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MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 8, 1970
Monday - 11:45 a.m

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: Dwight L. Chapin

RE: Gallup

Within the last week and a half, the President's old law firm has taken as a client the Gallup organization. They are only handling Gallup International. According to Tom Evans, they hope to get the American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup domestically) as a client sometime in the future.

The question comes up as to whether or not it is a good idea to have the President's old law firm representing the Gallup organization. I would rather see us tell the law firm that it is best for them not to handle the business and then leak the story that the President's old law firm was advised by the White House that they should not take the business because it could be misconstrued.

Do you see any problems?

Tell the law firm it is best not to handle Gallup business

Let the law firm handle Gallup business

Other
DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By... Q-A... NARS, Data... A-10-32...

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. H. R. Haldeman

FROM: Dwight L. Chapin

RE: Gallup Poll

John Davies, when he gave me the results of the poll yesterday, asked
that they be kept very confidential. He stressed that they were rechecking
the poll and even suggested that one reason for the drop might be an
error in the sample.

He also indicated there had been a meeting -- probably of their editors --
where the decision was made to recheck the sample. I know from
past conversations with Davies that there are some people at Gallup
who would just as soon see us done in and would probably encourage
the release of the poll. Davies, if properly directed, would urge
against publication. Accuracy is his primary concern.

SUGGESTIONS.

(A) If I am to call saying we have some information contrary to
what they gave me yesterday, I suggest this be for a region.
Rather than say we have some national figures which don't
relate to theirs, I would point to some special polling we have
done in the South. It is easy to point out that -- as they have --
we have been looking at the South.

Our Poll

(1) We have a "Presidential Acceptance" factor of 3 minus....
As of a week ago last Monday...
(2) This is on a scale of 0 - 4. Translated to percentage, it came out to around 70% acceptance -- or in your terms (Gallup) approve.

(3) Our poll prior to the latest -- right after the Carswell nomination -- (still having the Haynsworth fall out) was an acceptance of 3 -- or 75% but that was the high point.

(4) There is a serious question as to how your poll can hit at 59% (February-March) and ours at the same period hits 70%.

(5) Ours is a telephone survey, but it is an unusually large sample -- and takes in the deep South and border States.

(B) Call Davies and state the poll results have been reviewed and in the absence of significant events between these two polling periods -- there must be something wrong. Have you decided to not publish and wait for the next poll?

(C) Have a couple of Senators -- like Griffin, Stennis (?) -- anyway a couple of Democrats and Republicans -- call for an investigation on persuasion of public attitudes. One major part of the statement could be on public opinion research companies. If this could be done within the next two days, perhaps Gallup would hold up the poll.

(D) One other alternative would be to put some pressure on via their subscribers -- but I can't figure out how to do this since the existence of the poll is unknown (or at least the results). If they decided to go with it, maybe we can get a paper to question the poll -- refuse to run it and turn that into a story and tie it to point "C" above.
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CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. H. R. Haldeman

FROM: Dwight L. Chapin

RE: Gallup Poll

John Davies, when he gave me the results of the poll yesterday, asked that they be kept very confidential. He stressed they were rechecking the poll and even suggested that one reason for the drop might be an error in the sample.

He also indicated there had been a meeting -- probably of their editors -- where the decision was made to recheck the sample. I know from past conversations with Davies that there are some people at Gallup who would just as soon see us done in and would probably encourage the release of the poll. Davies, if properly directed, would urge against publication. Accuracy is his primary concern.

SUGGESTIONS

(A) If I am to call saying we have some information contrary to what they gave me yesterday, I suggest this be for a region. Rather than say we have some national figures which don't relate to theirs, I would point to some special polling we have done in the South. It is easy to point out that -- as they have -- we have been looking at the South.

Our Poll

(1) We have a "Presidential Acceptance" factor of 3 minus .... As of a week ago last Monday...
2.

(2) This is on a scale of 0 - 4. Translated to percentage, it came out to around 70% acceptance — or in your terms (Gallup) approve.

(3) Our poll prior to the latest — right after the Carcourt nomination — (still having the Hayworth fall out) was an acceptance of 3 — or 75% but that was the high point.

(4) There is a serious question as to how your poll can hit at 59% (February-March) and ours at the same period hits 70%.

(5) Ours is a telephone survey, but it is an unusually large sample — and taken in the deep South and border States.

(E) Call Davies and state the poll results have been reviewed and in the absence of significant events between these two polling periods — there must be something wrong. Have you decided to not publish and wait for the next poll?

(G) Have a couple of Senators — like Griffin, Stennis (?) — anyway a couple of Democrats and Republicans — call for an investigation on persuasion of public attitudes. One major part of the statement could be on public opinion research companies. If this could be done within the next two days, perhaps Gallup would hold up the poll.

(D) One other alternative would be to put some pressure on via their subscribers — but I can’t figure out how to do this since the existence of the poll is unknown (or at least the results). If they decided to go with it, maybe we can get a paper to question the poll — refuse to run it and turn that into a story and tie it to point "C" above.
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CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM: Dwight L. Chapin

RE: Gallup Poll

John Davies, when he gave me the results of the poll yesterday, asked that they be kept very confidential. He stressed they were rechecking the poll and even suggested that one reason for the drop might be an error in the sample.

He also indicated there had been a meeting -- probably of their editors -- where the decision was made to recheck the sample. I know from past conversations with Davies that there are some people at Gallup who would just as soon see us done in and would probably encourage the release of the poll. Davies, if properly directed, would urge against publication. Accuracy is his primary concern.

SUGGESTIONS

(A) If I am to call saying we have some information contrary to what they gave me yesterday, I suggest this be for a region.

Rather than say we have some national figures which don't relate to theirs, I would point to some special polling we have done in the South. It is easy to point out that -- as they have -- we have been looking at the South.

Our Poll

(1) We have a "Presidential Acceptance" factor of 3 minus. . . .

As of a week ago last Monday...
(2) This is on a scale of 0 - 4. Translated to percentage, it came out to around 70% acceptance — or in your terms (Gallup) approve.

(3) Our poll prior to the latest — right after the Carewell nomination — (still having the Haynsworth fall out) was an acceptance of 3 — or 75% but that was the high point.

(4) There is a serious question as to how your poll can hit at 59% (February-March) and ours at the same period hits 70%.

(5) Ours is a telephone survey, but it is an unusually large sample — and takes in the deep South and border States.

(B) Call Davies and state the poll results have been reviewed and in the absence of significant events between these two polling periods there must be something wrong. Have you decided to not publish and wait for the next poll?

(C) Have a couple of Senators — like Griffin, Stennis (?) — anyway a couple of Democrats and Republicans — call for an investigation on persuasion of public attitudes. One major part of the statement could be on public opinion research companies. If this could be done within the next two days, perhaps Gallup would hold up the poll.

(D) One other alternative would be to put some pressure on via their subscribers — but I can't figure out how to do this since the existence of the poll is unknown (or at least the results). If they decided to go with it, maybe we can get a paper to question the poll — refuse to run it and turn that into a story and tie it to point "C" above.
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MEMORANDUM FOR MR. H. R. HALDEMAN

RE: Gallup Presidential Popularity Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATEST POLL</th>
<th>LAST TWO POLLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 11 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Davis of the Gallup organization said that the two-point shift between the August and September poll is rather insignificant. They will point out in their story that they can give no reason why the shift took place. Mr. Davis did point out that the trend (if you go back to July) is moving from approval to disapproval.

He pointed out that the next poll they do will register the intensity of feeling and the reasons why.

He warned that although Gallup considers the reading of the poll to be insignificant that we can count on people like the New York Times saying that the President's popularity is down. He also pointed out that "Gallup has to fight the New York Times from time to time also."

Dwight L. Chapin
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