

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
Contested Materials Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
3	51	10/26/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to RN RE: Broder's thoughts on society's views of the government and how to combat these ideas. 1 pg.
3	51	10/26/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	Colson's in-depth analysis of Broder's ideas for RN, including strategies on how to combat widespread apathy toward the government. 6 pgs.

October 26, 1970

**SUMMARY OF MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT**

Broder argues that there is wide spread fear and apprehension over the future -- the economy, youth, lawlessness. Many people have lost confidence in Government. There is a vacuum of leadership, great indecision about 1972, party loyalties are deteriorating and people are disenchanted with our national leaders.

Broder's conclusions tend to be supported by the feelings of many pollsters that there is a large undecided, probably apathetic, group in this year's elections.

Broder's conclusion, in my opinion, apply only to a segment of the voting population, mainly middle class, Wallace oriented, dissatisfied and troubled people who are especially apprehensive about the economy. His conclusions cannot be generalized.

What we should do:

1. Not only attack permissivism in society but prove how much we are doing about it on a positive basis. Demonstrate that we can effectively solve problems; that we are cutting crime, curbing drugs and restoring order to our campuses.
2. If possible, accelerate our economic game plan and develop a positive psychology about the future of the economy.
3. Emphasize reform, revenue sharing and restoration of power to state and local governments. We must prove that Government can function.
4. Maintain the President's image as a tough, courageous, masculine leader.

Conclusion: Broder has provided an exaggerated diagnosis of the disenchanted alienated segment of the population. It, nonetheless, may be the swing vote in the next election. Thus, it is politically imperative that we attempt to allay their fears and build confidence.

Charles V. Colson

October 26, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Analysis of Broder Series

Broder's basic points are:

1. People are fearful and apprehensive over the future. They are mostly concerned (a) about what the future holds for their children, (b) the future of the economy, and (c) drugs, violence and lawlessness.
2. Many people have concluded that Government is incapable of handling the nation's problems; the feeling that no one can solve the great problems of the day creates frustration and, hence, disdain for Government and politicians.
3. There is a vacuum of leadership and a "negative, tentative" approval of you. You are doing as well as you can and people have concluded there is no better alternative; none of the national Democrats do any better in inspiring confidence. This accounts for what Broder calls a "Nobody for President" attitude.
4. There is great indecision about 1972. There is not yet an "emerging new majority." There is no clear cut pattern developing along ideological or party lines. Party loyalties are deteriorating.
5. Agnew, Wallace and Kennedy are too controversial to be President (for different reasons). People do not want a leader who scares them.
6. The people want leadership -- someone who will speak for and unify the whole country.

In analyzing Broder's conclusions, it is important to note that he interviewed only 200 people. All pollsters agree that in-depth interviews with any small sampling permits the interviewer to reinforce his own preconceived notions. Broder was undoubtedly trying to be objective but I believe that he has greatly exaggerated a number of points.

In preparing the series Broder worked closely with Dick Scammon (the social issue) and would naturally tend to be influenced by the Scammon thesis. Broder also concentrated on that portion of the population which he believes to represent the independent swing vote. He acknowledged that he spent little time with black or Jewish voters (who would tend to take a clearly liberal position) or with businessmen (who would tend to be with us). One in five of those interviewed were Wallace voters in 1968; they would tend to be the most disturbed, dissatisfied and negative. In short, therefore, I think that some of Broder's conclusions may be valid as to a segment of the voting population but his conclusions cannot be generalized or applied across the board. There is a disturbed element in society but the whole country is not racked with fear as Broder would suggest.

Every pollster in the country reports an unusually large undecided vote in next week's election -- in many cases a quarter of the population. The prevailing thesis is that this quarter of the population is apathetic, disinterested in the election, sees no choice between the parties, and is generally frustrated, having lost faith in Government's ability to solve their problems. In studying the comments of Broder's interviewees it is my opinion that he is talking mostly with people in this category, hereafter referred to, for lack of a better term, as the "alienated voter."

The following is my point by point analysis:

1. Fear and concern about the future. Broder is correct -- there is a politically volatile segment of the population that is very apprehensive about the future. The alienated voter is concerned about all of the things that we reflect concern about -- drugs, pornography, lawlessness, student unrest -- but he doesn't believe anything can be done about it. We are clearly on the right side of the issue but, as to this voter at least, we have not gained his confidence that we can solve the problem.

In the first two years by emphasizing the law and order issue, we have kept people aroused about student militants, drugs, pornography, etc. We have also effectively associated the liberals with all that is bad about permissiveness in society. As a result, we have succeeded in splitting voters away from the Liberal Democrats.

To win them over, we must do more. We cannot simply continue to decry permissivism and social evils; in the second two years we are very likely to inherit the responsibility for their continuation. Proving that we can do something about the evils that we and the alienated voter are against must be our highest priority political objective. We must start to build and advertise a positive record of (a) restoring order on campus, (b) cutting crime, (c) curbing drugs and (d) generally rebuilding the moral foundation of our society. People want to believe that the future is safe, that we can do something about the ills in society; witness the reaction you get whenever you say that the vast majority of our children are good and that the rock throwers are a small majority.

Perhaps an even more socially unsettling factor than law and order is concern over the future of the economy -- unemployment and the cost of living. This concern permeates all of Broder's interviews and is high on every pollster's issue list. People have always equated "good times" with prosperity. Fear of recession or depression greatly affects the national mood and aggravates other fears, like the social issue. Many of the people Broder interviewed are old enough to remember the "Great Depression." As Broder points out, the economic issue draws the alienated voter to the Democrats even though at the same time the same voter agrees with us on the law and order issue. Not only the fact of economic health but restoring confidence in the economic future is vital if we are to win the political allegiance of this group. The early success of our economic game plan is critical.

2. Government is incapable of handling nation's problems. This may be the most serious point in the Broder articles. The latest Harris Poll shows that 27% of the people interviewed say that you are "doing the best job you can." Harris says that further in-depth questioning reveals that this answer most often reflects a belief that no President can solve the country's problems and that Government is no longer workable or manageable. It is an answer which reflects frustration. Significantly, this percentage was also high during the Johnson Administration (hitting a top figure of 35% in 1968).

This may also be the source of much of this year's apathy, i. e., it really doesn't matter who wins. This attitude creates what Broder calls "the leadership vacuum", i. e., the job is too tough for anyone to handle.

The alienated voter is the most politically volatile, the most negative and, hence, the most likely to vote against the "ins" or not vote at all. These are not the radical students who believe that our society is degenerate and our system of Government unresponsive; these are middle Americans who simply feel that Government cannot do anything about the problems of our society.

We must, therefore, restore people's faith in our ability to manage Government and Government's ability to solve problems. We should emphasize over and over the "reform" theme, dramatize how we have gotten Government and the bureaucracy under control, and push very hard for revenue sharing and return of power to the states and communities. We have a better record in this area than any of our predecessors but we need to do a better job of selling it. We also must do more to tighten up management (getting rid of programs that people know are ineffective and wasteful.)

3. Leadership vacuum. The so-called leadership vacuum or the "tentative, negative approval" of you is simply a consequence of the alienated voter's frustration, and his fear over the economy and lawlessness. My point is that this attitude prevails only in this particular group. The proof of this is that in his interviews Broder discovers that this same group, which is indifferent to you, is equally indifferent towards any other national leader. Therefore, it is not your leadership that they reject; their frustration causes them to lose faith in governor's leadership. It is perfectly obvious from the crowds you have turned out across the country and their reaction that there is real enthusiasm for you and your Presidency. I believe that the majority of the people do identify you as a strong, forceful leader, one who doesn't promise things that can't be done, one who has calmly and quietly tried to cope with the very serious problems our nation faces.

In a meeting with Pete Brennan last week, he explained the reason for the "hard hat" support of you more perceptively than I think we have analyzed it. He said that the "hard hats" wave the flag and cheer the President but that, in and of itself, does not translate into votes. Moreover, most of the "hard hats" don't like our economic policies and feel that we are pushing them too hard in the civil rights area. What is winning their political loyalty is their admiration for your masculinity. The "hard hats", who are a tough breed, have come to respect you as a tough, courageous man's man. Brennan's thesis is that this image of you will win them over to the Republican cause. The image of being

strong, forceful and decisive will have a powerful personal appeal with the alienated voter.

4. Indecision about 1972; diminishing party loyalties. The alienated voter, by definition, has lost his party loyalty. Ideologically he is pulled towards us on the law and order issue and away from us on the economic issue. By definition, he is disenchanted with Government; therefore, disenchanted with politicians and political parties. To the extent that traditional party loyalties have been broken, we have an opportunity to win over large blocks of voters (like Wallace Democrats). We should not be trying to make them Republicans, rather we should be trying to win their confidence and allay their fears.
  
5. Agnew, Kennedy and Wallace are too controversial to be President. This is also a logical extension of Broder's other points. People who are frustrated and concerned and who have lost faith are least likely to turn to a leader who frightens them. It is significant that Kennedy's Chappaquiddic incident is still very much in the public mind, at least in this group (this reinforces Brennan's point that people want a firm leader with strong character.) The Agnew point is important. People identify with Agnew because he says the things they are thinking but they are afraid that a man who speaks out and says the things they are thinking is not responsible enough to be a good President. It is a paradox that because they identify with him, they believe that their own faults and weaknesses are reflected in him.  
  
The most significant point is the erosion of the Wallace strength. The alienated voter can express his frustrations by voting for Wallace -- and did in 1968. Broder points out, however, that significant numbers of former Wallace voters have now concluded either that he is too dangerous to be President or that a vote for Wallace is a wasted one. This should be an opportunity for us.
  
6. People want leadership and a unifying influence. This is really another restatement of the frustrations of this segment of the population. Restoring their confidence in the future in the ways described above is the key.

Conclusion: The Broder series must be read in context. His conclusions cannot be generalized for the whole country. In my opinion, the restless, frustrated and fearful voter group is no larger than 15% to 20% of the country. This may well, however, be the swing vote in 1972.

Our target is obviously to win their confidence and allay their fears by proving that we can do something about what they worry about most -- the economy, the lack of future for their children, drugs and crime. If we do, this group plus the solid constituency we now have will be an unbeatable majority; if we do not succeed, at best they will be non-voters; at the worst, they will vote against the "ins" merely as an expression of protest.

Most importantly, these people need an up-lift. The theme of the Jaycees' speech is one which should be hit over and over in the next two years. We need to do the things and say the things that will restore the confidence of the alienated voter.

Charles W. Colson