

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>
5	35	10/12/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personal	Memo	Memo from Tom Lias to Harry Dent and Harry Flemming RE: Lias relating who he saw at a Black Silent Majority luncheon. Names mentioned include Clay Claiborne, Bob Wilson, Hugh Scott, George Bell, Murray Chotiner and Joe Robertson. 1 pg.
5	35	6/9/1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	Foreign Policy	Letter	Copy of letter from David R. Derge, President of Behavioral Research Associates, to Jeb Magruder RE: assesement of National Media Analysis' proposal, methodology and fees. 2 pgs.

October 12, 1970

TO: Harry Flemming  
Harry Dent ✓

FROM: Tom Lias

On Saturday, I attended a luncheon at the Washington Hilton given by the Black Silent Majority Committee, which is a Negro Republican front group put together by Clay Claiborne with Bob Wilson's aid and assistance. Hugh Scott got an award, as did Bob Wilson, and some others - George Bell and Murray Chotiner were also there from the White House. Sitting next to me, at the head table, representing the Secretary of Agriculture was Joe Robertson!!!!!!

# BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

DAVID R. DERGE, President  
WOODRUFF LANE, BITTNER WOODS  
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

(812) 336-5564

June 9, 1970

Mr. Jeb MaGruder  
The White House  
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Jeb:

This is in response to your letter of June 1, 1970, concerning the National Media Analysis proposal. Discussions with FitzGerald and several RNC people took place earlier this year and my recommendation at that time was negative.

I have two basic objections. First is that FitzGerald declines to reveal his techniques and methodology, asking that they be accepted on the basis of prior successes. Under these circumstances it is impossible to reach a professional judgment on the adequacy, reliability and validity of his assumptions and analytical tools. I judge this to involve too many risks and too much mystery. I did propose that FitzGerald conduct a simultaneous test with our last field survey to compare the results of his undisclosed methods with our standard survey research techniques. FitzGerald at first agreed, then declines to participate.

My second objection goes to the basic assumption underlying the measurement of public opinion through media analysis. Put simply, FitzGerald assumes that the mass media deliberately structure content to please the reader. That is, the media "market" the news that the "consumer" wants to have. If this is true, what appears in the media would be a good reflection of what the people are thinking. I doubt that this assumption is valid enough to base policy decisions upon it.

I suggested to RNC that FitzGerald might provide another service--content analysis of media to provide accurate information about what is being purveyed by the press. You undoubtedly know more about content analysis techniques than I do and can judge whether such a service would be useful. There is an adequate literature on this technique and many people believe it is better than a simple clipping service. Even so, I balk at the leap in logic which extends content analysis to accurate measurement of public opinion. Thus, I conclude that content analysis should stand on its own merits and not make the added claims FitzGerald does.

Mr. Jeb MaGruder

Page 2

June 9, 1970

If you decide to subscribe to this service as a content analysis product, I still believe you should insist that FitzGerald reveal his methodology and techniques to allow a comparison between what he does and known professional standards of content analysis. While he quantifies his data, I am certain there are built-in qualitative or value judgments. As an example see the attached report on "military," "anti-military," and "neutral" attitudes toward Vietnam. I object to the definitions he assigns and would have grave objections to basing Presidential policy on these definitions.

If I understand your letter correctly, the cost would be \$5,000 per week or \$260,000 per year. This is considerably in excess of all survey research costs we now have under way.

Finally, I am not enthused about basing our survey content decisions on FitzGerald's judgments. These decisions should be made by White House and RNC staff according to needs.

Sincerely yours,



David R. Derge  
President

bb

cc: Mr. Bill Low