<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box Number</th>
<th>Folder Number</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
<th>No Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/29/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Dwight Chapin. RE: President's interest in having political state dinners. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/28/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Dwight L. Chapin to Gordon Strachan. RE: The possibility of political state dinners, esp. with Ohio. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/28/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Dwight Chapin. RE: Gallup Polls. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/15/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Dwight Chapin. RE: Update on the status of the RNC-Citizens Committee film on the President. 34 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/14/1971</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Domestic Policy</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Forrest Anderson. RE: The opposition of construction permits for the Waters Edge Unit No. 2. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/14/1971</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to George Grassmuck. RE: Detailed post by Gerald Kline on the 18-20 year old vote. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/28/1971</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Mr. Higby. RE: Discussion of the results of Haldeman's selection of the key states. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/10/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Mr. Higby. RE: Discussion with Dr. Derge on the Indiana poll questions. 3 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/8/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Mr. Higby. RE: Bi-monthly caravan study. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/8/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Mr. Higby. RE: Walter DeVries as “the strongest Republican voting behavioralist available.” 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/28/1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Herb Kalmbach. RE: A meeting scheduled between Kalmbach, Haldeman, and Dean. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/10/1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Herb Kalmbach. RE: Kalmbach's upcoming schedule. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/30/1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Attorney General, John N. Mitchell. RE: memo on &quot;The Odds Against Henry Jackson&quot;, as well as analysis of the 18-20 year old vote. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/29/1971</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Rose Mary Woods. RE: Wedding invitation on behalf of the president from Alfredo Basalo. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Folder Number</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/15/1971</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to John C. Williams. RE: Wishes for success with the Germany post. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/9/1971</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>White House Staff</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Gordon Strachan to Mr. Higby. RE: Flanigan-Derge Meeting information. 2 pg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presidential Materials Review Board
Review on Contested Documents

Collection: H. R. Haldeman
Box Number: 231
Folder: Gordon Strachan-Chron June 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Chapin, 6-29-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Chapin, 6-29-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Chapin, 6-15-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Personal Ltr, Strachan to Anderson, 6-14-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Grassmuck, 6-14-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-28-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-28-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Retain Close</td>
<td>Invasion of Privacy Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-15-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Retain Close</td>
<td>Invasion of Privacy Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-23-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Presidential Materials Review Board

### Review on Contested Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection: H. R. Haldeman</th>
<th>Box Number: 231</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-10-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-9-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-8-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Higby, 6-8-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 Return Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Howard, 6-14-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Kalmbach, 6-28-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 Retain Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336 Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Kalmbach, 6-10-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Retain Close Invasion of Privacy Memo, Strachan to Kehri, 6-14-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Kehri, 6-4-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Mitchell, 6-30-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Return Private/Personal &quot;Personal Report Form,&quot; Strachan, 6-15-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Miller, 6-11-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Ltr., Strachan to McDonough, 6-14-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Return Private/Political Memo, Strachan to Odle, 6-24-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Return Private/Political &quot;Talking Paper for the A.G.,&quot; 6-28-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Return Private/Personal Memo, Strachan to Woods, 6-29-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Retain Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Return Private/Personal Ltr., Strachan to Williams, 6-15-71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM FOR: DWIGHT CHAPIN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

June 29, 1971

Your attached memorandum of yesterday's date expresses the President's interest in having political state dinners. Ohio is specifically mentioned. This subject has been raised before with the Attorney General, but to no avail.

My mechanism, as I explained on the telephone, would normally be to go to Magruder to get information or a decision from the Attorney General, however, this system has not worked on this particular request before.

Larry suggests, on his copy of your memorandum, that Mr. Baldeman should raise the subject with the Attorney General. I will do this by preparing a talking paper for Mr. Baldeman to use when he sees the Attorney General on Friday.
MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. GORDON STRACHAN
FROM: DWIGHT L. CHAPIN

The President has raised again the subject of the political state dinners. He is particularly concerned with Ohio and wants us to explore the possibility of having an Ohio dinner here sometime soon. This question is to be raised with the Attorney General to see whether he concurs and if we should get something worked out soon.

Do you want to raise this with the Attorney General or should I? Please advise.

cc: Mr. Parker
June 20, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:       DWIGHT CHAPIN
FROM:                   GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT:                Gallup Polls

Nell Yates advises that you have been trying to place a call to the Gallup Organisation for the last two days to discover whether any Presidential popularity questions were asked in the most recent survey.

Another subject that you may want to cover with the Gallup people is some advance knowledge about their 1972 Convention Preview Series, which will go public on Sunday, July 4th. Gallup has announced that the subjects covered will be:

1. How the Party "Pros" see the Vietnam War;
2. What will be the top issue in the 1972 Campaign;
3. Which issues are most important to the voters.

After you reach your contacts at the Gallup Organisation, please let me know what might be coming up so that we are not caught short.

GS:1m
June 15, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  DWIGHT CHAPIN
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN

You requested information as to the status of the RNC - Citizens Committee film on the President.

Herb Klein has been working with Lyn Nofsiger at the RNC on the film. Klein has seen a copy of the script (attached at Tab A).

Robert Goodman of Baltimore is producing the film for the RNC. He currently shooting footage in the West.

When I called Chris Perry at the RNC for a copy of the script, Tom Evans returned the call. Evans made the following points:

1) The project is being done at the direction of the Attorney General;

2) The RNC wants to avoid too many changes in the film;

3) Herb Klein, Lyn Nofsiger and Jeb Nagrauer are the top people involved;

4) The RNC is considering a second version for Democrats and independents;

5) The projected completion date is September 1;

6) Evans wants to do some film at the White House and needs a total of six hours when the President is away (Evans memorandum to Mark Goode, attached at Tab B);

7) Evans believes the cost (as yet undetermined) will be borne by the RNC and Citizens Committee.

Evans assured me, of course, that the film would not be released until approved by Mr. Haldeman, but was quite anxious to head off any second guessing at this stage. I tried to alleviate his fears by emphasizing that we were unfamiliar with the film until his memorandum to Goode arrived and that we were just curious as to what might be planned.
Presumably you will cover this matter with Mr. Haldeman, but if not please advise so that I can have materials available for him should the subject come up in his discussion with the Attorney General.

Attachment

GS: elr
1971-72 PARTY PRESENTATION FILM

Prepared for: THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

By: The Robert Goodman Agency, Inc.
March 16, 1971
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQUENCE TIME</th>
<th>SEGMENT TITLE AND BRIEF PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>MAX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQUENCE</td>
<td>TIME SEQUENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8.        | 120           | 140  |      | "HEROES" Some inspiration and encour-
|           |               |      |      | agement from some Republican winners |
|           |               |      |      | who've shown they can make it against |
|           |               |      |      | long odds.                         |
| 8A.       | 35            | 45   |      | "WINDOW WASHER" A comic bit in      |
|           |               |      |      | which an un-hero makes a point.     |
| 9.        | 100           | 120  |      | "REPUBLICAN MEETING" Another oppor-
|           |               |      |      | tunity to make the audience the star |
|           |               |      |      | of the film and to tie-in the impor-
|           |               |      |      | tance of their particular work ses-
|           |               |      |      | sion or nuts-and-bolts organization. |
|           |               |      |      | We add to this some very dramatic |
|           |               |      |      | personal urgings to the meeting      |
|           |               |      |      | participants from some heavyweight  |
|           |               |      |      | Republicans.                        |
| 10.       | 70            | 75   |      | "IT" The whole glorious Republican pu-
|           |               |      |      | rpose in life in a beautiful techni-
|           |               |      |      | color dream. It begins the motion |
|           |               |      |      | that is to draw the film to its emo-
|           |               |      |      | tional conclusion. The beginning of |
|           |               |      |      | the...                             |
| 11.       | 100           | 120  |      | "PARADE" The Party on the move in 1972 |
|           |               |      |      | Lots of movement and stirring march |
|           |               |      |      | music with scenes of typical Ameri-
|           |               |      |      | cans. Suddenly, the President is    |
|           |               |      |      | included which causes us to stop   |
|           |               |      |      | for...                             |
| 12.       | 70            |      |      | "HELICOPTER TOUR" A highly unique and |
|           |               |      |      | moving reminder of the greatness of |
|           |               |      |      | America and the men who made it     |
|           |               |      |      | great.                             |
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 1
SEGMENT TITLE: "WHAT WOULD YOU BE DOING..."

To play 40-50 seconds.
Gathered Edits. All cuts.
The camera sees short silent slices of life depicting the typical, often meaningless, sometimes humorously unpleasant things people might find themselves doing on a given weekend afternoon.
Result should be 6 to 8 cuts gathered from over shooting scenes such as: family trying vainly to get kids, dogs, packages into station wagon, fat woman riding horse in park, man doing sloppy, amateur paint job, kids covering father at beach with sand and getting sand in his face, woman treating her poison ivy with calamine lotion, man in a very leaky rowboat, backyard chef socializing while his hamburgers go up in flame behind him, etc.

Music, light, cheap and bouncy.
Faded under for...

NARR.
What would you be doing... if you weren't doing what you're doing now?

Music up full

NARR.
And if, despite the little miseries, you'd rather be there than here... good. That's the perspective you need to help understand what we have to do. To help understand why we're here.

Music fades

Final cut should be a person's face.

CUT TO
SS NO. 2

-- HARD AUDIO CUT TO
SX IN SS NO. 2

--
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 2
SEGMENT TITLE: "DEAD SOLDIER"

To play 120-150 seconds.

Scenic Continuity. Mostly dissolves.

The camera sees and does a study on a compacted urban neighborhood street — typical of the Irish, Italian, Puerto Rican or black ethnic neighborhoods of New York City. Kids have a stickball or kick-the-can game going in the street. After fully establishing the setting, the camera slowly moves in on one particular house in the row of houses on the street.

Camera stays on the house for a few seconds after narrator finishes. Then, attracted by the noise of the kids playing, we start watching the game. Cutaways to neighbors conversing on front steps. Young women with baby carriages. A mother reaching out of her front door to gather in two small children, etc. Mostly we watch the game picking up close-ups of kids.

Superimpose over scene:

Pages being leafed over in a family snapshot album. We see, in order:

Parents with new child. Young boy with school chums. Teenager with buddies. Young man with sweetheart. Wedding picture. Army service portrait. Group picture of Army unit, with camera closing in on

SFX. A full, and heavy mix of all the sounds of the street.

NARR.

Anthony Franzetti, who used to live in this house, is dead. That's where he is.
subject creating high grain and contrast. Freeze.

SFX. Out

NARR.

In 1962, the President of the United States sent 17,000 American men to Viet Nam. In 1965, the President of the United States sent 546,000 American men. Today, the President of the United States is bringing them home.

One life. More perspective. On the job we have to do.

SFX. Up full, then fades

Street scene as before. 3 or 4 seconds.

CUT TO SS NO. 3

HARD AUDIO CUT BEFORE FINAL FADE TO MUSIC IN SS NO. 3
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 3
SEGMENT TITLE: "PANORAMA"

To play 70-75 seconds.
The scene is the most beautiful
place in America. We picture a
green grassy farm or ranch with
a mountain ridge in the distance.
There are some horses with young
colts gamboling in a very open
grassy corral. Some happy, but
interesting looking people are in
the picture. An older, but hard-
somely rugged, man is beside a
pretty young girl sitting on the
fence rail watching, smiling and
laughing as they watch a younger
man try to round up the horses.
During the whole of the narration
we watch the scene from all the
pretty angles possible. Often
we get close and pan across the
faces of the people—particularly
when the narration calls for
introspection.

Music, film theme, in pastoral
sweeping panoramic tones.

NARR.
And who are we, anyway? We are
Republicans. We are Americans. What
are we all about, we American Republicans?
What makes us different? How different
are we? And how different should we be?
Isn't it true that most all good, loyal,
concerned Americans have the same goals?
A continuation of the best of what this
country is founded on. Its freedom,
Its security. Its idealism. There really
are no villains. No bad people versus the
good people. No, what makes us
Republicans is a much more interesting,
exciting idea. We have better ways to
achieve the American goal. Better ways
to protect our freedom, insure our
security and promote the energy and idealism of the United States in the world today. And, at no time in the history of the Republican Party in America have we had a better opportunity to make our better ideas work.
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 4 (LIBRARY EX.)
SEGMENT TITLE: "GENERATION OF PEACE"

A 30-50 sec. extract from color S.O.F. film coverage of President Nixon's speech on the carrier.

CUT TO
SS. NO. 5

CUT TO
SS NO. 5
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 5
SEGMENT TITLE: "PARABLE IN THE OVAL OFFICE"

To play 75 seconds.
The camera is in the oval office of the President. It makes the fact obvious at the beginning by identifying Presidential items such as photographs, seals, etc.

As the narration begins the camera continues its study of the office in tempo with the dramatic pace of the story. Explanations are punctuated by swish pans, faces are imagined by cuts to various corners of the room, motion is indicated by slow movement with the extreme wide angle lens.

NARR.

In the early part of the last century, a migrating tribe of Plains Indians led by a chief whose name is translated as Chin of Iron, found itself weak, hungry and nearly dying of thirst at the edge of a muddy water hole in the western desert. A cry of joy and relief ran through the assembled tribe as they waited only for their chief to signal that they might drink from the water hole. But Chin of Iron hesitated.

"Let us drink, Chin of Iron. Let us drink, chief, or we shall surely die." Chin of Iron walked to the water, wet his finger and tasted. "Drink, Chin of Iron, let us drink," they began to chant now. Shuffling faces chanting
Wide angle pull back of office.

FADE TO BLACK
THEN CUT TO
SS NO. 6

to the point of frenzy. Braves, squaws, children -- he saw them all begging, imploring him to give the signal.

Finally, the popular decision -- "Drink!" he bellowed, hoping that his own judgment was at fault, hoping that the traces of poison he had surely detected in the well were not there. A leader hoping -- no longer reasoning. A tribe lost.

Decisions made here, in this room--thank goodness--will not be made just because they are popular.
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 6
SEGMENT TITLE: "WHO SPEAKS FOR THE PRESIDENT?"

To play 110-130 seconds. For the opening narrative, we have rapid cuts of people conducting their normal daily activities. This starts with large general shots of people walking downtown streets, getting off bus, at large lunch counter, and then begins to preview wide views of the subjects and settings to come in the SOF excerpts.

SFX or SOF to match cuts.

NARR.

Who speaks, then, for the President?

Who will carry the weight of decisions that cannot always be popular?

Who must share the responsibility of this high office—an office that cannot afford to be partisan?

Who must carry the ball in the national elections of 1972?

Who is more important than ever in the campaign that decides America?

We are.

Republicans are.

These are all cuts.

6-1 Girl student to other students

SOF:

...no, no, I think you're wrong. You have to look at where we were before he took office. And if you want to be honest...

I mean really honest...President Nixon has done more of the things we wanted...
to see happen in this country, than any other president before him.

6-2. Golfer in locker room to his wife. SOF
...to me, it's foreign policy. For the first time, we have a President who has clearly spelled out our objectives around the world. And, they're sensible, they're reasonable. We can live with them and so can the rest of the world. I don't know what you guys think, but that's what a good foreign policy's all about and we have a President who can do it.

6-3. Older woman to another woman. SOF
...the war, he closed down the war. Now, don't start telling me about what somebody else would have done. They had their chance and they didn't. President Nixon did.

6-4. A Mavo; to an Aide. SOF
...it was brilliant. Revenue sharing is a great Republican idea for bringing government closer to the people. But it also is the most practical way to get our cities and local governments on
their feet again. The President put it all together and got something going.

6-5. Old man in cafeteria to crutches. SOP
Yeah? Well, you sure didn't turn up your nose at President's Nixon's national health insurance plan. Did ya?

6-6. Young Black to reporter. SOP
I give him very good marks on pressing school integration in the South and, for the first time, not ignoring the problem in the North.

6-7. Mother, to camera. SOP
...the country's cooled down. We're all a little less insane.

6-8. Working man on corner to fall. SOP
...well I'll tell you what I think. I think President Nixon is the right man in the right place at the right time. He's steady and he's strong -- and that's just the kind of President we need now. You take a look at those other guys who want the job...

Continued: SOP in 5-8 in Script under
While the narration comes over the final scene of the man on the corner, we have two brief "premonition-type" intercuts of SS No. 10, "The Republican Meeting".

CUT TO
TITLE ART OF SS NO. 7

NARR.
So, in 1972, with a President in office concerned with the daily responsibility of all Americans, we... become more important than ever. He has his job to do. We have ours.

HARD AUDIO CUT TO PIANO MUSIC
OF SS NO. 7
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 7
SEGMENT TITLE: "AS OTHERS SEE US"

To Play 130-150 seconds.

TITLE CARD: 
REPUBLICANS -- 
AS SEEN THROUGH THE 
EYES OF DEMOCRATS

Scene is a dimly lit warehouse interior. A beam of light is cast on the floor to indicate a door has been opened and people are entering.

Music, funky piano type

MEN’S VOICES (OFF CAMERA):

Easy, easy! OK, swing your end around. Watch it. OK, I got it.

Oh, man, this thing ain’t feathers.

Lights flash on. We see a single exposed light bulb and in the center of a circle of light beneath it, two warehousemen with a large refrigerator size packing crate. Lettered diagonally down the side of the crate are the words: STANDARD MODEL. The men, breathing hard from their struggle, take a few seconds break. Then...

MAN 1:

Okay, this will be your standard model Republican.

MAN 2:

Let’s see what we have.

With crowbars, they proceed to pry the front side off the standing crate.
Side comes off and falls to the floor. In the crate we see standing like a mannequin—a neatly groomed man in a blue business suit. He is wearing hornrimmed glasses and stands with a brief case in his hand. He stands motionless while the ware­housemen step back to discuss the product.

**MAN 1:**
All right, sweetheart, don’t say you never saw one. This is a basic Republican, standard model.

**MAN 2:**
Geez.

**MAN 1:**
Note that the style is always pretty much the same. And get your order slip and we’ll check off the accessories.

**MAN 1:**
All right, this one should go with a split level home...

**MAN 2:**
Check.
(SS NO. 7 con't)

MAN 1:
...junior executive job...

MAN 2:
Check.

MAN 1:
...wife...

MAN 2:
Check. One each.

MAN 1:
two to three kids and a year old
station wagon...

MAN 2:
Check. Check. Check.

MAN 1:
one large collie dog.

MAN 2:
Says poodle here.

MAN 1:
Hmmm. That's a change.

MAN 2:
Hey, George, don't go on any further.
MAN 1: Yeah, I know what you mean. The excitement of this product is just too much for you. Republicans put me to sleep, too.

MAN 2: No, I don't mean that. I mean we got the wrong thing here. Look at this packing slip--this is an old model, out of stock.

MAN 1: You know you're right. We picked up the wrong crate back there. It must of been that other one near the door. Oh, boy...let's go get it. We're supposed to check all the new stuff.

Music, funky piano as before

CUT TO

TITLE CARD:
REPUBLICANS '72 -- AS WE REALLY ARE!

We are close in over the shoulders of the warehousemen as they are opening the new crate. This is clearly marked on the front with the words: 1972 MODEL.
Front panel is ripped off, revealing contents to be the exact same man we saw the first time.

Close up of Man 1.

Close up of Man 2 as he changes expression from resignation to incredulity.

Camera zooms into crate quickly. In one motion the man in the crate is peeling off his coat and shirt and talking into a payphone mounted on inside of crate. We begin to see, under his clothing, the familiar "S" in the shield.

FADE TO BLACK

CUT TO SS NO. 8
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 3
SEGMENT TITLE: "HEROES"

To Play 120-140 seconds.
These are some head-on 
statements by a few Repub-
lican winners at the state 
level. The theme of their 
message in each case is 
encouragement to work and 
win despite the odds. 
The text here is suggested 
only as an example as are 
the participants. In all 
cases, the statements should 
be lively and candid—not 
behind-the-desk stereotypes. 
The subjects should be aware 
that they are speaking to 
friends.

GOVERNOR HOLTON:

Democrats? You bet there are plenty 
of Democrats in Virginia. There are so 
many Democrats that when they used to have 
their Primary, that was it...it was all over. 
Well, we changed all that in '68. We had 
one whale of an organization that went 
right to work after the Democrats had 
their big battle and we showed a lot of 
people that we Republicans really had what 
they were looking for. It was hard work 
against tough odds. But we did it. And 
we won.
GOVERNOR REAGAN.
Don't make the mistake of thinking all
the big elections are won or lost today
on advertising and media. Both sides
have the weapon and when they both
use it, they cancel each other out. No,
the difference is what we prove out here
in California. Hard working people
dedicated to an idea. That kind of
combination can move mountains...and
I don't care what the numbers are.

SENATOR BROOKE.
We Republicans have a great opportunity
coming up. I think we have yet to let go
our best shot. This country hasn't seen
our best: our excitement, our dynamics,
our full head of steam behind positive
And brother if we can keep it all together...
hold on to your hat.
GOVERNOR NUNN.

Well, I think you should just all come to Kentucky. We have two Republican Senators and a Republican Governor.

And maybe all three of us have a little different idea on some things—but when it comes to working at election time, we're all together and so is every Republican in this state. We work at it.
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 8-A
SEGMENT TITLE: "WINDOW WASHER"

To Plan 35-45 seconds
We're slowly zooming in through a window frame to a window washer sitting on a scaffolding.
Stop at a medium shot, only sky is seen behind the subject.

WINDOW WASHER.
He's right, folks. And so are all the rest of these fellas. And I'm out here to add one single dramatic point. If we don't do our job in '72...it's a long way down. We're building on the best advance our party has made in a long time. We've started some great things for this country in the last couple years, and don't you know those other guys are just waiting for us to fall. To see it all go out the window. 1972 is about the biggest, most decisive election year we ever had to face. Now, I'm no Senator...and I'm no Governor. And, as a matter of fact, I'm not even a window washer. I'm Jerry Carroll of the Illinois State Committee and I've just discovered I have a fear of heights. I mean I like to do my part, folks, but...

He peers over the side of the scaffold.

PAGE TO BLACK
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 9
SEGMENT TITLE: "REPUBLICAN MEETING"

To Play 100-120 seconds.

The camera is doing a wide overhead pan of a Republican meeting of the type that eventually will view this film. We see lots of our instructional material around on the tables like the "mission '70s" books, etc.

Medium shot of the chairman.

Here we begin to take some close-up looks at the meeting's participants as they sit listening with rapt attention.

As we look at the third face, there is brief...

INTERCUT: SENATOR DOLE

CHAIRMAN'S SOF FALLS TO LOW LEVEL AS HIS SPEECH CONTINUES

SENIOR DOLE, SOF

We're counting on you.
Fourth face goes by without intercut. But on fifth,

**DOUBLE INTERCUT:**

**SENATOR SCOTT**

*You're carrying the ball.*

**GOVERNOR HOLTON**

*We're counting on you.*

Fifth face...

**INTERCUT: REP. FORD**

*You're important.*

Camera pans and entire row of meeting participants, as pace of intercutting picks up.

**INTERCUT: GOV. REAGAN**

*The country's counting on you.*

**INTERCUT: SEN. BROOKS**

*Give it your best.*

**INTERCUT: TOM EVANS**

*We can help. But it's up to you.*

**INTERCUT: VP AGNEW**

*We're counting on you.*

**INTERCUT: SEN. JAVITZ**

*We're counting on you.*
INTERCUT: SEN DOLE
(REPEAT)

Medium shot of group of
faces still listening to
chairman.

CUT TO
SS NO. 10

SEN. DOLE, SCP.
We're counting on you.

CHAIRMAN'S SCP COMES UP FULL AGAIN.
Now, let's go through the book page by
page and if you have any questions...

SFX of Wind begins to be heard
from SS NO. 10
To Play 70-75 seconds.
This is a return to the same setting as SS NO. 3, only it's a different time of day. The sun is setting and the first subjects we see are semi-backlighted by the setting sun. The camera is in fairly tight as a man is lifting a small child on to a horse and begins to check his saddle and stirrups.

Camera follows tightly as the man walks around the horse to help another child onto another horse. This child is Black.

Cuts of other people getting on horses. As they are mounted, they look toward the kids. Some of the same people are seen from SS NO. 3. Scene gradually begins to expand to a broader, more spectacular sunset scene.

Where it fits the narration best, there are cuts to close-ups of the kids waiting on their horses.

The first man looks around, mounts his own horse, then, checking back to see that everyone is ready, he gives a quiet signal to move out.

About 10 riders begin to move out on to the field and the camera follows.

SOP. We hear the soft and occasional sounds this action would produce like the man saying, "You okay, partner", and the boy answering "Yes".

NARR.

Rudyard Kipling wrote a poem once with a two-letter title. Short of reciting the Republican Party philosophy, perhaps more to the point would be these lines and liberties from Kipling:

If we can gather up the energy that is ours. If we can give every child a feeling that he belongs among us and has a place waiting for his own unique talent and imagination. If we can show him the challenge of an enduring America and affirm our faith in his being able to meet it. If we can fill his world with fresh air, ideas and endless horizons. And if we will see through his eyes a world different...
(SS NO. 10 con't)

Close-ups of kids as they ride.

Now, for the first time, we reverse the camera position to get the sunset color directly on all the riders.

Freeze the frame.

Saturate color.

Briefly flash film credits as sets of super over saturated frame. One set is preferable, two at most.

(Continuation in SS NO. 11)
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 11
SEGMENT TITLE: "PARADE"

To Play 100-120 seconds
Saturated freeze frame from end of SS NO. 10.

As the melody line of the march begins, we begin to see a rapid series of cuts, 3 to 4 seconds each, of Americans on the move. The cuts can be made on the phrase changes in the music. Suggested:


Then...
Picture of President Nixon again in the open car.

Freeze the frame.

Music. We hear the lone drum beats establishing the rhythm of the film theme as it is about to be developed into a growing and stirring march.

March builds and becomes fuller and more intense as it progresses.

March comes to a planned, but sudden conclusion.

After a second or two of silence...

SFX: The steady beat of a helicopter in flight.

DISSOLVE TO SS NO. 12. Continue SFX into SS NO. 12.
SCENE SEQUENCE NO. 12
SEGMENT TITLE: "HELIICOPTER TOUR"

To Play 70 seconds.
The camera will now take a tour that few, if any, Americans have seen before. All film here will be shot in a high contrast style so that most images appear as white marble against a deep velvet background.

From the helicopter, we are looking directly down at the tip of the Washington Monument. Starting in close at the tip, we move away to fully frame the monument landscape with the Jefferson Memorial in the upper right corner. We move to the Jefferson Memorial, framing it and its water reflection as we go.

Dissolve to
Tight shot of columns in motion at the Lincoln Memorial. The columns continue to flash by the lens as the helicopter circles until, suddenly we encounter the pool and the Lincoln statue looms before us.

Dissolve to
Movement over waters of the Reflecting Pool, reaching the end we swoop upwards and begin to circle the Capitol. Then up further still until all that we have seen is emossed in one frame.

SUPER LETTERS:
The Beginning
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 10, 1971

Dwight:

If there are any restrictions to be set forth on this filming, please advise. As soon as I hear from you, I will set up a schedule with Steve.

Mark
MEMORANDUM TO: The Honorable Mark I. Goode
FROM: Thomas B. Evans, Jr.

The National Committee, in conjunction with the Citizens Committee for the Re-election of the President, is producing a film to generate enthusiasm for the President around the country.

We will need to film the President's office and perhaps some other areas of the White House including his office in the Executive Office Building. A film of this type is long overdue and we would appreciate it if we could accomplish this part within the next two to three weeks.

I will ask Bob Goodman, who is producing the film for us, to contact you directly to arrange a time which will not conflict with the President's schedule. They will need an hour to shoot some test footage and on another date approximately five hours for the actual filming.

Many thanks.

TBEjr/mb

cc: The Honorable Herb Klein
    Lyn Nofziger
    Chris Perry
June 14, 1971

El Dorado County Planning Commission
2850 Cold Springs Road
Placerville, California

As a member of the Board of Directors of the McKinney Bay
Improvement Association, be advised that I strongly oppose
the granting of construction permits for the Waters Edge
Unit No. 2 tentative subdivision map. The project is
inconsistent with the rational development of Lake Tahoe.

Gordon Strachan

Forrest Anderson
Post Office Box 207
Homewood, California

elr
We have just learned the following and are rushing the information on to you. Please read this and act on it.

With little publicity of the meeting, a proposal was made before the El Dorado Planning Commission, May 27, to permit construction of an additional 36 units on 3.3 acres, (some 4 bedrooms and 3 stories) between Highway 89 and the present 35 units (on the water) at Waters Edge, Tahoe.

Consideration has been delayed until a meeting on June 24. The proposal is totally out of scale with present planning. Parking and recreation facilities would be inadequate, and the buildings would add to the "Chinese Wall" effect between highway and lake.

Please attend the meeting, if possible, and send letters and telegrams in protest.

Bearing for
Waters Edge Unit No. 2 Tentative Subdivision Map
El Dorado County Planning Commission
El Dorado County Office Center
2850 Cold Springs Road
Placerville, California
Telephone: (916) 626-2433
9:00 A.M., Thursday, June 24, 1971

Thank you in advance,

[Signature]
E. Forrest Anderson
June 14, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: GEORGE GRASSMUCK
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Gerald Kline from the Survey Research Institute at the University of Michigan did a detailed post 1970 election study of youth. He has some interesting conclusions on the 18-20 year old vote, including the statement that the 18-20 year old vote will have "very little effect on the 1972 election."

Would you work through your sources at the Survey Research Center and see if we could obtain a copy of this survey without indicating the source of the request?

GS: elr
June 20, 1971

LARRY BISHBY
GORDON STRACHAN

Do you have a copy of Senator Brock's analysis of his youth program in Tennessee and the potentials for the President in 1972?

GS: lm
June 28, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  
MR. HIGHY

FROM:  
GORDON STRACHAN

SUBJECT:  
Key States

You may have already covered this with Dwight, but, in light of the plans he is making for this summer's travels, it might be helpful for him to have the results of Haldeman's selection of the key states.

Please advise whether you want me to cover this personally with Dwight.

GS: lm
MEMORANDUM FOR:    MR. HIGBY
FROM:        GORDON STRACHAN

June 10, 1971

After I submitted the Alabama, Indiana Poll to you yesterday, I had an opportunity to discuss with Dr. Derge possible questions on an Indiana poll. His suggestions include:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Whitcomb is handling his job as Governor?

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Dick Lugar is handling his job as Mayor of Indianapolis?

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the Republican Party has handled the government of Indiana?

Which party would best serve the interests of Indiana - Democrats or Republicans?

You may want to include these in your discussion with Mr. Hagedeman.

GS: elr
**Suggested questions re. Wallace**

1. How would you rate the job George Wallace is doing as Governor of Alabama—excellent, good, fair, or poor?  
   1. EXCELLENT  
   2. GOOD  
   3. FAIR  
   4. POOR  
   5. NO OPINION

2. What are some of the things you like the most about Governor Wallace?

3. If the election for Governor of Alabama were being held today, would you vote for George Wallace if he were one of the candidates?  
   1. YES  
   2. NO  
   3. DON'T KNOW

4. In general, do you approve or disapprove of Governor Wallace's position on States Rights?  
   1. APPROVE  
   2. DISAPPROVE  
   3. NO OPINION

5. In general, do you approve or disapprove of Governor Wallace's position on Civil Rights?  
   1. APPROVE  
   2. DISAPPROVE  
   3. NO OPINION
6. If a candidate for President of the United States was supported by Governor Wallace, would you be more likely to vote for him, more likely to vote against him, or wouldn't it make any difference?

7. Which one of these two statements is the better description of Governor Wallace — he is opposed to equal rights for all people regardless of race, or he is opposed to the federal government interfering in the affairs of a state?

5. Familiarity — Wallace
Bresnik
Mikon
Kennedy
MEMORANDUM FOR:  
MR. HIGBY
FROM:  
GORDON STRACHAN

June 9, 1971

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 what 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 Harik programmed to guide Flanigan or whoever else you suggest to guide the simulation question to decision.

GS:elr
June 8, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  MR. HIGBY
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN

One of the aspects of the Tom Benham proposal for the polling plan is our regular use of their bi-monthly caravan study. You may recall that we discussed including Presidential popularity and trial heat questions as a regular item.

In order to be included in the July caravan, we should have a decision on this aspect by June 15.

GS:elr
June 8, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HIGBY
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Walter DeVries

In a discussion today with Lance Torrence about the status of the New York census - redistricting information, I mentioned Walter DeVries. It turns out that Lance was a student of DeVries when DeVries was working for the RNC in 1963.

DeVries is a Republican, who worked for Romney in '68 and Mulligan in Michigan recently. He has been approached by other Republican Senators in anticipation of 1972.

Lance characterizes DeVries as the strongest Republican voting behavioralist available. He and Lance are co-authoring a book to be released this fall on the theory of ticket splitting.

Walter DeVries is a Professor at the University of Michigan, but contrary to information we received before he is not connected with the Social Research Institute, which is dominated by Democrats.

According to Lance, DeVries might be interested in a national campaign, but would not be available until this fall and at that time would like to be contacted by someone at the top (S. G. Mitchell). Lance characterizes DeVries as a moderate Republican, neither of the Rockefeller nor Goldwater wing. He has never worked for Democrats. However, he is currently testing some new ticket splitting theory in a Louisiana primary race because there is no effective Republican party in the area.

As a vendor, DeVries uses FredCourier at Marquis Opinion Research in Detroit.

The net result of this rambling memorandum is that we probably should not dismiss DeVries out of hand, but rather might want to have someone like Cliff Miller approach him and get a reading as to his possible usefulness to us.

Should we proceed with having Miller contact DeVries?

Yes ______ No _______ Comment __________________________

GS: elr
June 14, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:  DICK HOWARD
FROM:  GORDON STRACHAN

You were able to obtain for us the Decision Making Information Poll done for the ANA on the post 1970 election studies.

We understand that DMI also prepared an analysis of When the Voter Makes Up his Mind Prior to Voting. This DMI study may have been done in connection with the original ANA contract for a series of post election studies.

Would you check your sources and see if you could get this study?

GS:slr
June 28, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: HERB KALMBACH
FROM: GORDON SYRACHAN

Welcome.

As ever, we have a full schedule planned for you. After you are settled at your hotel this evening, please call me as the memorandum has returned with much of the information we have awaited.

As I indicated to you, a meeting has been scheduled for 3:00 p.m. tomorrow with Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Dean.

We have several other matters to go over and I wonder if breakfast at the White House at 8:30 in the morning would be convenient for you?

GS:1m
June 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: HERB KALMBACH
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Welcome back!

We have a busy schedule planned for you:

A) Lee Nunn and Hugh Sloan would like to have breakfast with you tomorrow at 8:30 a.m. at the Hay Adams with Messrs. Fisher and Pappas;

B) Larry Higby and I would like to see you at 9:30 a.m. in Larry's office, if this is convenient and

C) Mr. Haldeman would like to see you at 11:00 a.m.

At your convenience, we have quite a list of items, of a procedural nature, that we should discuss.

Please call me when you arrive at your hotel. The White House operator has been instructed to reach me tonight when you call.

GS: elr
June 4, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: BRUCE KEHRLI
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Chapin TV Proposal

Discussion with Dwight this morning indicated that he has heard back from Bill Carruthers regarding the ASI matter. ASI indicated to Carruthers that they did work for us in any way, they would accept no other political candidate. ASI also promised to assure a pure sample, which you will recall was Derge’s main reservation; however, the price will be increased.

Chapin assured me that he would submit a memorandum to Haldeman today updating the project and suggesting the next action step, that is, a meeting in California with ASI to work out the details of a proposal.

GS: elr
June 30, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE JOHN N. MITCHELL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

Mr. Haldeman asked that you receive this memorandum for the President, prepared by Pat Buchanan on "The Odds Against Henry Jackson."

Also enclosed is an analysis of the 18–20 year old vote prepared by Tom Benham of Opinion Research Corporation for your review.

Attachment: Memorandum for the President from Pat Buchanan, dated June 25, 1971
Memorandum from Tom Benham to H. R. Haldeman, dated June 15, 1971

GS:elr
June 25, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN
SUBJECT: The Odds Against Henry Jackson

That Senator Jackson is a candidate for his party's nomination -- there is no question. That he can win it -- there appears little hope. But Jackson has some very high cards to play which make him a strong contender for Vice President, and a powerful force at the Democratic National Convention.

JACKSON'S STRENGTHS

1. He has almost all the moderate and conservative columnists in the palm of his hand. They like, admire and respect Scoop Jackson. A cursory review of the last three months finds supportive presidential talk about Jackson from columnists White, both Alsops, Kilpatrick, Alexander, Cuneo, the Drummonds several times, Gould Lincoln, Chamberlain, Wilson -- and on and on. (Evans & Novak are solicitous.) They provide him with regular backpage support in most of the papers of the nation. Even columnists who disagree with him (Wicker, Viorst) respect him.

2. A choice not an echo: He is the single national Democrat who stands as a clear alternative against the crowd of Bayh, Hughes, Muskie, McGovern, Humphrey, Kennedy crowd. He emerges thus a visible rallying point for conservative Democrats at the '72 convention.

3. Having hired the capable adviser Ben Wattenburg, he is paralleling the Scammon-Wattenburg thesis. His attacks on "environmental extremists," his denunciation of fellow Democrats for paying "homage to the radical fringe," his focus on bread-and-butter issues, the economy and jobs, his call for Democrats to stay on the "Economic Issue," not the war; his rough terminology which is being described in liberal circles as "Agnewian" -- in all these instances, Jackson is setting himself up against the trendy,
bell-bottomed, elite of the left wing of his party -- and with the working man center and right of his party. On issues, he is carving out his own independent sector within the Democratic Party.

4. His super-hawkish anti-Soviet stand in the Middle East, his fight for SST, against the "environmental extremists," for space and defense, not only make him first choice of George Meany -- but guarantee a well-financed campaign from Aerospace, from Defense Industries, from the Jewish Community, from Big Labor.

5. He is well respected by his Senate colleagues. A Drummond Poll of the Senate found that 18 percent of Democrats felt Jackson "most qualified to be President" ahead of Humphrey -- second only to Muskie -- (interestingly, EMK got less than anyone, three percent or one vote of those polled.)

6. He gets excellent press coverage.

7. His hard-line on the Soviets, and on strategic defense, wins him publicity plaudits from the Republican Conservative Community. While such is of little use in a run for the nomination, it might be to any Democrat for his Vice President.

8. On Vietnam he is down-playing his support of the President, leaving it high enough to be visibly opposed to the rest of the pack, but shading it a bit. Domestically, he pays occasional obeisance to such myths as the "repression" by the Administration. Enough to keep his dues up -- but not nearly enough to close the sizable gap that exists between him and the liberal left of his party.

9. He is the best vote-getter in the Senate -- winning his primary against a Galbraithian type by 85 percent -- and beating our candidate in the general by the same margin -- 85 percent of the vote in a northwestern industrial state. This evidence of massive support across the party lines and throughout the ideological spectrum makes him especially attractive as a Vice Presidential nominee.

10. His strength with press was evident in a poll of editors at ASNE who felt he would probably have nearly best chance of any Democrat of defeating RN.
DEFICIENCES

1. He has almost no recognition nationally. This will force him to raise his profile rapidly, to announce fairly early, and probably to go the primary route -- and it is doubtful how well he can do against Democrats like Muskie.

2. He is apparently an unexciting speaker, who often bores even those audiences who agree with him. One friend called him a "Barry Goldwater without charisma."

3. His nomination would sunder the Democratic Party. And with left-wing strength greater at this convention than the past, difficult to see how his nomination could be swallowed by a Democratic Convention. (However, if a Teddy Kennedy were nominated and Democratic conservatives sufficiently outraged -- a Kennedy-Jackson ticket might do for the party what the Kennedy-Johnson ticket did in 1960, bring it together again. Where Johnson had the opposition of Labor and support of the South -- Jackson for Veep would have both the South and Labor in his corner.)

4. He is sixty years old, at least will be, when the Democratic Convention is over. This is his last chance to be on a national Democratic ticket, after three decades in the Senate.

JACKSON'S CHANCE

Having carved out an independent Churchillian Position, if you will, on the Soviets, on the Middle East -- whence war is likely to come if it comes -- Jackson is dependent upon circumstances. If the Vietnam war is raging, and there is calm between East and West -- Jackson has next to nothing going for him.

But if Vietnam is removed as an issue, and the Soviets become belligerent in Europe or the Middle East or the Mediterranean or anywhere, then Jackson may very well appear the man for the times. If national focus turns upon American weakness in the face of a rapidly arming Soviet Empire, then Jackson could generate real support among Conservative Democrats, Meany unions and the South -- and even conservative Republicans.
No other Democrat seems today capable of making credible a hard-line policy against the USSR.

But in such times Jackson will have a long shot for the top position, and an inside track for the Vice Presidency.

THE FLORIDA PRIMARY

Jackson cannot win in New Hampshire; his lack of public recognition requires him to step out early if he is to have any hope at the Convention. Thus he is forced, it seems into the primaries. Thus Florida -- according to two writers -- which is the same day as New Hampshire -- becomes crucial to Jackson.

If Jackson wins in Florida, and Muskie is defeated, then the Muskie opening day becomes a flop; Muskie's candidacy is damaged; the Jackson candidacy becomes interesting -- and the stage is set for a bitter division at the Convention.

While we may be desirous ourselves of having a massive turnout for RN in Florida -- there may be something worth while for us in assisting the efforts of Scoop Jackson in that State. Something we ought to keep in mind.
MEMORANDUM

TO: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: TOM BENHAM, OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION
SUBJECT: POTENTIAL EFFECT OF THE 18 TO 20 YEAR OLD VOTE ON 1972 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION RESULTS.

Because of the postwar "baby boom", the numbers of newly eligible voters rose abruptly to over 12,000,000 in 1968. Of this number, Census Bureau estimates indicate that approximately one-half (51%) actually went to the polls to cast their ballots. They comprised some 7% of all voters in the 1968 election.

Present estimates indicate that the newly eligible group will increase to 25,000,000 in 1972, including more than 10,000,000 in the age group 18 to 20 years. If every age group votes the same way in 1972 -- including the newly eligible voters -- then those voting for the first time will account for some 13% of the total vote. This is shown in Table 1.

A number of conflicting claims have been made about the potential effect of these new voters on the outcome of the election -- ranging from the prediction that they will mean nothing at all to the idea that they will surely determine the outcome. The recent Gallup discussion in the May, 1971 Gallup Opinion Index is valid as far as it goes. It indicates
that 18-20 year olds are heavily Democratic and tend to favor Nixon opponents. However, there has been no attempt, so far as we know, to estimate exactly what the effect might be in key states comprising most of the electoral votes. That is the purpose of this memorandum.

The Analysis and Assumptions Used

We selected the 15 states with the largest electoral votes (omitting Georgia, which was carried by Wallace in 1968). A total of 320 of 1972's electoral votes are accounted for by these 15 states. We studied the effect on the vote in each state in two ways -- with Wallace in the race and without Wallace. We also have applied two different assumptions about the probable voting participation of the newly eligible voters:

(1) Assuming 50% of the age group 18 to 24 will vote in 1972, and

(2) Assuming 70% of this age group will vote in 1972

It is our fairly strong feeling that 50% participation will be much closer to the actual voting participation than 70%, despite the extravagant claims of some youth leaders that as many as 90% of the newly eligible voters will be voting.

Our final assumption is that other age groups will vote in the same proportions and numbers in 1972 as they did in 1968 -- in other words everything else being equal.

We are basing our estimate of how the new voters will vote on the preferences of 18-20 year olds in four recent ORC surveys (telephone surveys of January 25-28, March 1-3, April 12-13, and the personal interview study of May 12-23, 1971 all combined). A total of 361 respondents were available for the analysis as it pertains to Muskie and Kennedy, and 327 as it applies to Humphrey, since he was not included in all the trial heats.
Kennedy enjoys a wide margin over President Nixon, among the 18-20 year age group. Muskie enjoys a slight edge, and Humphrey runs somewhat behind. This is true both with Wallace in the race, and without Wallace. These trial heat results are shown in Table 2.

Some Conclusions

1. With Kennedy in a three-way race, including Wallace, present indications are that the results could be a disaster for the Nixon candidacy, assuming all things equal except the newly eligible voters. (Additional assumptions, are, of course, that the national data for young voters will apply equally to each state and that the present preference of the young voters will remain the same at election time, as in recent surveys.)

With Kennedy in a three-way race, including Wallace, and 50% of the newly eligible voters actually going to the polls — among the key states President Nixon carried in 1968, he would lose California, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Missouri, and Wisconsin. President Nixon would receive only 55 of the 320 electoral votes in the fifteen states.

With 70% actually getting to the polls, Nixon would also lose North Carolina and Virginia, and receive only 30 of 320 electoral votes.

In a two-way race against Kennedy, results at the 50% level are exactly the same. With 70% voting the only difference is found in the State of Virginia, which stays in the Nixon column.

Note: Obviously, this analysis does not take into account the campaign that could be mounted against Kennedy, including some of his failings in time of crisis. Basically, this analysis assumes he will run in 1972 as Humphrey ran in 1968. In actuality, he
would probably not do as well in the South. (In recent trial heats in the South, he runs about 10 points below his average for the rest of the country.) Also among older voters, he scores notably poorer.

2. Against Muskie -- and again assuming young people vote on election day the way they indicate their preferences today -- there will be little difference for 1968 in the number of electoral votes President Nixon carries in these states. He will receive 191 out of 320 votes. There is this one exception: with Wallace in the race, and 70% actually getting to the polls, President Nixon would lose Missouri, but would carry the 15 states overall by 179 electoral votes to 114.

Against Muskie, President Nixon's plurality declines in the various states but not enough to throw them into the Democratic column.

3. Should Humphrey be the opponent the plurality for President Nixon in each state will increase although this will not make any change in the gain or loss of states compared to 1968.

* * *

Obviously many things can change this picture. The voters, other than the newly eligible, can swing much more for or against President Nixon in 1972 than in 1968. Young voters may change their preferences. New voters comprise 13% of the whole whereas the age groups of 35 to 74 comprise two-thirds of the vote, and turn out at the 71%-75% level. Should this later group become more solidly pro-Nixon it could affect the youth vote.
Nevertheless, the following seem valid:

- Kennedy seems to be the most dangerous opponent as of now — youth could swing the balance in his favor in a close election.

- Against Muskie, pluralities become thinner, and any downturn in favor for Nixon overall could be a serious problem.

- Wallace could be an important factor. He appeals to about 15% to 20% of youth in three-way trial heats. Should Wallace withdraw, Nixon would tend to benefit, against all three opponents.

Table 7 shows a summary of the electoral vote estimates for all of these various possibilities. Table 5 shows the disposition of electoral votes for each state with Wallace in the race. Table 6 shows the disposition of electoral votes without Wallace. Tables 3 and 4 show the same data in terms of the actual pluralities generated with the addition of new voters.

See Tables
Table 1
New Voters as a Percent of Total Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1968 Election</th>
<th>1972 Election (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent That Voted</td>
<td>Percent Of All Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New voters: 18-20 years of age</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New voters: 21-24 years of age</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Census Department Series P-20, #192, p. 10)
### Table 2

#### Trial Heats -- 18-20 Years of Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Wallace</th>
<th>With Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nixon</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muskie</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Nixon**       | 31%         | **Nixon**       | 23%         |
| **Kennedy**     | 62%         | **Kennedy**     | 59%         |
| **Undecided**   | 7%          | **Undecided**   | 6%          |

| **Humphrey**    | 47%         | **Humphrey**    | 38%         |
| **Undecided**   | 9%          | **Wallace**     | 16%         |
| **Undecided**   | 2%          | **Undecided**   | 7%          |

(From ORC Surveys)
**Key States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Nixon's Votes in 1972</th>
<th>Nixon's '68 Plurality (000's)</th>
<th>Estimated New Voters in 1972 (000's)</th>
<th>Nixon's Plurality Against...</th>
<th>Opponent's Plurality Against...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(000's)</td>
<td>(000's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>(000's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>223.3</td>
<td>2500.4</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>-226.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-370.5</td>
<td>2070.0</td>
<td>-432.6</td>
<td>-743.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-360.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-169.4</td>
<td>1371.1</td>
<td>-210.5</td>
<td>-416.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-162.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>1306.9</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>-100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-39.5</td>
<td>1454.0</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>-301.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-32.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>1303.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>-144.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-222.4</td>
<td>1114.7</td>
<td>-255.8</td>
<td>-423.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-216.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>758.4</td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>783.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>-79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-702.4</td>
<td>694.5</td>
<td>-723.2</td>
<td>-827.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-698.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>261.2</td>
<td>650.9</td>
<td>241.7</td>
<td>144.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>163.1</td>
<td>708.9</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>556.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>621.5</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>550.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nixon's Electoral Vote**

| 191 | 55 | 191 | 179 | 30 | 191 |

**Opponent's Electoral Vote**

| 129 | 265 | 129 | 141 | 290 | 129 |

**Total**

<p>| 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 | 320 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Electoral Votes in 1972</th>
<th>Nixon's '68 Plurality (000's)</th>
<th>Estimated New Voters in 1972 (000's)</th>
<th>50% Voting Nixon's Plurality Against...</th>
<th>70% Voting Nixon's Plurality Against...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muskie Kennedy (000's)</td>
<td>Kennedy Humphrey (000's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>246.6</td>
<td>2500.4</td>
<td>196.6 -141.0 284.1</td>
<td>176.6 -299.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-403.8</td>
<td>2070.0</td>
<td>-445.2 -724.7 -372.7</td>
<td>-218.8 -477.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-180.4</td>
<td>1371.1</td>
<td>-207.8 -392.9 -159.8</td>
<td>-111.2 -135.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>1306.9</td>
<td>121.7 -54.8 -167.4</td>
<td>-90.0 -364.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
<td>1454.0</td>
<td>-78.4 -274.7 -27.5</td>
<td>-282.5 -493.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>1303.2</td>
<td>76.9 -99.0 122.5</td>
<td>-65.5 -179.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-251.3</td>
<td>1114.7</td>
<td>-273.6 -424.1 -234.6</td>
<td>-282.5 -493.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>293.2</td>
<td>758.4</td>
<td>278.0 175.6 304.6</td>
<td>272.0 128.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>783.1</td>
<td>53.3 -52.4 -80.7</td>
<td>47.1 -100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-732.2</td>
<td>694.5</td>
<td>-746.1 -839.8 -721.8</td>
<td>-751.6 -882.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>297.3</td>
<td>650.9</td>
<td>284.3 196.4 307.1</td>
<td>279.1 156.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>238.1</td>
<td>708.9</td>
<td>223.9 128.2 248.7</td>
<td>218.3 84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>556.8</td>
<td>10.6 -64.6 30.1</td>
<td>6.1 -99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>621.5</td>
<td>183.6 99.7 205.3</td>
<td>179.6 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>550.2</td>
<td>56.7 -17.6 76.0</td>
<td>52.3 -51.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nixon's Electoral Vote 191 55 191
Opponent's Electoral Vote 129 265 129
Total 320 320 320
Table 5

Expected Victory in Each State
With Wallace in the Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968 With 50% Voting</th>
<th></th>
<th>1968 With 70% Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electoral Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nixon</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) = Indicates change from 1968
## Table 6

**Expected Victory in Each State Without Wallace in the Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With 50% Voting</th>
<th></th>
<th>With 70% Voting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electoral Votes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nixon</th>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) = Indicates change from 1968
Table 7

320 Electoral Votes -- 15 Key States

(Assuming newly eligible voters will vote in '72 as they presently indicate, and that the Nixon percent of the remaining vote will be the same in '72 as in '68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Wallace</th>
<th>Without Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vs. Muskie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Wallace</th>
<th>Without Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vs. Kennedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Wallace</th>
<th>Without Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vs. Humphrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Wallace</th>
<th>Without Wallace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
<td>50% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PERSONAL REPORT FORM**

**Martindale-Hubbell, Inc.**

One Prospect Street, Summit, N. J.

---

**Dear Sir:**

In the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory lawyers in government service located at Washington, D. C. are listed separately under the Department, Commission, or Agency with which they are connected. These listings are of course without charge or other obligation and include name, years of birth and admission to the bar, one college and one law school attended with the first degree for each, and title or name of government branch or subdivision. Will you, therefore, please promptly complete and return this form to the designated person in your organization for transmission to us.

Besides obtaining the normal advantages of being listed in our Directory, you will be cooperating with the **AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION** and the **AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION** in connection with the work which they have entrusted to us of preparing statistical reports on the lawyers of the United States based on our Directories.

Very truly yours,

**MARTINDALE-HUBBELL, INC.**

---

**Correct Name**

Gordon C. Strachan

---

**Activity**

Executive Office of the President

---

**Branch or Subdivision**

The White House

---

**Birth**

Place: Berkeley, Calif.

Month: 7

Day: 24

Year: 43

---

**Year Originally Admitted**

New York 1969

---

**Academic and Legal Education**

(If no degree awarded, give dates of attendance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Attended</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of So. Calif.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Calif.</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Former locations and firm connections, if any**

New York: Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander, Associate

---

**Date Submitted**

6/15/12

**Signed**

Gordon Strachan

---

Form 504 (Master) Printed in U. S. A. (Rev. 5-57)
June 11, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: CLIFF MILLER
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Walter DeVries

Pursuant to our telephone conversation today, at your convenience would you contact Mr. Walter DeVries. He is a Republican, who worked for Romney in '68, and Miliken in Michigan recently. He has been approached by other Republican Senators in anticipation of 1972.

DeVries has been characterised as the strongest Republican voting behavioralist available.

Walter DeVries is a Professor at the University of Michigan, Dearborn campus, and is not directly connected with the Social Research Institute, which as you may know is dominated by Democrats.

Our information indicates that DeVries might be interested in a national campaign, but would not be available until this fall, and in the meantime would like to be contacted by someone at the top (such as yourself).

As to vendors, DeVries uses Fred Courier at Market Opinion Research in Detroit.

When you have had a chance to talk to him, would you let us know your reaction?

GS:elr
June 14, 1971

Dear Mr. McDonough:

Thank you for sending the suggestions and comments about the Republican Party. Your interest is appreciated.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Gordon Strachan
Staff Assistant
to H. R. Haldeman

Mr. William F. McDonough
One Magna Road
West Islip, New York 11795

GS: elr
June 29, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT C. ODELE, JR.
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

You asked for my impression of Don Schollander as a possible Youth for Nixon leader.

I talked with Schollander for only half an hour yesterday, however, I was quite impressed. He is personable, articulate, and intrigued by the number of young White House Staff Members.

I have no reading as to his organisational ability, but since we may be looking at him to be the front man and spokesman, it shouldn't be too much of a problem.

My only concern is his loyalty to the President. On that, I would have to defer to John Rose who has known him for many years.

GS:Im
TALKING PAPER FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

RE: Citizens Brochure

Magruder forwarded the mock-up of the brochure to be sent to people who write in offering assistance to re-elect the President.

Wouldn't it be helpful to have Dick Moore, Herb Klein, Bill Safire, and Dwight Chapin review the booklet?

GS: lm

June 28, 1971
June 29, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: MISS ROSE MARY WOODS
FROM: PERSONAL SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT
GORDON STRACHAN

I received the attached invitation to a wedding on behalf of the President from Alfredo Basalo. He is from Venezuela and a good friend of Bob Guthrie at Nudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander. Mr. Basalo worked at the law firm in New York for six months, and handles much of the firm business in Venezuela. In addition, he has a good position with the Caldera Regime in Venezuela.

My question is really, what, if anything, would be an appropriate response on behalf of the President?

Thank you.

GS:lm
Luis Rodríguez Santana

triene el honor de invitar a Ud.
al matrimonio de su hija

Alicia con el señor

Alfredo G. Basalo B.

Alfredo Basalo Rodríguez

Gloria Ballísti de Basalo

tienen el honor de invitar a Ud.
al matrimonio de su hija

Alfredo con la señorita

Alicia Rodríguez Plaza

La fiesta se efectuará en la Capilla Nuestra Señora del Carmen, Campo Alegre,
el día dieciséis de julio de mil novecientos setenta y uno

Cienfuegos San Luis
Calle Los Jardines Country Club

Hora: diez y treinta p.m.
June 15, 1971

Dear John:

"I hope we are more successful this time than with the Germany post.

"Let me know if there is anything else I can do."

Sincerely,

Gordon Strachan

Mr. John C. Williams
1257 Dover Lane
Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007

GS:elr
MEMORANDUM FOR:  
FROM:  
SUBJECT:  

June 25, 1971  
H.R. Haldeman  
Gordon Strachan  
1972 Convention Site  

Technically the RNC will decide on the site for the 1972 Convention on July 22-23, based on the last Site Committee meeting and recommendation of July 21; so the specific, technical answer to your question as to the final date for a decision on the 1972 Convention site is July 21.

However, Timmons, who as Chairman of the Attorney General's task force on the Convention has developed scenario that requires a firm decision earlier:

1. Late today, Timmons will submit his analysis of Chicago;

2. Next week, Timmons will meet with Dole to determine the Site Committee's preferences, and will submit to you and the Attorney General a formal decision paper. This paper will attach the formal bid by San Diego, which is expected to be $500,000 in cash and $1,000,000 in inflated price services;

3. Upon decision by the President on the location of the Convention, Timmons hopes to relay this to Dole, who will in turn have the Site Committee decide on the same location;

4. If the location is San Diego, Timmons suggests that Dole, during the San Clemente trip, formally advise the President and then immediately make the announcement to the media;

5. If San Diego is not chosen, the same scenario would be followed except that there is no need to make the announcement from San Clemente.