that when you have a game plan that is working and if you are way ahead, it is nuts to throw it away. Why take the risk?

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 10/6

TO: H.R. HALDEMAN

FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Chotiner met with MacGregor on October 3. As you can see from Chotiner's October 4 note to you, he is not satisfied with the results.

You may want to cover this with MacGregor directly.

Mope

From the desk of...

MURRAY M. CHOTINER

October 4, 1972

TO: H. R. HALDEMAN

If I had wanted to talk to Clark
MacGregor - I could have called
him.

My opinions regarding the campaign
are still the same.



SUITE 500
1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
TELEPHONE 202 298-9030

September 26, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: MURRAY CHOTINER

Dear Bob:

Things are no better since we met. I believe both of us must meet with the President.

Please let me know when and where.

Cordially,

Murray Chotiner
MMC:a

*Clark Mac
You told
me to call up Murray
then we filed
a review.
Shall not go
to p-
Brennan at least,
Not you
K*

LAW OFFICES
REEVES & HARRISON
SUITE 500
1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
TELEPHONE 202 298-9030
TELEX 440376 CRDK
CABLE "REEVLAW"

OF COUNSEL
MURRAY M. CHOTINER

MARION EDWYN HARRISON
ERNEST GENE REEVES
ROBERT F. SAGLE
MYRON SOLTER
CHARLES EMMET LUCEY

September 26, 1972

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

For several months I have watched the development of the campaign for your re-election. Some time ago, I remarked facetiously that you would win in spite of the campaign. Today, six weeks before the election, I can only say that your re-election will occur in spite of the campaign.

At a time when a campaign should be one of the best and most efficient in history, I am sorry to say that it is far from this.

As you well know, it is most unwise to rely on how well things appear; every possible step must be taken to insure victory. Also, as you know, I would not impose on your time unless I felt the need to be of the utmost importance to you -- I am suggesting that we meet before things become any worse.

Very sincerely,


Murray M. Chotiner

MMC:a

✓ GS-NOTES

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 19, 1972

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI *(Signature)*
SUBJECT: Political Analyses
for Campaign Trips

You requested that something be done to upgrade the political briefing papers that go to the President for each campaign stop. These are prepared initially by Harry Dent and forwarded to John Ehrlichman for review from an issues standpoint. From there they go to Dave Hoopes for inclusion in the President's trip package.

The trip package is distributed to the following people: Ziegler, Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Higby, Waldron, Warren, Ball Chapin, Butterfield, Hoopes (file copy).

We should have some input from Bob Teeter including the latest trial heat information and a check on the Ehrlichman issues information. We found a couple of errors in the latest analyses for Pennsylvania and New York.

This can be done in one of two ways:

1. Take the political analysis as it comes from Ehrlichman's office and rewrite it to include the Teeter data. If we do this, distribution will have to be limited to the President and H. since none of the other people are to receive the trial heat information.
2. Include the memo from Dent, checked by Ehrlichman, in all trip packages after double checking it with Teeter and include in the ~~President's and~~ Haldeman's trip package a separate memo from Teeter on trial heats.

RECOMMENDATION:

That we proceed as outlined in Option 2. It is a round-about solution but will keep people from asking about or borrowing the information from you on the plane. It will also preclude the inevitable appeals from at least Ziegler, Ehrlichman, and Chapin to receive the political brief information.

APPROVE K

DISAPPROVE _____

If approve, attached are the Teeter addenda for Pennsylvania and New York. The standard Dent memo has been checked and will be included in all trip packages for these trips.

TEETER ANALYSIS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Our private polls show that the President's lead increased from 7% in Pennsylvania to 33% over the July-August period. Our follow-up study since early September indicates that this lead has held very steady during the past six weeks.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
6/27 - 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/14 - 1701	60	27	14	+33
10/16 - 1701	61	27	12	+34

The level of commitment in Pennsylvania also indicates that the President's lead is solid. The President has substantial leads in every geographic region of the state except the city of Philadelphia where he trails McGovern by 7%. Our Philadelphia data indicates that at this point the President would lose the city of Philadelphia by approximately 90,000 votes. It is generally accepted that a Republican candidate to have any chance to win statewide must hold his loss in Philadelphia to under 200,000. The President lost the city by approximately 271,000 in 1968 while losing the state overall by only 169,000.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Philadelphia	36	43	21
Philadelphia Suburbs	67	21	12
Allegheny County	62	31	7
Southwest	67	25	8
Anthracite Area	69	19	13
Other	67	16	17

In most recent elections there has not been nearly as much ticket-splitting in the city of Philadelphia as there has in the suburbs. It would appear, however, that this year the President has the opportunity to increase the amount of ticket-splitting in the city in his favor by a very substantial margin. While the President's committed vote in Philadelphia is at 36%, the other Republican statewide candidates, one of whom is black, are only getting 12 to 14% of the vote.

Rizzo is extremely popular with all of the white voters in Philadelphia (78% approval) and across the state.

Vietnam is the most important issue statewide followed by taxes, inflation, unemployment and crime. Pennsylvania recently adopted a state income tax for the first time

which is very unpopular and has caused Governor Shapp's approval rating to drop down to about 35%.

In Philadelphia, Vietnam as an issue is followed by unemployment, crime, high taxes and drugs. The importance of unemployment, however, is skewed high by the high concern of blacks with it and crime is by far the most important issue with white voters.

Pa

The President lost Pennsylvania in 1968 by 4%. He received 44% of the vote compared to Humphrey's 48% and Wallace's 8%. He trailed the normal Republican vote of 50% by 6%. He trailed the normal vote by the farthest in Allegheny County and Philadelphia City. He also did poorly in the suburban east Pennsylvania counties. Only in some of the rural central Pennsylvania counties did he exceed the normal vote.

	1968			1968		Average Rep. Strength
	Nixon	Humphrey	Wallace	Schweiker	Clark	
Statewide	44	48	8	53	47	50
Philadelphia	30	63	7	38	62	36
<u>Suburb-Phila.</u> (Delaware)	50	41	9	61	39	58
Bucks	49	40	11	60	40	56
Allegheny	37	52	11	51	49	48

A republican who carries Pennsylvania obviously has to run ahead of normal Republican strength by at least 1 or 2% and past voting patterns have shown that all of the Republicans who have carried Pennsylvania have had essentially the same pattern of support.

TEETER ANALYSIS OF PENNSYLVANIA

As ~~in most other states~~ our private polls show that the President's lead increased from approximately ~~7~~ % in Pennsylvania to 33% over the July-August period. Our follow-up study since early September indicates that this lead has held very steady during the past six weeks.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
6/27 - 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/14 - 1701	60	27	14	+33
10/16 - 1701	61	27	12	+34

The level of commitment in Pennsylvania also indicates that the President's lead is solid. The President has substantial leads in every geographic region of the state except the city of Philadelphia where he trails McGovern by 7%. Our Philadelphia data indicates that at this point the President would lose the City of Philadelphia by approximately 90,000 votes. It is generally accepted that a Republican candidate to have any chance to win statewide must hold his loss in Philadelphia to under 200,000. The President lost the City by approximately 271,000 in 1968 while losing the state overall by only 169,000.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Philadelphia	36	43	21
Philadelphia Suburbs	67	21	12
Allegheny County	62	31	7
Southwest	67	25	8
Anthracite Area	69	19	13
Other	67	16	17

In most recent elections there has not been nearly as much ticket-splitting in the City of Philadelphia as there has in the suburbs. It would appear, however, that this year the President has the opportunity to increase the amount of ticket-splitting in the city in his favor by a very substantial margin. While the President's committed vote in Philadelphia is at 36%, the other Republican statewide candidates, one of whom is black, are only getting 12 to 14% of the vote. The greatest potential for the President to gain from this ticket-splitting is in the three Jewish wards in the northeastern section of the city (53, 56 and 63) and several wards also in the northeastern section of the city that are largely Eastern European (55, 57, 64, 65 and 66) and in the Italian areas in South Philadelphia (Wards 1, 2, and 39).

Our most recent Philadelphia polls indicate the President may be losing a small amount of support in the Jewish wards, that he is running very strongly in the Eastern European areas and in Ward 39 which is the largest Italian ward of the city. Also while he is leading in wards 1 and 2, there appears to be the potential for him to gain even more votes in these areas.

Rizzo is extremely popular with all of the white voters in Philadelphia (78% approval) and across the state.

Vietnam is the most important issue statewide followed by taxes, inflation, unemployment and crime. Pennsylvania recently adopted a state income tax for the first time which is very unpopular and has caused Governor Shapp's approval rating to drop down to about 35%.

In Philadelphia Vietnam as an issue is followed by unemployment, crime, high taxes and drugs. The importance of unemployment, however, is skewed high by the high concern of blacks with it and crime is by far the most important issue with white voters.

The President should, in his statement on revenue sharing or at some time while he is in Philadelphia, emphasize how revenue sharing will hold local taxes down and at the same time assist in the strengthening of local police departments and in the control of drugs.

The President lost Pennsylvania in 1968 by 4%. He received 44% of the vote compared to Humphrey's 48% and Wallace's 8%. He trailed the normal Republican vote of 50% by 6%. He trailed the normal vote by the farthest in Allegheny County and Philadelphia City. He also did poorly in the suburban east Pennsylvania counties. Only in some of the rural central Pennsylvania counties did he exceed the normal vote.

	1968			1968		Average Rep. Strength
	Nixon	Humphrey	Wallace	Schweiker	Clark	
Statewide	44	48	8	53	47	50
Philadelphia	30	63	7	38	62	36
Suburb-Phila. (Delaware)	50	41	9	61	39	58
Bucks	49	40	11	60	40	56
Allegheny	37	52	11	51	49	48

A republican who carries Pennsylvania obviously has to run ahead of normal Republican strength by at least 1 or 2% and past voting patterns have shown that all of the Republicans who have carried Pennsylvania have had essentially the same pattern of support.

TESTED ANALYSIS OF PREDICTIONS

As in most other states our private polls show that the President's lead increased from approximately 7% in Pennsylvania to 33% over the July-August period. Our follow-up study since early September indicates that this lead has held very steady during the past six weeks.

	Nixon	McGovern	Undecided	Margin
6/27 - 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/14 - 1701	60	27	14	+33
10/16 - 1701	61	27	12	+34

The level of commitment in Pennsylvania also indicates that the President's lead is solid. The President has substantial leads in every geographic region of the state except the city of Philadelphia where he trails McGovern by 7%. Our Philadelphia data indicates that at this point the President would lose the City of Philadelphia by approximately 90,000 votes. It is generally accepted that a Republican candidate to have any chance to win statewide must hold his loss in Philadelphia to under 200,000. The President lost the City by approximately 271,000 in 1968 while losing the state overall by only 169,000.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Philadelphia	36	43	21
Philadelphia Suburbs	67	21	12
Allegheny County	62	31	7
Southwest	67	25	8
Anthracite Area	69	19	13
Other	67	16	17

In most recent elections there has not been nearly as much ticket-splitting in the City of Philadelphia as there has in the suburbs. It would appear, however, that this year the President has the opportunity to increase the amount of ticket-splitting in the city in his favor by a very substantial margin. While the President's committed vote in Philadelphia is at 36%, the other Republican statewide candidates, one of whom is black, are only getting 12 to 14% of the vote. The greatest potential for the President to gain from this ticket-splitting is in the three Jewish wards in the northeastern section of the city (53, 56 and 63) and several wards also in the northeastern section of the city that are largely Eastern European (55, 57, 64, 65 and 66) and in the Italian areas in South Philadelphia (Wards 1, 2, and 39).

Our most recent Philadelphia polls indicate the President may be losing a small amount of support in the Jewish wards, that he is running very strongly in the Eastern European areas and in Ward 39 which is the largest Italian ward of the city. Also while he is leading in wards 1 and 2, there appears to be the potential for him to gain even more votes in these areas.

Rizzo is extremely popular with all of the white voters in Philadelphia (78% approval) and across the state.

Vietnam is the most important issue statewide followed by taxes, inflation, unemployment and crime. Pennsylvania recently adopted a state income tax for the first time which is very unpopular and has caused Governor Scapp's approval rating to drop down to about 35%.

In Philadelphia Vietnam as an issue is followed by unemployment, crime, high taxes and drugs. The importance of unemployment, however, is skewed high by the high concern of blacks with it and crime is by far the most important issue with white voters.

The President should, in his statement on revenue sharing or at some time while he is in Philadelphia, emphasize how revenue sharing will hold local taxes down and at the same time assist in the strengthening of local police departments and in the control of drugs.

TEETER ANALYSIS OF NEW YORK

The Committee for the Re-Election of the President's private and public polls indicate the President is now running well in New York.

		<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
6/30	- 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/11	- 1701	55	33	11	+22
9/26	- Yankelovich	57	33	10	+34
10/10	- Yankelovich	50	33	17	+17
10/10	- 1701	54	33	11	+23

This data indicates that the lead the President gained over the summer is holding steady and while McGovern can be expected to pick up more of the undecideds than the President as they are largely Democrats and Ticket-Splitters, there is no evidence that the President is now in jeopardy of losing the state. In order for McGovern to carry the state there would have to be a substantial amount of switching away from the President by voters who now intend to vote for him.

The President's greatest increases have come with middle income working class people, many of whom are Catholics and Jews in

New York. He is now getting approximately 35% of the Jewish vote which is more than double his 1968 Jewish vote and over 60% of the Catholics.

Geographically his greatest gains from 1968 have come in the upstate cities, particularly Buffalo, and on Long Island.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
Suffolk/Nassau	61	27	12	+34
Manhattan	29	69	2	-40
Bronx/Queens/Kings	49	38	13	+11
Westchester/Putnam	55	33	12	+22
Greene/Ulster/ St. Lawrence/Oneida/ Onondaga/Chemung	71	17	12	+54
Erie	59	29	12	+35
Albany/Monroe	50	39	11	+11

The areas the President will visit are those that have the highest level of ticket-splitting in the state. They are largely middle and upper middle class suburbs. Yonkers is the largest city on the route and has a large Italian population. Rockefeller was the beneficiary of very high ticket-splitting in 1970 and it appears that the President will be this year.

New Rochelle is over 50% Jewish. Hastings-on-Hudson, Dobbs Ferry, Irvington and Tarrytown are largely WASP, upper middle income suburbs.

As in all other states, Vietnam is mentioned by the largest number of people as the most important issue in the Presidential election statewide and in all of the local areas of the state. It is particularly important to the voters in Westchester County and Manhattan. The next most important issues statewide are the economy, particularly inflation, drugs and crime, and taxes. Other important issues in Westchester County are inflation and crime. In Suffolk and Nassau Counties, inflation is also the second most important issue, and taxes third. There are no significant differences in the issue concerns of the various voting groups in the areas the President will visit.

NY

The average Republican strength for statewide candidates in New York is 44%. In 1968 the President ran at just this level and lost the state by just under 6%. Wallace got 5.2%.

The President ran only at about the level of average Republican strength in most of the upstate counties and behind it in several of the large urban counties, particularly New York, Erie (Buffalo), Monroe (Rochester) and Westchester. He ran well ahead of average Republican strength in Suffolk and Onondaga (Syracuse); he ran about even with it in Nassau, Queens and Kings.

	1968			1970		Average Rep. Strength
	Nixon	Humphrey	Wallace	Rockefeller	Goldberg	
Statewide	44	50	5	57	43	
Westchester Co.	50	45	5	67	33	53
Hastings-on-Hudson						
Dobbs Ferry	48	46	6	59	41	
Irvington						
Tarrytown						
Larchmont	52	44	4	61	39	
Momoroneck						
New Rochelle	41	54	5	55	45	
Yonkers	48	43	9	62	38	
Tuckahoe	62	34	3	69	31	
White Plains	47	49	4	60	40	
Nassau Co.	51	43	5	61	39	51
Suffolk Co.	58	55	8	67	31	47

The CREPTeeter Analysis of New York

Both our private and the public polls indicate the President is now running very well in New York.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
6/30 - 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/9 - 1701	55	33	11	+22
9/26 - Yankelovich	57	33	10	+34
10/10- Yankelovich	50	33	17	+17
10/10- 1701	54	33	11	+23

This data indicates that the lead the President gained over the summer is holding steady and while McGovern can be expected to pick up more of the undecideds than the President as they are largely Democrats and Ticket-Splitters, there is no evidence that the President is now in jeopardy of losing the state. In order for McGovern to carry the state there would have to be a substantial amount of switching away from the President by voters who now intend to vote for him.

The most recent Yankelovich poll (New York Times last Monday) noted that the pattern of the President's support is similar to that of Eisenhower in 1956 and Rockefeller in 1970.

The President's greatest increases have come with middle income working class people, many of whom are Catholics and Jews in New York. He is now getting approximately 35% of the Jewish vote which is more than double his 1968 Jewish vote and over 60% of the Catholics.

Geographically his greatest gains from 1968 have come in the upstate cities, particularly Buffalo and on Long Island.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
Suffolk/Nassau	61	27	12	+34
Manhattan	29	69	2	
Bronx/Queens/Kings	49	38	13	
Westchester/Putnam	55	33	12	+22
Greene/Ulster/St. Lawrence/ Oneida/Onondaga/Chemung	71	17	12	+54
Erie	59	29	12	+35
Albany/Monroe	50	39	11	+11

The areas the President will visit are those that have the highest level of ticket-splitting in the state. They are largely middle and upper middle class suburbs. Yonkers is the largest city on the route and has a large Italian population. Rockefeller was the beneficiary of very high ticket-splitting in 1970 and it appears that the President will be this year. New Rochelle is over 50% Jewish. Hastings-on-Hudson, Dobbs Ferry, Irvington and Tarrytown are largely WASP, upper middle income suburbs.

As in all other states Vietnam is mentioned by the largest number of people as the most important issue in the Presidential election statewide and in all of the local areas of the state. It is particularly important to the voters in Westchester County and Manhattan. The next most important issues statewide are the economy, particularly inflation, drugs and crime, and taxes. Other important issues in Westchester county are inflation and crime. In Suffolk and Nassau County inflation is also the second most important issue, and taxes third. There are no significant differences in the issue concerns of the various voting groups in the areas the President will visit.

~~Our recommendation is that the President discuss Vietnam in Westchester county and include some discussion of foreign affairs and national defense if he speaks in New Rochelle. These issues appear to be the words many Jews use when referring to Israel and the Middle East. In Nassau and Suffolk counties he should discuss property taxes with some emphasis on how revenue sharing will hold property taxes down. It is also important that he emphasize how revenue sharing helps suburban areas as well as large cities as I have seen some evidence in other~~

~~polls that some suburban and rural residents feel revenue sharing
is directed only at the large central cities.~~

NY

The average Republican strength for statewide candidates in New York is 44%. In 1968 the President ran at just this level and lost the state by just under 6%. Wallace got 5.2%.

The President ran only at about the level of average Republican strength in most of the upstate counties and behind it in several of the large urban counties, particularly New York, Erie (Buffalo), Monroe (Rochester) and Westchester. He ran well ahead of average Republican strength in Suffolk and Onondaga (Syracuse); he ran about even with it in Nassau, Queens and Kings.

	1968			1970		Average Rep. Strength
	Nixon	Humphrey	Wallace	Rockefeller	Goldberg	
Statewide	44	50	5	57	43	
Westchester Co.	50	45	5	67	33	53
Hastings-on-Hudson						
Dobbs Ferry	48	46	6	59	41	
Irvington						
Tarrytown						
Larchmont	52	44	4	61	39	
Momoroneck						
New Rochelle	41	54	5	55	45	
Yonkers	48	43	9	62	38	
Tuckahoe	62	34	3	69	31	
White Plains	47	49	4	60	40	
Nassau Co.	51	43	5	61	39	51
Suffolk Co.	53	43	8	67	31	47

~~TO BE DELETED~~Total Counties of New York

Both our private and the public polls indicate the President is now running very well in New York.

The areas the President will visit are those that have the highest level of ticket-splitting in the state. They are largely middle and upper middle class suburbs. Yonkers is the largest city on the route and has a large Italian population. Rockefeller was the beneficiary of very high ticket-splitting in 1970 and it appears that the President will be this year. New Rochelle is over 50% Jewish. Hastings-on-Hudson, Dobbs Ferry, Irvington and Tarrytown are largely WASP, upper middle income suburbs:

As in all other states Vietnam is mentioned by the largest number of people as the most important issue in the Presidential election statewide and in all of the local areas of the state. It is particularly important to the voters in Westchester County and Manhattan. The next most important issues statewide are the economy, particularly inflation, drugs and crime, and taxes. Other important issues in Westchester county are inflation and crime. In Suffolk and Nassau County inflation is also the second most important issue, and taxes third. There are no significant differences in the issue concerns of the various voting groups in the areas the President will visit.

Our recommendation is that the President discuss Vietnam in Westchester county and include some discussion of foreign affairs and national defense if he speaks in New Rochelle. These issues appear to be the words many Jews use when referring to Israel and the Middle East. In Nassau and Suffolk counties he should discuss property taxes with some emphasis on how revenue sharing will hold property taxes down. It is also important that he emphasize how revenue sharing helps suburban areas as well as large cities as I have seen some evidence in other

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
6/30 - 1701	49	42	9	+ 7
9/9 - 1701	55	33	11	+22
9/26 - Yankelovich	57	33	10	+34
10/10- Yankelovich	50	33	17	+17
10/10- 1701	54	33	11	+23

This data indicates that the lead the President gained over the summer is holding steady and while McGovern can be expected to pick up more of the undecideds than the President as they are largely Democrats and Ticket-Splitters, there is no evidence that the President is now in jeopardy of losing the state. In order for McGovern to carry the state there would have to be a substantial amount of switching away from the President by voters who now intend to vote for him.

The most recent Yankelovich poll (New York Times last Monday) noted that the pattern of the President's support is similar to that of Eisenhower in 1956 and Rockefeller in 1970.

The President's greatest increases have come with middle income working class people, many of whom are Catholics and Jews in New York. He is now getting approximately 35% of the Jewish vote which is more than double his 1968 Jewish vote and over 60% of the Catholics.

Geographically his greatest gains from 1968 have come in the upstate cities, particularly Buffalo and on Long Island.

	<u>Nixon</u>	<u>McGovern</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Margin</u>
Suffolk/Nassau	61	27	12	+34
Manhattan	29	69	2	
Bronx/Queens/Kings	49	38	13	
Westchester/Putnam	55	33	12	+22
Greece/Ulster/St. Lawrence/ Oneida/Onondaga/Cazenovia	71	17	12	+54
Erie	59	29	12	+35
Albany/Monroe	50	39	11	+11

polls that some suburban and rural residents feel revenue sharing
is directed only at the large central cities.

65

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 12, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: L. HIGBY L

John Ehrlichman turned in a memorandum to the President entitled "The South: Politics and Issues" and it was a combination of work done by his staff and Harry Dent. In it for each of the southern states there was significant poll data that I think we should check against our figures.

We shouldn't have Ehrlichman's office sending in poll data about how much the President's going to win by and what the Senate races are without us even knowing about it. Let's get on top of this thing. I've mentioned it to you once before and I'd like to know what specific steps or plans you are taking to make sure you are on top of it for the next trip. What happened on this one? Is the information that Ehrlichman forwarded to the President correct?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOHN EHRLICHMAN

SUBJECT: The South: Politics and Issues

The political sections of what follows were drafted by Harry Dent. The issues sections were assembled by my staff.

ALABAMA: This could be the President's best state. Governor Wallace has been silent on both presidential and senatorial races, except to say he will vote the "Democratic ticket," though implication was that he means on state level. Red Blount closed somewhat on Sparkman, mainly by McGovern linkage. Rumors out that White House really doesn't want to beat Sparkman. GOP will hold its three seats but redistricted Representative Bill Dickinson in tight race. Two House pickups possible, in Third and Fourth Districts.

Major National Issues:

1701 Third Wave Poll - Sept. 5-12

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| 1. Vietnam | 49% |
| 2. Drugs | 41 |
| 3. Inflation | 38 |
| 4. Crime | 36 |
| 5. Taxes | 32 |
| 6. Unemployment | 29 |
| (Busing is ninth with 19%.) | |

ARKANSAS: The President will win here by 55% to 60%. Rep. Paul Hammerschmidt will hold his GOP seat. Wayne Babbitt (R) has little chance against Senator McClellan. Dale Bumpers (D) will easily hold The Statehouse against Len Blaylock. Bumpers has reorganized state government, GOP charging it has resulted in cost increase. Amtrak eliminated Arkansas' only rail passenger service. Bumpers now making noise about it.

Major National Issues:

Source: Ray Brown, 1701 Regional Director

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Taxes
4. Crime
5. Drugs
6. Unemployment

FLORIDA: Another solid win for the President. No statewide races. GOP could pick up new Fifth and Tenth Districts. Last March in the primary, there were heavy votes against busing and for prayer. Gov. Askew's stance for busing has hurt him.

Major National Issues:

Source: An assessment by Peter Sawers, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Taxes
4. Unemployment
5. Crime
6. Drugs
7. Busing

Additional Comments:

In Florida, there is a strong interest in space and military installations. There is lingering concern about busing, but it isn't nearly as strong as it was earlier in the year during the primary.

KENTUCKY: President will win big here. This will be the most important factor for Louie Nunn against Dee Huddleston in Senate race. Possible House pickup in Sixth District; GOP candidate is Laban Jackson. His fortunes tied to President's strength.

Major National Issues:

Source: Assessment by Peter Sawers, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Unemployment
4. Taxes

Additional Comments:

Mine safety is a significant issue in eastern Kentucky. Military and government installations are important in Kentucky and are of concern.

LOUISIANA: The President, according to a recent poll is ahead with 68.2%, with 16.4% for McGovern. GOP Senatorial candidate Bennett Johnston and Independent ex-Governor John McKeithen. GOP candidate David Treen is two to four points ahead in the Third District.

Major National Issues:

Source: Senate candidate Toledano private poll

1. Vietnam
2. Economy
3. Crime
4. Drugs
5. Moral decay
6. Race

Major State Issues:

1. Corruption
2. Jobs
3. Crime
4. Education
5. Cost of living
6. Taxes

Additional Comments:

Busing does not seem to be a major issue in Louisiana. There is concern about drugs and crime in New Orleans. The localized issue is the offshore oil royalties question. Louisiana wants royalties beyond present limit, but we have opposed this request because by international law these royalties belong to all 50 states.

MISSISSIPPI: A win for the President of 72% according to late September poll. Some GOP demoralization and much visibility to White House non-support for GOP candidate Carmichael against Senator Eastland. Likely GOP House pickup in Fifth District, where former AA to retiring Rep. Colmer running on GOP ticket. Good shot in Second District, possible in Third. In recent poll, much sentiment for reduction of foreign aid, for President's Vietnam policy.

Major National Issues:

Source: Assessment made by Ray Brown, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Unemployment
4. Crime
5. Drugs
6. Taxes

Additional Comments:

In the Gulf Coast area, there is concern about the Navy holding up funds for the shipbuilding contracts with Litton Industries.

NORTH CAROLINA: Recent regional polls show the President winning from 64% to 82%. Jim Holshouser (R) is closing on Skipper Bowles in the gubernatorial race, though still lagging. Jesse Helms is within four points of Nick Galifianakis in the Senate race according to two recent Democratic polls. GOP may pick up the Galifianakis seat, but Jonas' vacant seat in danger. Busing remains a hot issue.

Major National Issues:

Source: Assessment made by Peter Sawers, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Drugs
4. Crime
5. Taxes

Additional Comments:

The Republican Party in this state is in disarray and filled with factions.

SOUTH CAROLINA: Another win of at least 60-70% is expected for the President. Strom Thurmond will have closer race than expected against State Senator Nick Zeigler. Possible House pickup in First District (old Rivers seat) and Sixth District where Ed Young is carrying GOP banner for John McMillan's old seat. Textile issue is a plus here for the President, as is Vietnam policy; busing simmers.

Major National Issues:

Source: Central Surveys poll (probably for Thurmond)
taken within the last two weeks

- | | |
|----------------|-------|
| 1. Vietnam | 42.3% |
| 2. Inflation | 26.0 |
| 3. Welfare | 17.0 |
| 4. Crime/Drugs | 8.7 |
| 5. Taxes | 8.0 |

State Issues:

Source: Same as above

- | | |
|-----------------|-------|
| 1. Unemployment | 18.7% |
| 2. Education | 17.3 |
| 3. Inflation | 12.3 |
| 4. Welfare | 11.3 |
| 5. Civil Rights | 9.0 |

TENNESSEE: Party leaders see a win for the President at about 60%+. Senator Baker will win in a tough race with Rep. Ray Blanton, GOP could pick up Fifth, Sixth (new) Districts. Rep. Dan Kuykendall (R) in tough race in new Eighth District. Busing extremely potent, particularly in Nashville and Memphis.

Major National Issues:

Source: Assessment made by Peter Sawers, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Taxes
4. Crime
5. Drugs
6. Busing

TEXAS: Chances for the President to win look good. Tower race remains close. Republicans concerned about Connally impact on Tower. GOP gubernatorial candidate Hank Grover, though closing, probably won't beat Democrat Dolph Briscoe. Good House shot in 24th District (new). Incumbents Bob Price (R) and Graham Purcell (D) head-on in new 13th. Price win is possible. Busing hot in Dallas, Austin and Corpus Christi.

Major National Issues:

Source: 1701 Third Wave Poll - Sept. 5-10

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Crime
4. Unemployment
5. Drugs

Major State Issues:

Source: 1701 Second Wave Poll - June 13-27

1. New leadership and scandal
2. High taxes

Additional Comments:

The insurance and loan scandal which rocked the Texas legislature still reverberates and is an important issue to ticket-splitters and upper socio-economic types. Vietnam is especially important in Corpus Christi and Houston. Drugs are important to blacks and women, inflation is important to ticket-splitters and Republicans. High taxes are important to Democrats and ticket-splitters, especially in Mid- and West Texas. Unemployment is important to blacks, Mexican-Americans and in South Texas. The President's weaker areas are in Houston and the Gulf Coast.

VIRGINIA: The President's win here will be strong. Would have major impact on Rep. Bill Scott's Senate race against William Spong. House wins possible in Fourth and Eighth Districts. Recent floods in Richmond, Petersburg quite serious. Busing still hot in scattered areas.

Major National Issues:

Source: Assessment made by Peter Sawers, 1701 Regional Dir.

1. Vietnam
2. Inflation
3. Taxes
4. Unemployment
5. Crime
6. Drugs

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 10/19/72

TO: H.R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

This report by Malek summarizes his Field Operations' canvassing in the Key States. The data is somewhat dated - a report later this week will show 7 million instead of 3.5 million contacted. All data is recorded in a campaign control room at 1730 Pa. that is one of the more interesting aspects of this campaign.

Mosiman is not doing as poorly as his sheet indicates - there was just a reporting lag.

1

Committee
for the Re-election
of the President

1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 (202) 333-0920

October 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR
FROM: FRED MALEK
SUBJECT: Canvassing Results

OVERALL PROGRESS

This memorandum reports the progress on door to door canvassing through October 7 and telephone canvassing through October 5. All but six states are now reporting canvassing results to our control center, and all telephone centers are reporting. The reported progress is as follows: (000 omitted)

Total Households in U. S.	63,316
Total Households in Priority Counties	48,149
Total Households Contacted Door to Door	3,459
% Priority County Households Canvassed	7.1%
Total Households Contacted by Phone	2,548
Total Households Canvassed Door to Door and by Telephone	6,006
% Priority County Households Canvassed	12.0%

Taken overall, I am pleased with the progress to date. A major canvassing effort is underway across the country with the three most important canvassing weeks yet to come (October 7 through October 28). At the same time neither the door to door nor the telephone banks have met the quotas we had originally set. This is due largely to a very late start by most states along with a certain amount of apathy we have encountered in generating volunteers. How well we do ultimately depends on whether or not we can make up for some of the lost time during the last three weeks in October. Needless to say, we are pushing hard to make this happen, and I hope to double the above results by October 28.

PROGRESS IN KEY STATES

When the overall results are broken out on a state by state basis, the results are uneven with some states performing superbly and with some not yet getting the job done. Tab A shows the progress in the key states, and the following paragraphs comment on this progress.

California is moving quite well with 24% of the priority county households canvassed either by phone or door to door. They are in high gear and should continue their fine performance.

Connecticut is canvassing, but results are below our expectations. Their organization is strong but they haven't yet delivered. We are hammering hard here, and I believe we can bring them up substantially.

Illinois has clearly generated the most outstanding results of any state - 924,991 households have been canvassed door to door and 271,699 have been telephoned. This represents roughly 37% of the households in the priority counties.

Maryland was considered to have the best organization, but the results are not as good as we had hoped from a state which organized for a primary. Twenty-two percent of the households have been contacted, mostly by telephone. Door to door was de-emphasized early with the goal of reaching the greatest number of households possible over the telephone.

New Jersey is doing an excellent job in light of their late start. Nineteen percent of the households in the priority counties have been contacted and I expect a major surge in the next three weeks.

Michigan has canvassed but the results have not been reported. We anticipate a fairly good performance, but any real appraisal must be based on the numbers.

Ohio shows a disappointing 10% canvass rate, but due to lax discipline, have not yet reported all that has been done. Therefore, they are likely to be in much better shape than indicated but again, we must await the numbers to make a meaningful evaluation.

New York, Pennsylvania and Texas are doing less well. Each has contacted 12 to 15% of their priority county households. New York and Pennsylvania have been working hard but have a lot of ground to cover and have not had firm leadership. They are clearly the worst of our key states although they are moving fairly well now. Texas is the victim of a late reorganization and is just beginning a hard effort. Because of this, Texas' major canvassing effort will be made from phone banks.

In the seven other battleground states, canvassing progress is behind that achieved in the key states. Their efforts have not, of course, been supplemented by the telephone banks, nor have their campaigns been as well financed as those in the key states. These states have canvassed 6.1% of the households in the priority counties as shown in Tab B. Of these states, Missouri, Washington and Oregon have done relatively well. Wisconsin has not yet begun their key cities program which was designed to get the canvassing done during the month before the election. Massachusetts will show rapid improvement and is not too bad off considering the late start. Minnesota should also improve. West Virginia, on the other hand, is a disaster, and I doubt if they will ever show the results needed. Progress for all other states by Regional Director is shown at Tab C.

ACTIONS TAKEN

In order to bolster the states where canvassing is going poorly, I have taken the following actions:

1. Assigned fieldman support to states where added management is needed - New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Texas, California, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, West Virginia, and Washington.
2. Personally talked to the State Chairmen, Executive Directors and other key personnel to re-emphasize the importance of canvassing and the results we are expecting of them. I am spending a good deal of my time on this telephone work now and am applying severe heat.
3. Instructed the Regional Directors to emphasize phone bank operations in the key states and make them the number one priority for the last three weeks of October. Their calling capacity, if properly utilized, can add significantly to the households contacted in the closing weeks of the campaign. Also, since they are essential to our get out the vote effort, it is imperative that all of them are fully manned and operating properly.
4. Increased the state budgets where finances have been a problem - Oregon, Massachusetts, Missouri and Wisconsin.

* * *

In summary, I am pleased at where we now stand in our canvassing efforts. Where weaknesses have appeared, actions are being taken to bolster the effort and I am certain the canvass results by October 28 will be impressive. Our major concern now is to plan our "Get-Out-The-Vote" effort so that it can turn out the favorables found in the door to door canvass as well as all registered Republicans.

One final note, the control system is now fully on stream. It not only provides the attached results, but also shows performance on every county in the country. I encourage you to visit the control room again for a complete review. Because it is clearly an innovation in national campaigns, you may want to mention it to the President.

Bcc: H.R. Halderman ✓

KEY STATES

PROGRESS REPORT

ON

DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
						Number Contacted Priority Counties
CALIFORNIA	5,047,704	424,000	8.3	768,612	152	15.1
CONNECTICUT	730,997	69,777	9.5	13,958	6.0	18.5
ILLINOIS	2,604,869	224,971	8.5	271,677	10.7	15.7
MARYLAND	935,627	61,780	6.6	145,317	15.6	17.1
NEW JERSEY	1,660,037	257,845	15.5	63,720	37	12.9
NEW YORK	4,902,038	191,206	3.9	511,205	12.2	11.1
OHIO	2,573,045	82,277	3.4	167,368	6.5	7.1
PENNSYLVANIA	3,095,630	141,842	4.5	238,057	7.1	11.1
TEXAS	2,270,018			345,816	15.2	15.2
TOTALS	23,819,965	2,160,742	9.0	2,542,731	12.5	15.1

BATTLEGROUND STATES

TAB B

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
						Number Contacted Priority Counties
Missouri	1,181,870	87,433	7.3	n/a	112	7.1
Mass.	1,177,833	37,787	3.2	n/a	112	3.1
Minn.	883,676	56,505	6.2	n/a	112	6.2
WASH.	837,966	87,584	10.4	n/a	112	10.4
OREGON	525,461	127,186	24.2	n/a	112	24.2
W. VIRGINIA	414,372	3,332	.8	n/a	112	.7
Alsc.	1,453,430					
TOTALS	6,497,614	400,827	6.1			6.1

YEUTTERPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
IOWA	574,000	92,884	16.1	n/a	n/a	16.1
KANSAS	573,505	51,940	9.0	n/a	n/a	9.0
Minn.	883,676	55,505	6.2	n/a	n/a	6.2
NEBRASKA	376,995			n/a	n/a	
N.DAKOTA	140,592			n/a	n/a	
Oklahoma	623,018	20,740	3.3	n/a	n/a	3.3
S.DAKOTA	155,947			n/a	n/a	
TOTALS	3,327,733	221,069	6.6			

GOOCHPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total Households Contacted In Priority Counties
NEW YORK	41,902,038	191,206	3.9	501,235	10,21	101
PENNSYLVANIA	3,095,630	141,842	4.5	238,087	9,11	101
TOTALS	7,997,668	333,048	4.1	742,321	9,21	103

SAWERSPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total Households Contacted In Priority Counties
FLORIDA	1,667,263	54,249	3.2	1,127	1,127	1,127
KENTUCKY	873,976	51,424	5.7	1,127	1,127	1,127
MISSOURI	1,184,870	87,433	7.3	1,127	1,127	1,127
N.CAR.	1,033,775	5,697	.5	1,127	1,127	1,127
Tenn.	841,555	40,117	4.7	1,127	1,127	1,127
VIRGINIA	919,324	71,807	7.8	1,127	1,127	1,127
WEST. VA	414,372	3,332	.8	1,127	1,127	1,127
TOTALS	6,955,155	314,059	4.5			

RICHARDSPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
ALASKA	58,294	5,641	9.6	n/a	n/a	9.6
IDAHO	164,127	27,003	16.4	n/a	n/a	16.4
MONTANA	170,319	32,544	19.1	n/a	n/a	19.1
NEVADA	129,490	16,815	12.9	n/a	n/a	12.9
OREGON	525,467	127,186	24.2	n/a	n/a	24.2
UTAH	242,224	52,083	21.3	n/a	n/a	21.3
WASH.	857,966	89,581	10.1	n/a	n/a	10.1
WYOMING	83,860					
TOTALS	2,231,747	357,856	16.0			

MOSIMAN

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total Households Contacted In Priority Counties
INDIANA	1,174,407	3,760	.3			
MICHIGAN	2,103,959	3,296	.1			
OHIO	3,573,045	89,279	5.4	167,388	6.5	9.7
Wisconsin	1,453,430					
TOTALS	7,304,841	96,335	1.3	167,388	6.5	

KAUPINENPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
Connecticut	730,997	62,779	9.5	43,738 ²	6,0	10.5 ¹
Illinois	2,604,869	24,971	35.5	27,677	1,0	1.5 ²
Maine	238,070	22,501	9.4			
Mass.	1,177,833	37,787	3.2			
New Hampshire	174,936	40,786	33.3			
Vermont	107,077	3,987	3.7			
R.I.	232,456	31,146	13.3			
TOTALS	5,266,237	1,130,999	21.4	315,017	5,7	10.3

REED

PROGRESS REPORT

ON

DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Mde	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
Arizona	413,000	28,413	6.8	n/a	n/a	6.8
Colorado	549,861			n/a	n/a	
Hawaii	165,000	10,289	6.2	n/a	n/a	6.2
New Mex.	224,000	17,272	7.7	n/a	n/a	7.7
TEXAS	2,270,018			345,556	15,2-	15.2-
TOTALS	3,621,879	55,974	1.5	345,821	15.2-	15.2

BROWNPROGRESS REPORT
ON

DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
ALABAMA	642,865	18,296	2.8	n/p	n/p	2.8
ARKANSAS	433,724	27,079	6.2	n/p	n/p	6.2
GEORGIA	715,213	4,402	0.5	n/p	n/p	0.5
Louisiana	712,485	17,307	2.4	n/p	n/p	2.4
MISS.	403,784	96,501	23.8	n/p	n/p	23.8
S.CAR.	524,337	5,697	1.0	n/p	n/p	1.0
TOTALS	3,444,408	169,282	4.9			

MURRAYPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total Households Contacted In Priority Counties
DELAWARE	141,436	6,188	4.3			
MARYLAND	935,627	61,780	6.6	145,347	15.5	73.1
NEW JERSEY	1,660,031	357,815	21.5	62,710	2.7	11.2
D.C.	197,000	1,864	.9			
TOTALS	9,934,100	347,677	11.1	203,159	7.0	11.1

FM

To
H 10/19

**Committee
for the Re-election
of the President**

1701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 (202) 333-0920

October 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLARK MACGREGOR
FROM: FRED MALEK
SUBJECT: Canvassing Results

OVERALL PROGRESS

This memorandum reports the progress on door to door canvassing through October 7 and telephone canvassing through October 5. All but six states are now reporting canvassing results to our control center, and all telephone centers are reporting. The reported progress is as follows: (000 omitted)

Total Households in U. S.	63,316
Total Households in Priority Counties	48,149
Total Households Contacted Door to Door	3,459
% Priority County Households Canvassed	7.1%
Total Households Contacted by Phone	2,548
Total Households Canvassed Door to Door and by Telephone	6,006
% Priority County Households Canvassed	12.0%

Taken overall, I am pleased with the progress to date. A major canvassing effort is underway across the country with the three most important canvassing weeks yet to come (October 7 through October 28). At the same time neither the door to door nor the telephone banks have met the quotas we had originally set. This is due largely to a very late start by most states along with a certain amount of apathy we have encountered in generating volunteers. How well we do ultimately depends on whether or not we can make up for some of the lost time during the last three weeks in October. Needless to say, we are pushing hard to make this happen, and I hope to double the above results by October 28.

PROGRESS IN KEY STATES

When the overall results are broken out on a state by state basis, the results are uneven with some states performing superbly and with some not yet getting the job done. Tab A shows the progress in the key states, and the following paragraphs comment on this progress.

| California is moving quite well with 24% of the priority county households canvassed either by phone or door to door. They are in high gear and should continue their fine performance.

| Connecticut is canvassing, but results are below our expectations. Their organization is strong but they haven't yet delivered. We are hammering hard here, and I believe we can bring them up substantially.

| Illinois has clearly generated the most outstanding results of any state - 924,991 households have been canvassed door to door and 271,699 have been telephoned. This represents roughly 37% of the households in the priority counties.

| Maryland was considered to have the best organization, but the results are not as good as we had hoped from a state which organized for a primary. Twenty-two percent of the households have been contacted, mostly by telephone. Door to door was de-emphasized early with the goal of reaching the greatest number of households possible over the telephone.

| New Jersey is doing an excellent job in light of their late start. Nineteen percent of the households in the priority counties have been contacted and I expect a major surge in the next three weeks.

| Michigan has canvassed but the results have not been reported. We anticipate a fairly good performance, but any real appraisal must be based on the numbers.

| Ohio shows a disappointing 10% canvass rate, but due to lax discipline, have not yet reported all that has been done. Therefore, they are likely to be in much better shape than indicated but again, we must await the numbers to make a meaningful evaluation.

| New York, Pennsylvania and Texas are doing less well. Each has contacted 12 to 15% of their priority county households. New York and Pennsylvania have been working hard but have a lot of ground to cover and have not had firm leadership. They are clearly the worst of our key states although they are moving fairly well now. Texas is the victim of a late reorganization and is just beginning a hard effort. Because of this, Texas' major canvassing effort will be made from phone banks.

In the seven other battleground states, canvassing progress is behind that achieved in the key states. Their efforts have not, of course, been supplemented by the telephone banks, nor have their campaigns been as well financed as those in the key states. These states have canvassed 6.1% of the households in the priority counties as shown in Tab B. Of these states, Missouri, Washington and Oregon have done relatively well. Wisconsin has not yet begun their key cities program which was designed to get the canvassing done during the month before the election. Massachusetts will show rapid improvement and is not too bad off considering the late start. Minnesota should also improve. West Virginia, on the other hand, is a disaster, and I doubt if they will ever show the results needed. Progress for all other states by Regional Director is shown at Tab C.

ACTIONS TAKEN

In order to bolster the states where canvassing is going poorly, I have taken the following actions:

- ✓1. Assigned fieldman support to states where added management is needed - New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Texas, California, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, West Virginia, and Washington.
- 2. Personally talked to the State Chairmen, Executive Directors and other key personnel to re-emphasize the importance of canvassing and the results we are expecting of them. I am spending a good deal of my time on this telephone work now and am applying severe heat.
- 3. Instructed the Regional Directors to emphasize phone bank operations in the key states and make them the number one priority for the last three weeks of October. Their calling capacity, if properly utilized, can add significantly to the households contacted in the closing weeks of the campaign. Also, since they are essential to our get out the vote effort, it is imperative that all of them are fully manned and operating properly.
- 4. Increased the state budgets where finances have been a problem - Oregon, Massachusetts, Missouri and Wisconsin.

*

*

*

In summary, I am pleased at where we now stand in our canvassing efforts. Where weaknesses have appeared, actions are being taken to bolster the effort and I am certain the canvass results by October 28 will be impressive. Our major concern now is to plan our "Get-Out-The-Vote" effort so that it can turn out the favorables found in the door to door canvass as well as all registered Republicans.

One final note, the control system is now fully on stream. It not only provides the attached results, but also shows performance on every county in the country. I encourage you to visit the control room again for a complete review. Because it is clearly an innovation in national campaigns, you may want to mention it to the President.

BEST H. R. Haldeman ✓

KEY STATES

TAB A

PROGRESS REPORT

ON

DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
		Contacted Door to Door				
CALIFORNIA	5,047,704	424,000	8.3	768,512	11.2	15.5
CONNECTICUT	730,997	69,799	9.5	13,938	6.0	16.5
ILLINOIS	2,604,869	924,991	35.5	271,677	10.4	12.7
MARYLAND	933,627	61,780	6.6	145,317	15.6	22.1
NEW JERSEY	1,660,037	257,845	15.5	63,730	3.7	12.7
NEW YORK	4,902,038	191,206	3.9	501,235	10.2	11.1
OHIO	2,573,043	89,279	3.4	167,358	6.5	11.
PENNSYLVANIA	3,095,630	141,842	4.5	238,057	9.6	11.1
TEXAS	2,270,018			345,815	15.2	15.2
TOTALS	23,819,965	2,160,742	9.0	2,547,737	12.4	17.1

BATTLEGROUND STATES

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

TAB B

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
					Priority Counties	
Missouri	1,184,870	87,433	7.3	n/a	112	1.0
MASS.	1,177,833	37,787	3.2	n/a	112	3.2
MINN.	883,676	56,505	6.2	n/a	112	6.2
WASH.	857,966	87,584	10.4	n/a	112	10.4
OREGON	525,467	127,186	24.2	n/a	112	24.2
W. VIRGINIA	414,372	3,332	.8	n/a	112	.8
Wisc.	1,453,430					
TOTALS	6,497,614	400,827	6.1		112	

TAB C

COLLINS

PROGRESS REPORT

ON

DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted
		Door to Door	In Priority Counties			In Priority Counties
CALIFORNIA	5,047,704	424,000	8.3	768,512	15,22	23.5
TOTALS						

YEUTTERPROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
IOWA	574,000	92,884	16.1	n/p	n/p	16.1
KANSAS	573,505	51,940	9.0	n/p	n/p	9.0
MINN.	883,676	55,505	6.2	n/p	n/p	6.2
NEBRASKA	374,995			n/p	n/p	
N. DAKOTA	140,592			n/p	n/p	
OKLAHOMA	623,018	20,740	3.3	n/p	n/p	3.3
S. DAKOTA	155,947			n/p	n/p	
TOTALS	3,327,733	221,069	6.6			

GOOCH

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
						In Priority Counties
NEW YORK	4,902,038	191,206	3.9	501,235	132	1.1
PENNSYLVANIA	3,095,630	141,842	4.5	238,087	93	1.1
TOTALS	7,997,668	333,048	4.1	742,322	92	1.3

SAWERS

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total %
						Households Contacted In Priority Counties
FLORIDA	1,667,263	54,249	3.2	n/a	112	3.2
KENTUCKY	893,996	51,424	5.7	n/a	112	5.7
MISSOURI	1,184,870	87,453	7.3	n/a	112	7.3
N.CAR.	1,033,775	5,697	.5	n/a	112	.5
Tenn.	841,555	40,117	4.7	n/a	112	4.7
VIRGINIA	919,324	71,807	7.8	n/a	112	7.8
WEST. VA	414,372	3,532	.8	n/a	112	.8
TOTALS	6,955,155	314,059	4.5			

RICHARDS

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
ALASKA	58,294	5,641	9.6	n/a	n/a	9.6
IDAHO	164,127	27,003	16.4	n/a	n/a	16.4
MONTANA	170,319	33,544	19.1	n/a	n/a	19.1
NEVADA	129,490	16,815	12.9	n/a	n/a	12.9
OREGON	525,467	127,186	24.2	n/a	n/a	24.2
UTAH	242,224	59,083	24.3	n/a	n/a	24.3
WASH.	857,966	89,584	10.4	n/a	n/a	10.4
Wyoming	83,860					
TOTALS	2,231,747	357,856	16.0			

MOSIMAN

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
INDIANA	1,174,407	3,760	.3			
MICHIGAN	2,103,959	3,296	.1			
OHIO	2,573,045	89,279	3.4	167,288	6.5	9.9
Wisconsin	1,453,430					
TOTALS	7,304,841	96,335	1.3	167,288	6.5	

KAUPINEN

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
Connecticut	730,997	62,799	9.5	43,238	6.0	12.5
Illinois	2,604,869	924,991	35.5	271,677	13.9	45.7
Maine	238,070	22,501	9.4			
Mass.	1,177,833	37,787	3.2			
New Hampshire	174,935	40,786	23.3			
Vermont	107,071	3,989	3.7			
R.I.	232,456	31,146	13.3			
TOTALS	5,266,237	1,130,999	21.4	315,617	15.9	47.3

REED

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
Arizona	413,000	28,413	6.8	n/a	n/a	6.8
Colorado	549,861			n/a	n/a	
Hawaii	105,000	10,289	6.2	n/a	n/a	6.2
New Mex.	224,000	17,272	7.7	n/a	n/a	7.7
Texas	2,270,018			345,856	15,700	10.7
TOTALS	3,621,879	55,974	1.5	345,856	15,200	10.7

BROWN

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
ALABAMA	642,865	18,296	2.8	n/a	n/a	2.9
ARKANSAS	433,724	27,079	6.2	n/a	n/a	6.2
GEORGIA	745,213	4,401	0.5	n/a	n/a	0.5
Louisiana	712,485	17,307	2.4	n/a	n/a	2.4
MISS.	403,784	96,501	23.8	n/a	n/a	23.8
S.CAR.	524,337	5,697	1.0	n/a	n/a	1.0
TOTALS	3,444,408	169,282	4.9			

MURRAY

PROGRESS REPORT
ON
DOOR TO DOOR AND TELEPHONE CANVASSING

State	Number of Households in Priority Counties	Number of Households Contacted Door to Door	% Contacted In Priority Counties	Number of Telephone Calls Made	Number Contacted Priority Counties	Total % Households Contacted In Priority Counties
DELAWARE	141,436	6,188	4.3			
MARYLAND	935,627	61,780	6.6	145,347	15.5	23.1
NEW JERSEY	1,660,037	257,815	15.5	62,770	3.9	11.2
D.C.	197,000	1,864	.9			
TOTALS	2,934,100	327,677	11.1	208,159	7.0	11.1

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 10/20/72

TO: Charles Colson
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Bob disagrees with both suggestions.
Buchanan has been advised.

65
Hue
10/10

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some ideas sent in that have some merit: Considering the "corruption" charge, etc., why not have the President photographed in quasi-religious services; either Sunday services, funerals, if they come up -- or other -- which in and of itself makes McGovern look nasty in the character of his charges.

Secondly, strongly recommend that we take out ads in all major black publications attacking McGovern for taking blacks for granted -- and calling on blacks to repudiate that sentiment. These ads would serve to force McGovern to spend money to answer them -- and they might well weaken him in the black community as McGovern has never been strong there personally. This is the one major voting block where McGovern wins overwhelmingly -- and some hard negative ads might convince blacks either to "go fishing" or cut McGovern.

Buchanan

*I disagree on
both*
KJ

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 16, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN
CHARLES COLSON ✓
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Some ideas sent in that have some merit: Considering the "corruption" charge, etc., why not have the President photographed in quasi-religious services; either Sunday services, funerals, if they come up -- or other -- which in and of itself makes McGovern look nasty in the character of his charges.

Secondly, strongly recommend that we take out ads in all major black publications attacking McGovern for taking blacks for granted -- and calling on blacks to repudiate that sentiment. These ads would serve to force McGovern to spend money to answer them -- and they might well weaken him in the black community as McGovern has never been strong there personally. This is the one major voting block where McGovern wins overwhelmingly -- and some hard negative ads might convince blacks either to "go fishing" or cut McGovern.

Buchanan

Carter Buchanan - I heartily agree - we won't get any votes but we will stay home - see if we can do this car

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

~~ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL~~

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN *S*
SUBJECT: Key States and Senate Races

Clark MacGregor has approved a list of Key States which includes the crucial areas for the President as well as local candidates. The document attached at Tab A divides the President's Key States into four levels indicating the amount of effort.

Presidential Race

I = California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey,
New York and West Virginia

II = Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania

III = Maryland, Missouri, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin

IV = Minnesota

Local Races

The attached document uses a key to describe the situation in states where effort on behalf of local candidates is being directed:

NP = No effort necessary for the President

 = incumbent

() = House race

* = Maximum support

NG = Net gain in House or Senate

RO = Republican Open

For example, the situation in Illinois is: number II level of activity for the President; Percy is the incumbent Senator; Madigan is the Republican House candidate in the 21st trying to keep a Republican seat; Young is the Republican candidate who would be a net gain if he won the 10th seat.

Senate Races

The updated chart of the Senate Seats, with all available polling data and comments, is attached at Tab B. MacGregor will receive a copy.

You may want to discuss Key States and the Senate Races at tomorrow's Political Meeting.

10
A

Alabama NP

Blount

*(Dickinson - 2nd) Montgomery and S. E. Corner

Alaska NONE

Arizona NONE

Arkansas NONE

I California

*(Mailliard - 6th) San Francisco

*(Snider - 38th) NG San Bernardino - Riverside

Colorado NP

*(Johnson - 4th) NG Fort Collins and N. W. Corner

(Armstrong - 5th) NG Denver, Aurora

(McKevitt - 1st) Denver

Connecticut NP

*(Sarasin - 5th) NG Waterbury, Wallingford, Meriden

(Rittenband - 1st) NG Hartford

Delaware NP

Boggs

Florida NONE

Georgia NP

*Thompson

*(Cook - 5th) RO Atlanta

Hawaii NONE

Idaho NP

*McClure

II Illinois

Percy

(Madigan - 21st) RO Decatur, Champaign, Bloomington
(Young - 10th) NG Cook County
(Hoellen - 11th) NG Cook County

Indiana NP

*(Dennis - 10th) Muncie and Richmond
(Hudnut - 11th) NG Kokomo and Marion
?(Landgrebe - 2nd) Lafayette and North (not Gary or S. Bend)?
(Hillis - 5th) North of Indianapolis

Iowa NP

*(Schwengel - 1st) Iowa City, Burlington, Davenport
*(Kyl - 4th) Des Moines

Kansas NONE

Kentucky NP

*Nunn
*(Jackson - 6th) NG Frankfort, Lexington

Louisiana NONE

Maine NP

*(Cohen - 2nd) NG Bangor, Lewiston and North

III Maryland

(Holt - 4th) NG Annapolis

I Massachusetts

?(Cronin - 5th) RO Middlesex County - Lowell ?
*(Weeks - 12th) RO Weymouth - Plymouth County
*(Linsky- 4th) NG Newton, Brookline, Framingham

I Michigan

Griffen
*(Esch - 2nd) Ann Arbor and South

IV Minnesota

Hansen
*(Zwach - 6th) St. Cloud and S. W. Corner
*(Haavtan - 7th) NG Moorhead and N. W. Corner

Mississippi NP

(Butler - 2nd) NG Columbus to Greenville
(Cochran - 4th) NG Vicksburg and South

III Missouri

*(Sloan - 6th) NG St. Joseph

Montana NP

Hibbard

Nebraska NONE

Nevada NP

(Towell - ALL) NG at large

New Hampshire NP

Powell

I New Jersey

*(Maraziti - 13th) NG Phillipsburg, Boonton
(Dowd - 3rd) NG Long Branch, Monmouth

New Mexico NP

*Domenici

I New York

*(Gilman - 26th) NG Newburg
*(Koldin - 32nd) NG Syracuse
(Peyser - 23rd) Bronx and Southern Westchester
(Vergari - 24th) NG White Plains and Yonkers

North Carolina NP

*Helms
*(Martin - 9th) RO Charlotte
*(Hawke - 4th) NG Raleigh-Durham

North Dakota NONE

II Ohio

Oklahoma NP

*Bartlett
*(Hewgley - 1st) RO Tulsa

III Oregon

II Pennsylvania

Rhode Island NP

*Chaffee

South Carolina NP

(Limehouse - 1st) NG Charleston

South Dakota NP

*Hirsch
*(Abdnor - 2nd) NG Western two thirds
(Vickerman - 1st) NG Eastern Third

Tennessee NP

*(Beard - 6th) NG Clarksville - Columbia

Texas NP

*Tower

*(Price - 13th) Amarillo, Wichita Falls
(Steelman - 5th) NG Dallas

Utah NONE

Vermont NONE

Virginia NP

~~SCOTT~~

III Washington

(Bledsoe - 4th) NG Yakima and North

I West Virginia

III Wisconsin

(Thomson - 3rd) La Crosse, Eau Claire
(Froelich - 8th) RO Green Bay and North

Wyoming NP

(Kidd - ALL) NG at large

10
B

SENATE SEATS

STATE	CANDIDATES	POLLS	COMMENTS
<u>INCUMBENTS</u>			
Michigan	Griffin (R) Kelley (D)	10/16 - 47-37-2-14 9/21 - 42-36-22	Lead still very soft, Detroit area still key, needs P visit.
Texas	Tower (R) Sanders (D)	10/3 - 53-30-17 9/12 - 46-41-13	Tower pulling away as organization improves -- needs another showing of P interest. Still a lingering anti-Tower sentiment among voters.
Delaware	Boggs (R) Biden (D)	8/15 - 63-18-19 9/15 - 41-29-31 10/15 - 46-40-14	Biden <u>very</u> attractive and running well. Boggs badly in need of P assist. TV & radio tapes will help.
<u>REPUBLICAN SEATS</u>			
Kentucky	Nunn (R) Huddleston (D)	10/3 - 53-30-17 9/12 - 46-41-13	Field reports organization needs pick-up. Nunn thinks campaign going well.
Idaho	McClure (R) Davis (D)	10/9 - 47-30-23	Field reports encouraging.
South Dakota	Hirsch (R) Abourezk (D)	8/1 - 38-44-18 10/6 - 39-44-17	Needs \$ and help in western part of state. Also Butz & Mrs. N. wanted.
<u>NON-INCUMBENTS</u>			
<u>PROBABLE</u>	New Mexico	Domenici (R) Daniels (D)	Organization closely tied into P's. Needs S -- looks good.
	Rhode Island	Chaffee (R) Pell (D)	Needs Mrs. N. visit, organization now working w/P's.
<u>POSSIBLE</u>	Georgia	Thompson (R) Nunn (D)	Field reports close race, running poor campaign. P's visit a real boost.
	Oklahoma	Bartlett (R) Edmonson (D)	Campaign improving, still needs identity w/P.
	North Carolina	Helms (R) Galifianakis (D)	Running poor campaign -- too conservative, organization now improving w/tie-in to P. Considered close enough to win.
	Alabama	Blount (R) Sparkman (D)	Well organized -- P coattails will be strong w/straight ticket. Needs more P involvement -- TV tapes.
<u>LONG SHOT</u>	Montana	Hibbard (R) Metcalfe (D)	Needs \$ but now very doubtful and our resources should not be wasted here.
	Louisiana	Toledano (R) Johnston (D) McKeithen (I)	3-way race -- needs \$ and organizational help.
	Virginia	Scott (R) Speng (D)	Fair candidate, totally dependent on P landslide.
	New Hampshire	Powell (R) McIntyre (D)	Very conservative candidate, but trying to tie race in w/P's.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 13, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: GORDON STRACHAN

FROM: L. HIGBY

We need to gather a revised list of the states we need to worry about in terms of concentrating our surrogates etc., and taking a complete relook at the last two weeks of the campaign for surrogate scheduling on this basis.

Bob should have the latest information available as to what the priority states really are. We need to include, ~~for example, Texas where we are forty points ahead but other~~ states where things are close we need to take a look at.

L. what do
you mean?

*Potter's Cm
re Long*

~~ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL~~

October 18, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Key States and Senate Races

Clark MacGregor has approved a list of Key States which includes the crucial areas for the President as well as local candidates. The document attached at TAB A divides the President's Key States into four levels indicating the amount of effort.

Presidential Race

- I = California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York and West Virginia
- II = Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania
- III = Maryland, Missouri, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin
- IV = Minnesota

Local Races

The attached document uses a key to describe the situation in states where effort on behalf of local candidates is being directed:

- NP = No effort necessary for the President
- ___ = incumbent
- () = House race
- * = Maximum support
- NG = Net gain in House or Senate
- RO = Republican Open

For example, the situation in Illinois is: number II level of activity for the President; Percy is the incumbent Senator; Madigan is the Republican House candidate in the 21st trying to keep a Republican seat; Young is the Republican candidate who would be a net gain if he won the 10th seat.

Senate Races

The updated chart of the Senate Seats, with all available polling data and comments, is attached at Tab B. MacGregor will receive a copy.

You may want to discuss Key States and the Senate Races at tomorrow's Political Meeting.

Alabama NP

Blount

*Dickinson - 2nd) Montgomery and S. E. Corner

Alaska NONE

Arizona NONE

Arkansas NONE

I California

*Mailliard - 6th) San Francisco

*(Snider - 38th) NG San Bernardino - Riverside

Colorado NP

*(Johnson - 4th) NG Fort Collins and N. W. Corner

(Armstrong - 5th) NG Denver, Aurora

(McKevitt - 1st) Denver

Connecticut NP

*(Sarasin - 5th) NG Waterbury, Wallingford, Meriden

(Rittenband - 1st) NG Hartford

Delaware NP

Boggs

Florida NONE

Georgia NP

*Thompson

*(Cook - 5th) RO Atlanta

Hawaii NONE

Idaho NP

*McClure

II Illinois

Percy

(Madigan - 21st) RO Decatur, Champaign, Bloomington
(Young - 10th) NG Cook County
(Hoellen - 11th) NG Cook County

Indiana NP

*(Dennis - 10th) Muncie and Richmond
(Hudnut - 11th) NG Kokomo and Marion
?(Landgrebe - 2nd) Lafayette and North (not Gary or S. Bend)?
(Hillis - 5th) North of Indianapolis

Iowa NP

*(Schwengel - 1st) Iowa City, Burlington, Davenport
*(Kyl - 4th) Des Moines

Kansas NONE

Kentucky NP

*Nunn
*(Jackson - 6th) NG Frankfort, Lexington

Louisiana NONE

Maine NP

*(Cohen - 2nd) NG Bangor, Lewiston and North

III Maryland

(Holt - 4th) NG Annapolis

I Massachusetts

?(Cronin - 5th) RO Middlesex County - Lowell ?
*(Weeks - 12th) RO Weymouth - Plymouth County
*(Linsky- 4th) NG Newton, Brookline, Framingham

I Michigan

Griffen
*(Esch - 2nd) Ann Arbor and South

IV Minnesota

Hansen
*(Zwach - 6th) St. Cloud and S. W. Corner
*(Haavlan - 7th) NG Moorhead and N. W. Corner

Mississippi NP

(Butler - 2nd) NG Columbus to Greenville
(Cochran - 4th) NG Vicksburg and South

III Missouri

*(Sloan - 6th) NG St. Joseph

Montana NP

Hibbard

Nebraska NONE

Nevada NP

(Towell - ALL) NG at large

New Hampshire NP

Powell

I New Jersey

*(Maraziti - 13th) NG Phillipsburg, Boonton
(Dowd - 3rd) NG Long Branch, Monmouth

New Mexico NP

*Domenici

I New York

*(Gilman - 26th) NG Newburg
*(Koldin - 32nd) NG Syracuse
(Peyser - 23rd) Bronx and Southern Westchester
(Vergari - 24th) NG White Plains and Yonkers

North Carolina NP

*Helms
*(Martin - 9th) RO Charlotte
*(Hawke - 4th) NG Raleigh-Durham

North Dakota NONE

II Ohio

Oklahoma NP

*Bartlett
*(Hewgley - 1st) RO Tulsa

III Oregon

II Pennsylvania

Rhode Island NP

*Chaffee

South Carolina NP

(Limehouse - 1st) NG Charleston

South Dakota NP

*Hirsch
*(Abdnor - 2nd) NG Western two thirds
(Vickerman - 1st) NG Eastern Third

Tennessee NP

*(Beard - 6th) NG Clarksville - Columbia

Texas NP

*Tower

*(Price - 13th) Amarillo, Wichita Falls
(Steelman - 5th) NG Dallas

Utah NONE

Vermont NONE

Virginia NP

Scott

III Washington

(Bledsoe - 4th) NG Yakima and North

I West Virginia

III Wisconsin

(Thomson - 3rd) La Crosse, Eau Claire
(Froelich - 8th) RO Green Bay and North

Wyoming NP

(Kidd - ALL) NG at large

SENATE SEATS

<u>STATE</u>	<u>CANDIDATES</u>	<u>POLLS</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
<u>INCUMBENTS</u>			
Michigan	Griffin (R) Kellely (D)	10/16 - 47-37-2-14 9/21 - 42-36-22	Lead still very soft, Detroit area still key, needs P visit.
Texas	Tower (R) Sanders (D)	10/3 - 53-30-17 9/12 - 46-41-13	Tower pulling away as organization improves -- needs another showing of P interest. Still a lingering anti-Tower sentiment among voters.
Delaware	Boggs (R) Biden (D)	8/15 - 63-18-19 9/15 - 41-29-31 10/15 - 46-40-14	Biden <u>very</u> attractive and running well. Boggs badly in need of P assist. TV & radio tapes will help.
<u>REPUBLICAN SEATS</u>			
Kentucky	Nunn (R) Huddleston (D)	10/3 - 53-30-17 9/12 - 46-41-13	Field reports organization needs pick-up. Nunn thinks campaign going well.
Idaho	McClure (R) Davis (D)	10/9 - 47-30-23	Field reports encouraging.
South Dakota	Hirsch (R) Abourezk (D)	8/1 - 38-44-18 10/6 - 39-44-17	Needs \$ and help in western part of state. Also Butz & Mrs. N. wanted.
<u>NON-INCUMBENTS</u>			
<u>PROBABLE</u>	New Mexico	Domenici (R) Daniels (D)	39-24-37 Organization closely tied into P's. Needs \$ -- looks good.
	Rhode Island	Chaffee (R) Pell (D)	9/22 - 49-34-17 10/12 - Chaffee +8 Needs Mrs. N. visit, organization now working w/P's.
<u>POSSIBLE</u>	Georgia	Thompson (R) Nunn (D)	No good data Field reports close race, running poor campaign. P's visit a real boost.
	Oklahoma	Bartlett (R) Edmondson (D)	Due 10/20 Campaign improving, still needs identity w/P.
	North Carolina	Helms (R) Galifianakis (D)	No good data Running poor campaign -- too conservative, organization now improving w/tie-in to P. Considered close enough to win.
	Alabama	Blount (R) Sparkman (D)	28-47-2-23 Well organized -- P coattails will be strong w/straight ticket. Needs more P involvement -- TV tapes.
<u>LONG SHOT</u>	Montana	Hibbard (R) Metcalf (D)	No good data Needs \$ but now very doubtful and our resources should not be wasted here.
	Louisiana	Toledano (R) Johnston (D) McKeithen (I)	No good data 3-way race -- needs \$ and organizational help.
	Virginia	Scott (R) Spong (D)	No good data Poor candidate, totally dependent on P landslide.
	New Hampshire	Powell (R) McIntrye (D)	10/16 - 30-58-15 Very conservative candidate, but trying to tie race in w/P's.