

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>
45	4	5/28/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Larry Higby From: Gordon Strachan RE: "Home Testing Institute Poll." 1pg
45	4	5/28/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Larry Higby From: Gordon Strachan RE: "Home Testing Institute Poll." 1pg
45	4	6/9/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Larry Higby From: Gordon Strachan RE: Bob Marik's report about the Flanigan- Derge meeting of previous afternoon. 2pgs

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 28, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN G
SUBJECT: Home Testing Institute Poll

You asked to have someone give a quick analysis of material that Pat Buchanan had sent to Mr. Haldeman concerning the Home Testing Institute Poll. I talked with Tom Benham and read the text of the information to him. He had these observations:

1. Home Testing Institute does mail polls. That is, when they are mailing materials to housewives, they frequently include questions which are probably the source of the attached poll. The problem with any mail poll is that there is no way to assess representativeness. The sample cannot be checked;
2. The sample is frequently heavily concentrated in cities, where it is more economical to use some of the Home Testing Institute mailing lists;
3. The questions themselves are faulty in that no real alternatives are offered. For example, "If the next Presidential election were held today, would you vote for Nixon-Agnew?". This is not a real trial heat because the opposition candidate is not named. This explains the very high percentage (36.2%) who "aren't sure". The reason they aren't sure is that they have no alternative. Benham characterized paragraph five "after calculating the percentage of shifts since 1968, it is found that we have lost more than 3.25 votes for every one that we have picked up" as very, very risky; and
4. In addition to these specific criticisms of the poll, Tom Benham characterized Home Testing Institute Polls as "crap".

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 28, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN 5
SUBJECT: Home Testing Institute Poll

You asked to have someone give a quick analysis of material that Pat Buchanan had sent to Mr. Haldeman concerning the Home Testing Institute Poll. I talked with Tom Benham and read the text of the information to him. He had these observations:

1. Home Testing Institute does mail polls. That is, when they are mailing materials to housewives, they frequently include questions which are probably the source of the attached poll. The problem with any mail poll is that there is no way to assess representativeness. The sample cannot be checked;
2. The sample is frequently heavily concentrated in cities, where it is more economical to use some of the Home Testing Institute mailing lists;
3. The questions themselves are faulty in that no real alternatives are offered. For example, "If the next Presidential election were held today, would you vote for Nixon-Agnew?". This is not a real trial heat because the opposition candidate is not named. This explains the very high percentage (36.2%) who "aren't sure". The reason they aren't sure is that they have no alternative. Benham characterized paragraph five "after calculating the percentage of shifts since 1968, it is found that we have lost more than 3.25 votes for every one that we have picked up" as very, very risky; and
4. In addition to these specific criticisms of the poll, Tom Benham characterized Home Testing Institute Polls as "crap".

*6/11
Polls
Chen*

June 9, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

After our meeting with Jeb Magruder this morning, I talked with Bob Marik. He reported the following about the Flanigan-Derge meeting of yesterday afternoon:

- 1) Derge spent most of the time filling in Marik on the polling plan of 1968 because Mr. Flanigan was in and out of his office for the entire two hours.
- 2) Flanigan is taking charge of what he views to be his responsibility as Chairman of the Polling Planning Group. However, he realizes that no commitments are to be made and that all suggestions to The Attorney General should be funneled through Magruder.
- 3) Flanigan would not hire Derge as the polling consultant for the campaign, for example.
- 4) Marik is keeping close track of the polling task force and will continue to keep us advised.

On the question of simulation, Dr. Derge suggested to Flanigan that he bring the man from IBM in California who did the original Derge simulation memo back to the White House for discussion. Flanigan is not eager about simulation, but realizes that the question should be considered and decided.

To implement your suggestion about having a top level group review the question of simulation and submitting a recommendation to Mr. Haldeman and The Attorney General, Marik will suggest to Flanigan on Friday the following:

- 1) Dr. Derge and the California IBM man come to Washington the following week;
- 2) Flanigan, Magruder, Marik, Higby or Strachan, Anderson, Derge, Torrance and DeBolt should listen to the presentation;
- 3) Flanigan should submit a recommendation over his signature as to whether to commit the 35,000 necessary for the segment one trial run of the simulation project.

If this is a wholly incorrect method of approaching the simulation problem, please advise me and I will have Marik programmed to guide Flanigan or whoever else you suggest to guide the simulation question to decision.

GS:elr