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MEMORANDUM
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 23, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: L. HIGBY

Mr. Kalmbach reports that he met with Firestone regarding E. Nixon and that Firestone bought the idea 100%. Kalmbach will see Eddie soon and Herb plans to just move ahead on this. He indicates that the salary level would be the same that Herb had discussed with you.
November 12, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR

BOB HALDEMAN

The campaign manager of Governor Melvin Evans in the Virgin Islands has called and urgently requested a telegram from the President to the Governor in effect endorsing him for re-election next Tuesday in the runoff for Governor. He would like for the President to, in effect, commend him for his effectiveness in dealing with the problems of the Virgin Islands and in his contacts and relationship with Washington, particularly with regard to the recent disaster (where we complied with the Governor's request) and in helping them get emergency school facilities this fall (where we also helped). What he wants to show is his effectiveness in dealing with the powers that be in Washington.

If this can be done, it should be done right away, and Keogh's shop should clear the final wording with me because the wording is important.
November 17, 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: LARRY HIGBY
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI

George Bell’s office sent the attached material on National Media Analysis.

It describes their techniques in very general terms. As I told you in my previous memo, they measure the coverage of various topics in the media by lineage and then apply a faction based on location, density of coverage and characteristics of the medium (i.e. circulation, secondary readership, target population, etc.) to come up with their final measurement expressed numerically as media strength units (MSU).

Included in the attached are examples of how effective National Media Analysis has been in predicting election results. Of course, they only talk about their successes.

George gave me some background on Fitzgerald, the President of the organization. He is a long time Republican supporter, an effective fund-raiser and a very wealthy man. He started the poll as a hobby 18 years ago and after the 1968 campaign he kept it going as a business; serving his services.

Fitzgerald talked to Chattiner and Dent during the recent campaign and as a result, thought that he was commissioned to do the South Carolina poll that you saw. There was some misunderstanding, as we had no intention of paying for it. However George feels that because Fitzgerald’s prediction was so far off, he will not press it. If he does, George thinks that we should pay the $5-6,000 (approx.) rather than alienate Fitzgerald. Incidentally, Fitzgerald claims his poor predictions in South Carolina are due to his being called in too late and therefore not being able to establish benchmarks.

Bell thinks that the survey is worthwhile as far as indicating what issues are on the public’s mind. He also mentioned that Fitzgerald is doing some research on the underground press which he claims
is becoming a more important factor.

Finally, George is collecting some comments from the candidates (Rockefeller) who used the poll. He will get back to us with these.

I suggest we wait until the additional information comes in as Bell admits that he may be biased in favor of his old friend, Fitzgerald.
Kalmbach advises that the following names be dropped for failure to come through as promised:

Gerritty, Ned
King, John W.
McCulloch, Robert
Mills, Jack
Morrison, Thomas J.
Parr, David

Perot, H. Ross
Pistell, Richard
Shaheen, John M.
Wilde, Claude
Wilson, David K.
Wyly, Sam

Add Mulcahy, John M. to letter list.

Herb feels that Mulcahy, Stone, Rollins, and Scaife are definitely the top people; the real heavies. He also thinks that Pappas, Olin and Smith, K. could be added without hurting the quality of the group. These last three are not quite in the same league but close enough so that the exposure might serve as the impetus to get them there.

After the first seven come Fisher and Ford who might be included if a larger group is required but are not strongly recommended.

Finally, two other names that were mentioned without any enthusiasm were Salvatori and Liedtke. Those were included only because we were trying to work with a group of ten.

Herb likes the top seven and feels that it drops off after that.

He also suggested sending the letter as well as a phone invitation to the group that was picked for the WH gathering.

Kalmbach liked the letter very much. He thinks it has a very personal tone.
MEMORANDUM FOR: L. HIGBY
FROM: BRUCE KEHRLI
RE: National Media Analysis Predictions vs. Actual Result of S. C. Gubernatorial Election

Final Results of Election:

Watson (R) 46%
West (D) 53%
Bethea (I) 1%

National media analysis predicted a Watson victory with 50-52% of the vote.

I talked to Bob Dole re/background information on National Media Analysis. Bob has been approached many times with sales pitches from these people. He has turned them down because they refused to divulge their techniques. Evidently one man, William Fitzgerald, reads quite a few newspapers and assigns a weight (he won't tell how) to the coverage of various topics and candidates.

The credibility of the poll is very suspicious as it does not include broadcast media and polling techniques are so poor. It also assumes that because a person reads a specific paper, he will vote with the editorial policy of that paper - very weak assumption.

You might ask Dr. Derge about it if you get a chance (for a completely subjective viewpoints).

It looks as if this poll is a dead issue -- we shouldn't depend on it.