<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>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>List of campaign themes for various Congressional hopefuls. 2 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11/6/1970</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Breakdown of NBC coverage of Republicans and Democrats on election night. 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>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/13/1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Sheet of notes on the state of various Congressional races across the U.S. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>List of Congressmen and governors elected in various states in 1970. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Notes detailing races won and lost by Republicans running for the House of Representatives in various states. 4 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/23/1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Chotiner to RN RE: the Senate race in Illinois. 4 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Background memorandum on various facets of the 1970 election generated by Haldeman and Buchanan. 4 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>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>Copy of a background memorandum on various facets of the 1970 election generated by Haldeman and Buchanan. Handwritten notes on original added by unknown. 4 pgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11/6/1970</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>AP release on the voting results of certain 1970 political races. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Comprehensive voting results for gubernatorial races. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Other Document</td>
<td>Comprehensive voting results for Senate races. 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>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/7/1970</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>From Tom Lias to Dent RE: the Brock campaign budget. Handwritten note added by Dent. 1 pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>A general strategy for RN to follow for the 1972 campaign. Author unknown. 13 pgs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAMPAIGN THEMES

Florida, Congressman William Cramer

1. **Experience** -- can get more done in Florida - very positive approach.
2. "Chiles is part of liberal establishment."
3. Walking Senator versus **Working Senator**.
   Cramer running as a Nixon Man.

Maryland, Congressman J. Glenn Beall

1. Spending.
2. Deliverance of Government services, more state and local government.
3. Beall a moderate good guy, not an arrogant liberal.
4. Law and order.
   He is tying in with the President.

New Jersey, Nelson Gross

1. "You'll know he's there." A powerful new voice in Washington.
2. Spending
3. The war.
4. Law and order.
   "100% behind Nixon."

Nevada, William Raggio

1. Law and order.
   **Nixon** candidate.
Campaign Themes - page 2

**Tennessee, Congressman Bill Brock**

1. The war.
2. Spending.
3. Domestic unrest, law and order.
4. Prayer in schools.
   All the way with the President.

**Texas, Congressman George Bush**

1. "He can do more."
2. Bentsen's shady dealings (farm subsidies, other business dealings).
3. Economy.
   Running as a "Texas" candidate, and proud of his Nixon affiliation.
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 24, 1970

MEMO FOR FOLLOW UP

Chotiner is to draft a letter for the President's signature to go to all the Minnesota "fat cats". We should make sure that this is done.

Larry:

Chotiner's office doesn't know a thing about the above.

I have no memo to Chot requesting this? Perhaps it was a phone request?

Attached are some memos to Chot (recent), but none of them touch on this subject.

G
Pat - This is the letter that went out to the Mo. Groups

Anne Heffey
Dear /////////:

I hope you will understand the heavy schedule that precluded the possibility of my meeting with you personally when I was in Kansas City. I do want you to know, however, of my deep gratitude for the generous support you are giving to Jack Danforth.

As I have said, Jack is an exceptionally able, aggressive young leader, and his record of service is well-known to the voters. His election to the United States Senate will be a long step toward bringing teamwork to Washington -- teamwork that will help us hold down the cost of living, wage a war on crime, and bring about a generation of peace. Missouri can be proud of Jack Danforth. His voice and his vote will make the Senate a more effective chamber in the 1970's.

With my appreciation and best wishes,

Sincerely,

/////////

/////////

/////////

RN:AH: Transf--10/28/70--ms

(Rec. from AVH 10/27/70)
Coverage given to Democrats and Republicans on NBC on election night. Includes victory and losing statements; commentary from reporters at candidates' headquarters and time given to party spokesmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATS</th>
<th>REPUBLICANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:02 - Kennedy HQ</td>
<td>:45 - Goodell HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 - Philip Hart</td>
<td>:50 - Buckley HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - Dan Walker (Stevenson's</td>
<td>1:25 - Beall HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaign manager)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 - Ottinger HQ</td>
<td>:50 - Blair HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 - Kennedy</td>
<td>3:37 - Rockefeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 - Wallace</td>
<td>(above is before 11:00 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 - Philip Hart</td>
<td>2:20 - Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - Albert Gore</td>
<td>9:35 - Buckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 - Tydings HQ</td>
<td>2:40 - Goodell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:35 - Mandel HQ</td>
<td>3:10 - Herb Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 - Goldberg</td>
<td>2:40 - Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 - Humphrey</td>
<td>27:52 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 - Larry O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(above is before 11:00 p.m.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - John Tunney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 - Ottinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:07 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in both columns represent minutes each man appeared on screen.)

November 6, 1970
7:05  Vanocur downplayed early Tennessee returns saying, "It was expected to go to Brock." Richard Nixon wants this seat most.

7:10  Brinkley said RN and V. P. put Administration on the line with Senate elections.

7:15  Chancellor says it's ironic that RN wants conservatives since it's the Conservatives who hold up his legislation, i.e., FAP, in Senate.


7:20  Project Stennis winner in Miss. Senate race.

7:25  Project Gov. Wallace in Alabama.

Project Stevenson in Illinois. Vanocur says it was a dirty campaign. Smith made stiff charges. Smith commercials were "pretty rough." No mention of Stevenson's tactics.

7:30  Project Byrd of W. Va. Dem. for Senator

7:35  Vanocur says EMK will win but because of all that happened we wouldn't expect his margin to be as wide.

Project John Gilligan as Dem. winner of Ohio Governor's race. McGee mentions Ohio Republican scandal.

7:40  To Kennedy Headquarters - Dean Brelis (1 minute 2 seconds film) Back to Brinkley who talked about K's previous campaign when he was in hospital.

7:50 Projects Askew victory - Florida (Governor)

7:55 Chancellor talks about Indiana race and says Republicans are running their classic campaign appealing to the "fears of the people." Hartke uses classic Democratic tactic of appealing to working men. Hartke did well with blue-collar workers.

Projects Harry Byrd, Va., Independent, winner - Senate
Projects Mandel, Maryland, Dem. - winner - Governor
Projects Williams, N.J., Dem. - winner - Senate
Projects Hart, Mich., Dem. - winner - Senate

8:00 Projects Harry Byrd, Va., Independent, winner - Senate
Projects Mandel, Maryland, Dem. - winner - Governor
Projects Williams, N.J., Dem. - winner - Senate
Projects Hart, Mich., Dem. - winner - Senate

8:05 David Brinkley says Williams wins in N.J. in spite of Republican blitz "money and Agnew."

Projects Roth, Del., Republican - winner - Senate
Projects Prouty, Vermont, Republican - winner - Senate

8:10

8:15 Projects Deane Davis, Vermont, Republican - winner - Governor
Projects Kennedy - Mass., Democrat - winner - Senate 67%
running against a very moderate Republican

8:20 Projects Muskie, Maine, Democrat - winner - Senate 65%
Muskie a powerful thrust forward as the Democratic Presidential candidate.
Projects Prouty, Vermont, Republican - winner - Senate 63%
Vanocur says Vt. Senate campaign was very dirty. Mentions Al Capp's statement that Hoff's plan to bring Negro children to Vt. would bring

8:25 "thieves & rapists." Dirty -- but Prouty not involved.
Fred Briggs interviewed Dan Walker, Stevenson's campaign manager. Tried to bring Walker to call Smith's campaign dirty. 3:00 on film

8:30 Project Shapp, Democrat, Pa. - winner 54% Governor
Project Meskill, Republican, Conn. - winner 54% Governor

8:35 Project Docking, Democrat, Kansas - winner - Governor
Project Arkansas, Democrat, Bumpers - winner - Governor
(Rockefeller was a heavy T.V. candidate)

Hartke in Indiana doing 14% better than HHH and better than RN did in '68 campaign

8:40 Projects Weicker, Conn., Republican - winner - Senate
Duffy lost blue collar vote

Projects Burdick, N.D., Dem. - winner - Senate
Projects Scott, Pa., Republican - winner - Senate
Projects Weicker, Conn., Republican - winner - Senate

8:45 Projects Symington, Mo., Dem. - winner - Senate

In Texas Administration put up lots of money - More $ than any other Senate candidate. (Vanocur)
Projects Peterson, N.H., Republican - winner - 47% Governor
Projects Bumpers, Dem., Arkansas - winner - 59% Governor

8:50 (Agnew did not help Republicans with his attack on Little Rock Gazzette and Sen. Fulbright, who is well liked in Ark.)
Projects Smith, Texas Dem. - winner - Governor
Projects West, S. C., Dem. - winner - 54% Governor
Projects Rockefeller, N.Y., Republican - winner Governor 54%
(moved to right getting working class vote)

8:55 Projects Proxmire, Wis., Dem. - winner - 62% Senate
Projects Love, Colorado, Republican - winner - Governor
Al Capp called NBC, Vanocur misquoted him. Vanocur said that he referred to article in N.Y. Times which quoted Capp. Vanocur said if he was wrong, he apologized. (Vermont race)
Geoffrey Pond at Goodell's Headquarters in N. Y. :45 on film

9:00 Jack Paxton at Buckley's Headquarters :50 on film
Bob Teague at Ottinger's Headquarters -- Ottinger people predict massive shift from Goodell to Ottinger 1:00 on film
Projects HHH, Minn., Dem. - winner - Senate 55%
Projects Bentsen, Texas - Dem. - winner - Senate "This is a disappointment to the Administration." They put a lot of money in there.

9:05 Projects Sargent, Mass., Republican - winner - Governor
Vanocur implied that since Dems had so many up for re-election, that we should expect them to lose in Senate.

To Kennedy's Headquarters in Mass. Doing well in Boston and Italian precincts. NBC projects 67% win. Kennedy people now feel he has a chance at Presidency. Commentator mentioned famous Kennedy smile. Kennedy starts his commentary by thanking voters, said he has tried to be outspoken on great issues of our times. There is deep concern from people on issues. K. commended Spaulding for way he conducted Republican campaign. K said he (meaning Kennedy) is the Voice for Peace. Looking forward to returning to Senate. Mentioned Vietnam (wants peaceful solution to war and return of service men) 7:50 on film

Projects Brock, Tenn., Republican - winner - Senate

Republican National Chairman, Rogers Morton re-elected to House
Interview with Wallace in Alabama - Presidential election '72 aspirations???
Wallace said it depends on what transpires in next 2 years. No plans at present for '72 campaign. Wallace said RN not carrying out commitments to South. Nixon and Agnew saying things re. law and order Wallace said 2 years ago. Wallace said he is "interested" in Pres. '72. 3:15 on film

Projects Anderson, Minn., Dem. - winner - Governor

According to Chancellor, Republicans thought law and order issue would be more important (over economy) has not been the dominant factor re. voting.
Brinkley said Arkansas was a surprise. "Bumpers won with a smile, a shoe shine and one speech" said Rockefeller.
Projects Cannon, Nevada, Dem. - winner - Senate 57%

To Philip Hart Headquarters in Michigan. Few signs reading Hart for '72. Hart said concession speech by Mrs. Romney very graceful. Hart thanked young people, retirees, and his good friends for their support. Hart was asked if Mrs. Romney's being a woman hindered her campaign -- contributed to her losing -- Hart said no. 5:45 on film

To Gore's Headquarters -- Gore thanked his workers and family for their support 2 minutes on film
9:55 Projects Exon, Neb., Dem., - winner - 55% Governor
Comment from Chancellor that President's campaigning in states not that helpful.
Projects Moss, Utah, Dem., - winner - 63% Senate

Chancellor said Indiana expected to be close race, Administration wanted badly (Hartke and Roudebush race)

Ed Newman said Republicans had hoped to pick up seat in House in New Jersey. Great deal of emotion but little change in House elections.

Projects Beall, Maryland, Republican - winner - Senate

10:00 To Beall Headquarters with McMithias commentary. Voting encouraging, Beall is a middle of the roader 1:25 on film
To Tydings Headquarters - no concession statement by campaign manager (did not know which areas were reporting in with votes)
1:10 on film

10:10 To Blair Headquarters (50 seconds)
To Mandel Headquarters (35 seconds)

10:15 Utah -- Republicans had a safe seat in House, RN asked Burton to run for Senate, Burton said he would think about it. RN announced from W.H. that Burton would run (before Burton had made up his mind) Brinkley said now he is out of House and Senate.

10:20 Goldberg Headquarters - Goldberg's losing statement 3:55 on film
Brinkley said Goldberg had paid staff of 35 -- Rocky had paid staff of 370.

10:25 Said Buckley, the Conservative candidate, is really a Connecticut Republican

10:30 Projects Reagan in Calif., Republican, - winner - Governor

10:35 HHH Headquarters for victory speech 5:25 of HHH on tape
10:40 Projects Dale McGee, Wyoming, Democrat - winner - Senate

10:45 Vanocur looking at Hruska race mentioned that Hruska will be remembered for his statement during Carswell nomination that mediocre people need representation too.

10:50 J. Chancellor -- "Would you believe Roman Hruska, the sage of Nebraska in trouble?" Mentioned that Republicans called his opponent Hanoi Frank (w/o saying why he did so). J. C. said maybe calling him Hanoi Frank didn't help Republicans.

10:55 Rockefeller Headquarters - Rockefeller's Victory statement 3:37 on film Interview with Larry O'Brien 2:40 on film

11:00 Projected winner in South Dakota Gubernatorial race - Kneip Discussion re: unemployment and effect it had on House races. On basis of surveys projected that Democrats would pick up as many as 2 House seats due to unemployment.

11:05 Statement that Albert Lowenstein had conceded. Discussion regarding the President's and Vice President's campaigning in 30 states because President would like to have a Senate which would vote with him. Stated in years that Nixon was in Congress - 1947 to 1952 and Truman was President, Nixon voted 57 times against but 15 times for. (2 minutes 30 seconds)

11:10 Projected Winners - Senate and Gubernatorial races - just board listing of previously projected winners by state.

11:15 Vanocur - "Gilligan shirrtail not helping Metzenbaum"; conceded Arizona to Fannin; refused to detail Grossman's downfall; conceded Hawaii to Fong Reagen Office - 2:20 on film "Reagen had all the money" - Vanocur

11:20 Detailed 16 target states New York Congressional seats mentioned; mentioned 2 seats, the only 2 Republican incumbents who lost.
11:25 Interview with John Tunney - 3 minutes
With 82% of New York vote in - Buckley 40%; Ottinger 36% - no concession

11:30 Projected a Tunney victory with 8% of the vote in; it's 54-42 now

11:35 Brinkley again says that liberals Goodell and Ottinger outpolled Buckley

11:40 Buckley Headquarters 9:35

11:45

11:50 Goodell Headquarters 2:40
Projected a Buckley win

11:55

12:00 Brinkley said if you were Nixon you'd see results of "massive" effort to unseat lots of Democrats largely unsuccessful.
Herb Klein interviewed by Herbert Kaplow (3:10)
Kaplow - "You're behind in Senate by 7, how do you say the President is helped?" Antagonistic tone - a lot of people say it was a rough campaign - President's rhetoric

12:05 Vanocur - Metzenbaum getting no help from Gilligan coattails.
Ottinger - 3 minutes
12:15 Brinkley - Nixon has acquired 4 ideological seats and lost 3
Gains - New York, Texas, Tennessee
Losses - California, Illinois, Florida
He thinks Klein wrong on ideology; Chancellor agrees -- FAP help up by
Republican conservatives. Vanocur feels Weicker not a plus, and they
felt conservatives, especially Erwin, shot at D. C. crime bill.
12:20 Vanocur - "don't forget the Republican Senators who were out for
Goodell." Percy and Hatfield will be careful, says Chancellor --
Vanocur, Brinkley and Newman shot that down.
McGee pushing losses in Governors races. Said House forecasts
had been for a loss of 3 - 4 seats.
12:25 Vanocur said Democrats started with special disadvantage with 25
Senators up - (never heard them call our Gubernatorial situation
a special disadvantage).

12:30 Democrats have stuck "richest vain" in Governor races. Republicans
will control only one-half of the statehouses. Democrats have net
gain of 9, including Ohio, Florida with Michigan undecided.
Democrats lost in Connecticut and Tennessee; also lost Senate seats
If Democrats sweep in Governor races left, it will be D-29 R-21;
if Republicans sweep, D-25 R-25
12:35 Democrats have net gain of four House seats - will be increased before
evening is over. No national figure has lost a seat in the House.
Election figures do not bear out Kevin Phillips theory re: heartland
being Republican

12:40 "Republicans didn't stand to lose much because President Nixon's 1968
election was so slight that he really didn't bring in a number of
vulnerable Republican candidates with him."
Law and Order theme helped Republicans but was overcome by economic
situation.
In the House there is little change.
12:45 Newman: "Question of whose Gore had been axed."

12:50 "No indication that this Senate will be of a make-up that will go where
Administration wants to take it."
12:55 Situation comparable to 1962 - Demos lost 4 seats in House and that is precisely the number that Republicans are loosing right now. Not resounding victory for Democrats, but not devastating for Republicans (Newman smirking)

1:00 Democrats have taken the governorships in large states. This will have an effect in 2 years.

1:05 Brinkley: (Senate races)
Alaska - Republican ahead
Indiana - "too close" less than 4,000 vote difference
Arizona - 32% of vote in - to early to call
Maine - Governor race - still too close
Nevada - Governor race - still too close
Rhode Island - Unable to call

1:10
Fla. poll? Another 100?
Mo. poll? Chat says 40 needed
NJ does he need # - if so 200
AZ another 100 done? - after 50
UT need more? - after 50 + 40
Wyo? poll? Chat says need 35 - ready 50 - need more?

Moscou money? 16 pts behind.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Lost</th>
<th>Doubtful</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>Net Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Va.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 losses net

(17 losses
8 wins
3 uncertain)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Lost</th>
<th>Doubtful</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Won</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>Net Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 purchase loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 purchase loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missippi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. H.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM FOR
THE PRESIDENT
FROM: MURRAY CHOTINER
RE: ILLINOIS CAMPAIGN

The polls show Senator Smith behind; the ORC poll says 4%; Chicago Sun Times says 14%.

Senator Percy reports that he is being very candid and very harsh. Only a miracle can save Smith.

As of now, Ray Page, who is running for State Superintendent of Public Instruction has the best chance of winning. Kucharski, who is running for State Treasurer, has the next best chance, and Joe Woods, who is running for President of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, is next.

Major concern is that Smith is trailing by such a large margin, as to decrease the chances for the rest of the ticket. Ray Page has been way ahead and even his staff is getting nervous now.

The negative tone of Smith's campaign and the heavy emphasis being placed upon personal attacks against Stevenson has turned off the suburbs and many people down-state. Down-state, Smith is barely making it. These areas are normally Republican and Smith is running 5 to 10 points behind what Percy received in 1966.

In Chicago, Smith is losing by a large margin and the only place he has made any inroads in the Chicago area is with the ethnic groups.
Stevenson's name is well respected. The prevailing feeling is that he is a decent human being and should be given a chance. He holds much promise for a distinguished career. It is regretful that Smith is looked upon as an old-fashioned down-state politician and not a statesman.

Percy feels the issues have changed considerably. Law and order is no longer the major issue it was. He feels the economic issue is the key one; others are rising prices, softness in business, lack of factory orders. Percy feels the President must have sensed this from the Business Council report.

Voter apathy is another key problem in Illinois. Percy himself is keeping his tone optimistic and will continue to do so. He is hosting a "voter fest" tomorrow for Smith at the State Fair grounds. He has invited all the workers from over the State in a last ditch effort to build enthusiasm and get out the vote.

Percy feels something needs to be done to offset the Sun Times poll, which showed Smith trailing badly. Another later Sun Times poll shows Smith has picked up a little.

In Cook County it might be good to exploit the "Colorton scandal." Colorton is the county assessor who has been lowering real estate taxes in return for political favors for Democratic candidates.

We should also capitalize on the popularity of other Republican candidates urging them to talk up Smith, in particular, the incumbent US Congressmen who are very popular in their own Districts.

We need a combined effort. Use of other key Republicans who were defeated in the primary is good. For instance, John Altorfer, who was a candidate against Ogilvie in the 1968 gubernatorial primary. He is very popular.

Bill Rentschler, who was defeated by Smith in the primary this year, is popular in the Chicago area.

Bill Scott, the Attorney General, is another very strong vote getter.
Joe Woods reports:

Smith is in trouble but not as badly as the Sun Times indicates.

Right now, Smith will be defeated.

Smith is campaigning very well.

The voting polls should be watched. For example, in the Second Ward, Smith shows only 4.9%.

The Eagle Eye election day operation will be in effect to watch for chicanery at the polls.

Smith is behind now by 100,000 votes.
Governor Ogilvie reports:

Smith is still behind by approximately 50,000 to 75,000 votes.

The President's visit should be helpful.

The rest of the State ticket and the candidates for the Legislature are in good shape.

Smith has overdone the issue of law and order.

The President should stress the efforts to obtain peace and his need for cooperation in the Senate.

The Vice President did an excellent job on the law and order issue; but the President repeating it would be redundant.

Smith has not done as well in suburban Cook County as he should have.

This is a good area for the President to comment on the steps being taken to insure peace in the Middle East.
BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM (HRH/PJB)

SENATE AND HOUSE

At the campaign's opening in mid-September, Republican challengers for the Senate were running behind in every state except Tennessee -- and private Administration polls unescapably toward the customary loss of 30 seats in the House.

Because this conclusion was unacceptable to the President, when victory or defeat for the ABM can hinge on a single vote, he abandoned the tradition of remaining aloof, and involved himself fully in the national effort.

His tremendous investment in time and prestige clearly paid off.

Losses in the House were cut to 10 -- a good victory when weighed against the normal off-year losses; and a major victory when considered in light of the dislocations in the economy as inflation is being brought down and the nation moves from war to peace.

In the Senate, the President's intervention was clearly among the decisive factors in the victorious races in Tennessee, Connecticut, Ohio and Maryland -- and dramatically reversed for the Administration the off-year trend of Senate losses gaining 2 seats politically. An ideological gain of 3 was also attained. At the national level, on the national issues, the Administration record was clearly endorsed and the campaign a success.
Comparisons can be drawn with the off-year elections of 1954 and 1958 under the most popular President in recent American history, Dwight Eisenhower. In 1970, under President Nixon, Republicans gained two seats in the Senate, and lost 10 in the House. In 1954, Republicans lost both Houses of Congress; in 1958, the GOP lost 47 House seats and 13 Senate seats.

GOVERNORS

Because of the number of Republicans running at the State House level -- the gubernatorial arithmetic -- losses were to be expected here -- and they took place. These were largely traceable to party problems in Ohio and Florida -- and to local state tax problems in Pennsylvania and Nebraska. In the Western states, where GOP incumbents and challengers lost several close elections, the specific dislocations of the economy, false charges of an expanding 6-1/2% unemployment rate, and false chatter about the closing of federal bases and installations underscored the economic issue.

While the losses at the gubernatorial level were significant -- they were not extraordinary for the party in power. In 1970, Republicans lost eleven Governorships; in 1954, the GOP lost nine; and in 1958, the GOP lost seven.

1972

What does all this mean in terms of 1972? Is the President now in deep trouble because of the erosion of the GOP political base? Hardly,
The comparison with 1960 is apt. Then Vice President Richard Nixon running on a party base of 154 House members, 36 Senators and 14 Governors, ran a dead heat, carrying twenty-six states, with a popular moderate Democratic Candidate, John F. Kennedy. In 1972, Richard Nixon is not Vice President; he has all the power and prestige of the Presidency; he has attained a level of national approval never achieved in his Vice President President years -- and, if he runs, he will be running from a far stronger base than 1960 in every significant department -- 21 Governors, 175 Congressmen, and 45 or 46 Senators.

This is a far stronger base than the GOP had in 1960 -- and President Nixon is a far stronger candidate in every section of the country than Vice President Nixon could possibly have been.

So, the time is not yet, to reach for the crying towel.

Also, the Republican Party's support among independents is far stronger than it has ever been. Where the GOP can claim the allegiance of but 28 per cent of the American people -- we have 41 per cent of the House seats, 42 per cent of the nation's Governors and 45 per cent of the United States Senate -- and 100 per cent of the Presidency.

ISSUES

The Democratic Party had one issue this campaign -- the dislocations of an economy coming out of an inflationary spiral
and moving from war to peace -- and they played it for all it was worth. In 1972 that issue will be gone; it will be a Republican issue in 1972. The transition from war to peace will have taken place by then giving us not only the stable economy issue, but the peace issue in those fall elections.

We will have ended an inflation that they began -- we will have ended successfully a war they couldn't end. Peace and prosperity are the Republican arguments in 1972.

LEADERSHIP

One aspect overlooked in this election is the fulfillment of the President's commitment of 1960 that if elected President, he would be a party leader as well as a national leader. He invested the full resources and prestige of his office, not only in tight races, but in races where there was no opportunity at all -- because he is a Republican President -- and because he is willing to stand with his troops in victory or defeat -- as he has stood with them in every victory or defeat since the national elections of 1952.

This is the story of 1970 -- a Republican President fighting for his party candidates, reversing the off-year trends and maintaining the strong national base that is vital to his policies and vital to future party victories. Many good men went down running for Governor and the Senate -- but they were not forgotten by the President in their fight -- and they will not be abandoned in their defeat.
SENATE AND HOUSE

At the campaign's opening in mid-September, Republican challengers for the Senate were running behind in every state except Tennessee -- and private Administration polls unescapably toward the customary loss of 30 seats in the House.

Because this conclusion was unacceptable to the President, when victory or defeat for the Administration can hinge on a single vote, he abandoned the tradition of remaining aloof, and involved himself fully in the national effort.

His tremendous investment in time and prestige clearly paid off.

Losses in the House were cut to 10 -- a good victory when weighed against the normal off-year losses; and a major victory when considered in light of the dislocations in the economy as inflation is being brought down and the nation moves from war to peace.

In the Senate, the President's intervention was clearly among the decisive factors in the victorious races in Tennessee, Connecticut, Ohio and Maryland -- and dramatically reversed for the Administration the off-year trend of Senate losses gaining 2 seats politically. An ideological gain of 3 was also attained. At the national level, on the national issues, the Administration record was clearly endorsed and the campaign a success.
Comparisons can be drawn with the off-year elections of 1954 and 1958 under the most popular President in recent American history, Dwight Eisenhower. In 1970, under President Nixon, Republicans gained two seats in the Senate, and lost 10 in the House. In 1954, Republicans lost both Houses of Congress; in 1958, the GOP lost 47 House seats and 13 Senate seats.

GOVERNORS

Because of the number of Republicans running at the State House level -- the gubernatorial arithmetic -- losses were to be expected here -- and they took place. These were largely traceable to party problems in Ohio and Florida -- and to local state tax problems in Pennsylvania and Nebraska. In the Western states, where GOP incumbents and challengers lost several close elections, the specific dislocations of the economy, false charges of an expanding 6-1/2% unemployment rate, and false chatter about the closing of federal bases and installations underscored the economic issue.

While the losses at the gubernatorial level were significant -- they were not extraordinary for the party in power. In 1970, Republicans lost eleven Governorships; in 1954, the GOP lost nine; and in 1958, the GOP lost seven.

What does all this mean in terms of 1972? Is the President now in deep trouble because of the erosion of the GOP political base? Hardly.
The comparison with 1960 is apt. Then Vice President Richard Nixon running on a party base of 154 House members, 36 Senators and 14 Governors, ran a dead heat, carrying twenty-six states, with a popular moderate Democratic Candidate, John F. Kennedy. In 1972, Richard Nixon is not Vice President; he has all the power and prestige of the Presidency; he has attained a level of national approval never achieved in his Vice President President years — and, if he runs, he will be running from a far stronger base than 1960 in every significant department -- 21 Governors, 175 Congressmen, and 45 or 46 Senators.

This is a far stronger base than the GOP had in 1960 -- and President Nixon is a far stronger candidate in every section of the country than Vice President Nixon could possibly have been.

So, the time is not yet, to reach for the crying towel.

Also, the Republican Party's support among independents is far stronger than it has ever been. Where the GOP can claim the allegiance of but 28 per cent of the American people -- we have 41 per cent of the House seats, 42 per cent of the nation's Governors and 45 per cent of the United States Senate -- and 100 per cent of the Presidency.

ISSUES

The Democratic Party had one issue this campaign -- the dislocations of an economy coming out of an inflationary spiral
and moving from war to peace -- and they played it for all it was worth. In 1972 that issue will be gone; it will be a Republican issue in 1972. The transition from war to peace will have taken place by then giving us not only the stable economy issue, but the peace issue in those fall elections.

We will have ended an inflation that they began -- we will have ended successfully a war they couldn't end. Peace and prosperity are the Republican arguments in 1972.

**LEADERSHIP**

One aspect overlooked in this election is the fulfillment of the President's commitment of 1960 that if elected President, he would be a party leader as well as a national leader. He invested the full resources and prestige of his office, not only in tight races, but in races where there was no opportunity at all -- because he is a Republican President -- and because he is willing to stand with his troops in victory or defeat -- as he has stood with them in every victory or defeat since the national elections of 1952.

This is the story of 1970 -- a Republican President fighting for his party candidates, reversing the off-year trends and maintaining the strong national base that is vital to his policies and vital to future party victories. Many good men went down running for Governor and the Senate -- but they were not forgotten by the President in their fight -- and they will not be abandoned in their defeat.
Indiana Senate: Hartke 4,249 over Roudebush
Rhode Island Governor: Licht 2,710 over DeSimone
Oklahoma Governor: Hall 2,664 over Bartlett
Kentucky 3rd Dis.: Dem. Mazzoli 227 over Cowger
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>REPUBLICAN</th>
<th>DEMOCRAT</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>MILLER-I</td>
<td>WALLACE</td>
<td>CASHIN</td>
<td>68,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>WILLIAMS-I</td>
<td>CASTRO</td>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZ</td>
<td>ROCKFELER-I</td>
<td>BUMPERS</td>
<td>CARRUTH</td>
<td>17,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIF</td>
<td>REAGAN-I</td>
<td>UNRUH</td>
<td>SHEARER</td>
<td>64,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLO</td>
<td>SMITH-I</td>
<td>HOGAN</td>
<td>PLANKNIT</td>
<td>64,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>HESSKILL</td>
<td>DADDARIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA</td>
<td>KIRK-I</td>
<td>ASKEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>SUIT</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW</td>
<td>KING</td>
<td>BURNS-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>SAMUelsen-I</td>
<td>ANDRUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>RAY-I</td>
<td>FULTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANS</td>
<td>FRIZZELL</td>
<td>DOCKING-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ERWIN</td>
<td>CURTIS-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>BLAIR</td>
<td>VANDEL-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS</td>
<td>SARGENT-I</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH</td>
<td>MILLIKEN-I</td>
<td>LEVIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINN</td>
<td>HEAD</td>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBR</td>
<td>TIMMANN-I</td>
<td>SYXON</td>
<td>WALKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEV</td>
<td>FIKE</td>
<td>CALAHAN</td>
<td>HAMSEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>PETERSON-I</td>
<td>CROWLEY</td>
<td>THOMSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMEX</td>
<td>DOMINICI</td>
<td>KING</td>
<td>SEDILLO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>ROCKFELER-I</td>
<td>GOLDBERG</td>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>CLOUD</td>
<td>GILLIGAN</td>
<td>LAWTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLA</td>
<td>BARTLETT-I</td>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR</td>
<td>MCCALL-I</td>
<td>STRAUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN</td>
<td>BRODICK</td>
<td>SHAPP</td>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>DESIMONE</td>
<td>LIGHT-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCAR</td>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td>WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODAK</td>
<td>FARCHAR-I</td>
<td>KNEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENN</td>
<td>DUNN</td>
<td>HOEKER</td>
<td>HEINSOHN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEX</td>
<td>EGGERS</td>
<td>SMITH-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>HATHAWAY-I</td>
<td>O'BRIEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIS</td>
<td>OLSON</td>
<td>LUCY</td>
<td>MCDONALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYO</td>
<td>HATHAWAY-I</td>
<td>ROONEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I INDICATES INCUMBENT)
Ξ INDICATES ELECTED
ABAVER AS OF NOON, EST
11/4--ELECI157PES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>PCTS</th>
<th>REPUBLICAN</th>
<th>DEMOCRAT</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>STEVENS</td>
<td>KAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FANNINAI</td>
<td>CROSMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZ</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>FANNINAI</td>
<td>CROSMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>MURPHY</td>
<td>TURNEY</td>
<td>RIPEY</td>
<td>SCHEER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 102</td>
<td>2,622.704</td>
<td>3,442.295</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>55,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL 100</td>
<td>443.098</td>
<td>363.094</td>
<td>260,265</td>
<td>GIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA 100</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>64,839</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA</td>
<td>750.225</td>
<td>880,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL 100</td>
<td>125.334</td>
<td>116,039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND 100</td>
<td>879.908</td>
<td>879,412</td>
<td>10,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA 96</td>
<td>1,134.981</td>
<td>1,157,857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA 97</td>
<td>771.783</td>
<td>1,365,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>536.251</td>
<td>741,192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS 96</td>
<td>53,288</td>
<td>70,418</td>
<td>32,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 99</td>
<td>275,387</td>
<td>271,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 99</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>875,413</td>
<td>412,212</td>
<td>10,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONT 92</td>
<td>132.541</td>
<td>122,416</td>
<td>32,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBR 95</td>
<td>220.231</td>
<td>210,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEV 96</td>
<td>53,288</td>
<td>75,218</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ 100</td>
<td>899.921</td>
<td>1,142,624</td>
<td>54,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 98</td>
<td>148.042</td>
<td>144,024</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY 99</td>
<td>1,426.912</td>
<td>1,477,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 87</td>
<td>69,945</td>
<td>116,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO 100</td>
<td>1,465.621</td>
<td>1,493,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN 100</td>
<td>1,869.753</td>
<td>1,347,486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI 100</td>
<td>104,917</td>
<td>224,903</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENN 99</td>
<td>554.392</td>
<td>510,301</td>
<td>11,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX 96</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,146,147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH 100</td>
<td>1,507.718</td>
<td>1,495,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT 100</td>
<td>158.091</td>
<td>5,091</td>
<td>5,091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIR 99</td>
<td>145.467</td>
<td>294,447</td>
<td>505,204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH 94</td>
<td>120.368</td>
<td>783,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIS 100</td>
<td>343.061</td>
<td>343,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYO 99</td>
<td>384.971</td>
<td>964,915</td>
<td>6,178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I INDICATES INCUMBENT)
& INDICATES ELECTED)
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MEMORANDUM FOR MR. FINCH
MR. HALDEMAN
MR. KLEIN

FROM: W. Richard Howard

FIRST FAMILY SCHEDULING

I am attaching a summary of the political trips made by the First Family during Campaign '70. I have also attached samples of the press coverage they received.

I believe that the most important observation that can be made about the campaign activities of the First Family is that each person is a very effective drawing card. Press coverage was extensive both before and after each visit and was almost entirely positive. They all drew extremely large crowds with little or no crowd building techniques. For example, in Minot, North Dakota, Tricia received a larger reception than the Vice President, and each member of the First Family created much more public interest than any of the Cabinet officers.

The first political trips were covered by non-political activities, however, the final few visits were solely political and these were the ones that created the most excitement. Mrs. Nixon was extremely effective at large handshaking receptions and would shake 8-9000 hands at a time. One of Tricia's most effective political activities consisted of shopping center drop-by's. She received great coverage as she milled through the crowds. Although, Julie did not have much available time for campaigning, she also drew large reception crowds, and David is an effective speaker.
Because of my lack of direct communication with members of the First Family, it took a while for me to discover their likes and dislikes, but once these became obvious, I could use them to increase the effectiveness of each visit. Also, when I started scheduling for the First Family, I found there had been some misunderstandings on some of Tricia's earlier trips. After talking with her directly several times, I believe we were able to solve many of the previous problems.

I would recommend extensive individual political activities by the First Family in the 1972 campaign, because of their effectiveness. They should also be well supported, for it is a waste of resources for any of them to take a trip without competent advance preparations.

Finally, in preparation for 1972, I believe that the First Family should start increasing their visibility immediately by doing more TV talk shows, handling more special TV events such as Tricia's tour of the White House, and accepting more media interviews.
THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  
November 12, 1970

FIRST FAMILY SCHEDULING

**CALIFORNIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mrs. Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mrs. Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mrs. Nixon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONNECTICUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mrs. Nixon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLORIDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Julie and David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mrs. Nixon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEORGIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLINOIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Julie and David</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIANA
October 28      Mrs. Nixon
November 1      Tricia

MARYLAND
October 17      Mrs. Nixon

MICHIGAN
October 19      Mrs. Nixon

MINNESOTA
October 14      Tricia
October 19      Mrs. Nixon

MISSOURI
October 17      Julie and David

NEVADA
October 20      Mrs. Nixon

NEW JERSEY
October 21      Julie and David
October 26      Tricia

NEW MEXICO
October 13      David

NORTH DAKOTA
October 29      Tricia
OHIO
October 5  David
28  Tricia
31  Tricia

OKLAHOMA
October 28  Tricia

PENNSYLVANIA
October 20  Tricia
30  Julie and Mamie Eisenhower

SOUTH CAROLINA
October 19  David

UTAH
October 21  Tricia

Wyoming
October 29  Tricia
By ROBERT P. MOONEY

Miss Tricia Nixon’s visit to Indianapolis yesterday turned out “nonpolitical” although she shook a lot of hands, signed many autographs and presented four plaques to youth groups.

Senate GOP nominee Richard L. Roudebush, who hopes to beat United States Senator Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) in tomorrow’s election, gallantly welcomed Miss Nixon at Weir Cook Municipal Airport and escorted her on a hand-shaking trip among about 200 greeters.

ROUDEBUSH then hurriedly left to attend a scheduled campaign event at Brazil in Clay County, leaving the 24-year-old daughter of President Richard M. Nixon to carry out “nonpolitical” duties at:

A youth rally in the Heisler Naval Armory, 30th Street and White River Parkway, which climaxed National Youth Week.

A reception in the home of Mr. and Mrs. John Burkhart, 455 Sylvan Drive, where she was joined by Roudebush’s wife, Mrs. Marge Roudebush and Karen Roudebush, 23, daughter of the nominee.

MISS NIXON was besieged by a large number of neighborhood youths outside the Burkhart home. The attractive blonde accommodated youths who requested her signature on the backs of their hands, candy bar wrappers, scraps of paper and even on one shoe.

The ankle-length rough leather shoe belonged to Tun Marshall, 12, 3120 Shady Grove Court. The Marshall youth is a pupil at St. Michael’s Catholic...
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School and a carrier for The Indianapolis News. Miss Nixon, surprised when the boy removed his shoe and handed it to her, exclaimed:

"OH, THIS IS the first time I've ever been asked to autograph a shoe." She laughed and immediately signed the boot, making the newspaper carrier hero of the neighborhood.

Mayor Richard G. Lugar was the principal speaker at the Naval Armory meeting, which was attended by about 750 persons.

Evangelist Bill Glass, former college and professional football star, was noteworthy by his absence since it had been announced previously he also would speak.

BRUCE B. MELCHERT, chairman of the Marion County Young Republicans, said Glass' absence could be attributed to "politics."

"I think Glass personally wanted to come," Melchert said. "But I think that perhaps some Democrats who are helping him with the Greater Indianapolis Crusade objected."

Final appearance for the crusade was last night in the State Fairgrounds Coliseum. It started Oct. 25.

GLASS, reached before making his last appearance, confirmed that he had canceled out because "I was afraid it might have made a mistake," he added. "However, I want to say now that I might have made a mistake," he stressed.

"You MAY have a pretty hot fight going on here for the United States Senate, don't you?" he asked.

Yet, he appeared surprised when information that Roudebush did not appear at the youth rally with Miss Nixon. He said "both Republicans and Democrats attend and support his crusade meetings and he did not want to be put into the position of having his followers believe he was partisan to either party."

"It was my own decision," he said. "But I would like for you to say that I might have made a mistake."

GLASS was an All-American running back at the University of Iowa and played 12 years with the Detroit Lions and Cleveland Browns.

Miss Nixon at the youth rally presented plaques to James Nichols, representing Sinc Out Midwest; Bruce McKenzie, for the Pike Township High School band; Miss Bertha Hamman, for the Calvary Tabernacle Youth Choir and Richard Key, for the Marion County 4H clubs.

Sportscaster Sid Collins was master of ceremonies.

MAYOR LUGAR gave credit to high school pupils for taking matters into their own hands a few years ago when rowdiness and post-game hoodlumism threatened to stop high school sports programs.

"Because of student leadership, the interscholastic athletic program in our schools has been preserved," Lugar said. "We have pushed forward in this area," the Mayor added. "We are not going to terminate activities because certain people cannot follow the rule of the game."

LUGAR presented a key to the city to Miss Nixon, as he did last week when her mother, Mrs. Pat Nixon, visited Indianapolis, Greenwood and Anderson in behalf of Roudebush.

Miss Nixon wore a bright red coat suit with red velvet cuffs, and a red velvet ribbon was stretched across her hair.

She wore pale hose which matched her light beige shoes.

SHE TOLDnewsmen her mother had commented following her return from her Indiana visit last week on the warm welcome she had received here.

"Now, I'll have to tell her how nice everyone has been to me."

Asked if she had any boy friends, Miss Nixon blushed, then haltingly replied:

"I have a lot of boys who are friends... I mean I have a lot of friends who are boys."

She said she never had visited the home of her grandmother, Mrs. Harrys Milhouse Nixon, who was a native of Jennings County.

"I'll have to come back and do that when I have more time," she said.
Roses from First Lady

After Mrs. Clark MacGregor, wife of the congressman and Republican senatorial candidate presented a bouquet of roses to Mrs. Pat Nixon at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport Monday, the First Lady spotted several youngsters in the crowd. When the youngsters were introduced to her, Mrs. Nixon gave a rose to each of them. Elizabeth Collatz, 7, one of the youngsters who received a rose, said she is going to save it until Friday’s show-and-tell session in her 2nd grade class at Lincoln School White Bear Lake. (Details: Page 1C.)
Mrs. Nixon 'Very Encouraged' About GOP Chances in State

By DOROTHY LEWIS
Staff Writer

"I feel very encouraged — very encouraged about Republican chances in Minnesota," said Pat Nixon as she made her way to the plane this morning after her campaign trip to the Twin Cities.

The First Lady was met at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport for her departure by Mrs. Clark MacGregor, wife of the senatorial hopeful, who had been out campaigning at various factory gates from 5 a.m. today.

Mrs. Nixon, on her arrival at the airport, waved a happy "good morning!" to well-wishers, then joined several Republican women for some picture-taking beside the MacGregor "bandwagon," a blue station wagon decorated with wild decals.

SHE TOLD Mrs. MacGregor she had a "wonderful night's sleep," and looking skyward, commented, "What a beautiful morning it is!"

"Wearing a burgundy taffeta coat with a filmy pink scarf and pink gloves, she shook hands with everyone within reach as she walked beside her secretary, Mrs. Helen Smith, to board the C140 Air Force plane. It was the same plane that carried her daughter, Tricia, to Minnesota a week ago.

Poised and pleasant, she ignored a question referring to her trip here as "payment of a political debt her husband incurred 19 years ago."

She smiled at the reporter who asked it and said, "I love campaigning. I'm enjoying every minute of it."

She added she was "not a bit tired" and was ready for the next leg of her journey.

SHE SAID she would wind up her present trip today in Reno and Carson City, Nev., and would also fly over her birthplace, Ely, Nev.

Mrs. Nixon, whose father, William Byan, was a prospector at the time she was born in Ely in 1912. Later her family moved to a farming community near Los Angeles.

Asked if this would end her campaigning, she said, "Oh, no. I'll be off again Thursday to Florida."
David and Julie Eisenhower share laughs with Mrs. Nelson Gross during a rally Oct. 21 in Newark, N. J. Gross is a GOP senatorial candidate.

Tricia Nixon smiled at well wishers in Canton, Ohio last Wednesday where she made a brief appearance for U.S. Rep. Frank T. Bow, R-Ohio (at left).
Nixon Kids On the Trail for Votes
David, Girls Campaign in 16 States

By VERA GLASER
Special to The Star

The Nixon kids are lending sparkle to a humdrum political year.

By election day the President's daughters Tricia and Julie, and Julie's husband David Eisenhower, will have campaigned for Republican candidates in 16 states.

Scruffy, bright, and natural, they are better looking than Vice President Spiro T. Agnew and less controversial.

Candidates lucky enough to rate a visit from the kids got a publicity bounce.

Crowds, cameras and reporters are sure to follow wherever Richard Nixon, his daughters, and daughter-in-law Julie Ewan go.

Their "unhippie" qualities pack a wallop with middle-aged voters, said to hold the balance of power in U.S. elections, who appear apathetic this year.

"Send Tricia in," was the first thing California Sen. George Murphy told President Nixon when he asked how to help in Murphy's re-election race.

Then Murphy added, like an afterthought, "and phone yourself if you can."

Tricia Charms

"Golly, you all have to do is look to see the effect she's having," pushed a congressman in Atlanta where Tricia, strumming with low-down red and a pink stuffed elephant, opened the southeastern fair before a jubilant crowd of 500.

So flustered was William Hartsfield, the former Atlanta mayor who officiated, that he introduced the gubernatorial candidate's daughter to her own father as "Miss Nixon."

"Send Tricia in," was the first thing California Sen. George Murphy told President Nixon when he asked how to help in Murphy's re-election race.

Then Murphy added, like an afterthought, "and phone yourself if you can."

"Tricia's visit helped identify me with that vote," MacGregor said. He said she told the crowd, "my father and I are familiar with Clark MacGregor's work and consider him one of the finest men in Congress."

Laura said Tricia tried to avoid campaigning. She is known to dislike it, but her father successfully lured her into stumpings for Virginia Gov. Linwood Holton.

Now she appears to be enjoying herself on the hustings.

Julie and Tricia have turned on their charm toLabor Day, calm to political adoration.

Their last big appearance was on Labor Day in Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, New Jersey, and Florida.

Neat Scheduling

In a neat bit of scheduling, the trio's personal preferences have been laid into the administration's political priorities, as when Julie and David flew to Chicago to campaign for Cook County Sheriff Joseph Woods, brother of President Nixon's secretary Rose Mary Woods, a close family friend.

Meanwhile, they made points for incumbent Ralph T. Smith, in a tough race against Adal Steward III.

On a trip the kids waded into a crowd of 3,500 in the Conrad Hilton Hotel ballroom, shaking hands and chatting.

Their visit to Tallahassee, Fla., to dedicate a recreation area for the handicapped came about because David's godfather's sister has an interest in the project.

The trio took off political overtures when Gov. Claude Kirk and Senatorial hopeful William Cranmer latched on to the event.

Tricia, who has a special adoration for Sen. Murphy, for whom she once worked, spent an extra day barn-storming for him in California.

David In California

Baseball buff David had his heart set on attending the National League playoff in Cincinnati, with senatorial hopeful Robert F. Langer, Jr., and David personally chose to appear in San Francisco at the dedication of a memorial park to his grandfather, the late president.

The trio's visits are swift.

Traveling with secret service agents, they fly usually in and out in a day, using a small private jet. The Republican National Committee picks up the tab.

David is becoming a deat of the-cuff speaker who usually begins with, "I'm here as a representative of the Nixon family," then touches the issues.

In Columbus, S.C., he drew applause with, "Law and order is not a code word for racism but the legitimate demand of every American citizen."

He plugged gubernatorial candidate Albert Watson because he is the kind of man the President can work with.

Watson has been accused of fostering racial tension.

The kids have encountered some snubs but far no hostile demonstrations.

In St. Paul, a lad shouted at Tricia, "tell your old man we don't dig Nixon!"

In St. Louis, at a Boy Scout camporee, the young Nixon-haters took exception to the view that they aren't in tune with their own generation.

"The media sometimes give the impression that all youth goes to rock concerts," Julia said. "Okay, we don't smoke marijuana and we don't go to rock festivals, although we like rock.

Not Odd"

"But I don't feel odd in a crowd and haven't set to college campuses. If I did, I'd think I was out of it."

On Tuesday, Nov. 3, when the votes are counted, it will be next to impossible to figure the impact of Tricia, David, and Julie.

But if they're not a net plus, a lot of political planners ready to eat their hats.
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 7, 1970

TO: Harry Dent
FROM: Tom Lias
SUBJECT: Tennessee Budget

The Brock campaign budget was originally set at $1.1 million. Of this, some $700,000 was scheduled for media — the rest was for polling, research, administration, etc. To date, they have raised and spent $750,000. They have another $250,000 obligated. Of this, $150,000 goes to television, and $50,000 each to newspaper and radio advertising. This leaves them about $100,000 short of what they think they need but don't think they can raise. If they got the $100,000, they would spend half of it on television advertising and half on newspaper and radio advertising. Their advertising schedule for weekly papers is set and they are satisfied that it is adequate. They feel the daily newspaper advertising schedule is short. They have radio saturation coverage for only the last three days before election. They would like to expand this saturation coverage to include the last full week. Television coverage is now at 650 gross rating points for the last week. They would like to expand that to 1,000 gross rating points. 95% of the television production has been completed. They are hoping to do some video tapes in connection with a hoped-for Presidential visit and run those tapes in a series of spots and perhaps a thirty-minute Presidential show. In short, they feel they need an additional $100,000, and they say they know exactly how they'd spend it.

I suggest we provide $50-100 more.
"The Real Majority" by Scammon and Wattenburg contains a credible and workable blueprint for our defeat in 1972. Its three hundred pages contain a realistic cogent strategy for a liberal Democrat in 1972. However, the presentation of that strategy points up a counter-strategy which Republicans are going to have to adopt if they are not to lose the historic opportunity we have had for the last five years.

We can no longer count on our Democratic friends to cooperate in their own demise -- as they have in recent years. Liberals are waking up all over America. Columnists like Breslin and Harriet Van Horne and Mankiewicz, peaceniks like Sam Brown, politicians like HHH, Muskie and Lindsay are clearly moving on a new tough course -- a course outlined in this book. They have begun talking of law and order; they have ceased apologizing for student militants and black radicals; they are silent on bussing. We are no longer going to win the race for Middle America by default. The Democrats are moving to win back their white collar defectors and they are going about it the Scammon-Wattenburg way.

Attached is a comprehensive review of their analysis and strategy for Democratic victory. Appended is the outline of a counter-strategy we should follow in the 1970 elections.

THE HEART OF THE BOOK

Given the President's ability to wind down the war in 1972 and relatively stabilize the economy, Presidential elections throughout the coming decade will turn on the "Social Issue". First discovered by Goldwater and Wallace, the Social Issue is now the issue on which Middle America will vote -- if one candidate is on the wrong side as Humphrey was in 1968. This social issue embraces drugs, demonstrations, pornography, disruptions, "kidlash", permissiveness, violence, riots, crime. The voters will not tolerate "a liberal" on these issues, and will vote against him on this issue alone as victories for hard-liners Daley in Chicago, Maier in Milwaukee, Stenvig in Minneapolis and Yorty in Los Angeles clearly demonstrated.

It is "in the center of American politics that victory lies" and polls conclusively show that the center of American politics today wants
tougher administrators on campus, a crackdown on crime, pornography and drugs. If the Democrats do not move into that center position on the "Social Issue", then "goodbye Democrats".

"It is the judgment of the authors that the manner in which the Democratic Party handles the Social Issue will largely determine how potent a political force the party will be in America in the years to come."

THE RISE OF CONSERVATISM

From 1963 to 1969 the number of those identifying themselves as "conservative" has risen from 46 to 51 percent -- while those identifying as "liberal" has nose-dived from 49 to 33 percent.

Summer 1969 (Gallup)
(The Way Americans Identify Themselves)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Moderate Conservative</th>
<th>Moderate Liberal</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In any normal election the moderate conservative (Republican) should have an advantage over the moderate liberal (Democrat). However, what this simple analysis fails to take into consideration is that when individuals consider themselves "conservative", it is "conservative" on the social issue -- Americans will not abide a "liberal" on the social issue. At the same time, however, polls show Americans clearly favor medicare, aid to cities, anti-poverty efforts, aid to education -- issues traditionally defined as "liberal". How do we explain the dichotomy. Say the authors:

"... the attitudinal center of American politics today involves progressivism on economic issues and toughness on the "Social Issue".

The party that can hold this center will win the Presidency.

THE SOUTH

"When the Democratic vote goes from 72 percent in 1944 to 31 percent in 1967, something has happened, and it has been something tidal... The Democrats in the South were hurt by being
perceived (correctly) as a pro-black national party, but they were also hurt by the other nonracial aspects of the Social Issue that had become identified with liberal Democrats: soft on crime, "kidlash", morals and disruption... The villains in Agnew's tirade were almost exclusively white (kids) -- but throughout the South bumper stickers blossomed reading "Spiro is my hero", and a Southern politician was quoted as saying he was voting for Agnew in 1972 and if that meant voting for Nixon, so be it... In no southern state are there enough Presidential Democrats to put together a statewide majority... Although the divorce may not be final the question now is which of the two suitors the South will accept: 'Wallaceite or Republican'.

CRUCIAL QUESTION FOR '70s

"The key election fact of the seventies is that Democrats, by carrying non-southern states of Quadcali (California plus the Northeast Quadrant from Wisconsin to Massachusetts) can win national elections without the South, although it is more difficult than it used to be. Assuming that Republicans stay near the center, the electoral question of the seventies is whether the Democrats will be able to cope with the Social Issue electoral forces at work in the society and, by coping, hold together the FDR Coalition and build upon it.

"As this book is being written in the early part of the year 1970 the votes of the unyoung, unpoor, unblack Quadcalis are still very much up for grabs. The machinist's wife in Dayton may decide to leave the Democratic reservation in 1972 and vote for Nixon or Wallace or their ideological descendants. If she thinks that Democrats feel that she isn't scared of crime but that she's really a bigot, if she thinks that Democrats feel that the police are Fascist pigs, and that the Black Panthers and the Weathermen are just poor, misunderstood, picked-upon kids, if she thinks that Democrats are for the hip cultures and that she, the machinist's wife, is not only a bigot but a square, then goodbye, lady -- and goodbye Democrats."

#(Quadcali consists of the Northeast Quadrant of the country from Wisconsin to Massachusetts including California; the authors say it is the key to victory in Presidential elections; and they dump generously on Border State Strategies and "Sun Belts" etc. This is the weakest part of the book. It is an effort to contrast their approach with the Phillips Approach by suggesting Phillips wants to trade Illinois for Alabama, or New Jersey for Mississippi, which is nonsense. Basically, there is much in common between the two strategies -- more than Scammon and Wattenburg would care to admit.)
ON LOW-KEY & "LOCAL" CAMPAIGNING

"And how many people can be assembled to hear or even glimpse a candidate in the flesh on a given day? Twenty-five thousand? Fifty thousand? A hundred thousand? Two hundred and fifty thousand? A two minute clip on each of the three network news shows during the campaign will yield the candidate an audience of many tens of million Americans! Hubert Humphrey or Richard Nixon will be seen by more residents of New Jersey if he says something fairly noteworthy in Oregon than if he says something banal in Trenton, Montclair, Newark, Camden, and Tenafly all in the same day,"

What about the shot in the arm given party workers by the personal appearance?

"There is probably some limited truth to this, but again one must remember that far more party workers throughout the nation are enthused seeing their candidate in an effective two-minute spot on a news-broadcast appearance on television than can be enthused by a candidate's visit to Weehawken, Union City, Bergen and Short Hills..."

"The people in New Jersey, like the rest of Americans will be judging their Presidential choices largely on the basis of national television, national magazines, national columnists, and national reporters appearing in their local newspapers and largely on national issues and national images."

"LIBERALISM AND BUSSING!"

"All of this represents the beginnings of a strategy for liberals in the seventies. Beware of the 'liberal' label but do not be despondent about the liberal program... Beware of the Social Issue. It cuts deep and must be approached on little cat feet. There is learning as well as leading to do. There can be no pandering to disruption or crime; the public is not buying the notion that there are not bad boys, only bad environments..."

REPUBLICAN AWARENESS

"There can be no question that a good deal of Republican gardening will be done on the Social Issue. When Vice President Agnew says;"
'The rank-and-file Democrat in this country does not share the philosophy of permissiveness expressed by the best publicized moral and intellectual leaders of our society. He reads with disgust all the rave reviews the press gives the latest dirty movie or dirty book...'

then it is clear that the Republicans are aware of this strategy."

FORMULAS FOR SUCCESS

"This is the nature of centrism. Democrats must heal the wound of the Social Issue. Republicans must prove that they are the party of Middle America and not of the fat cats."

A FOURTH PARTY

"Furthermore, unlike the Wallace situation, an extreme left party would take almost all its votes from one party -- the Democratic Party. If it ever got strong, then, it could only be a "spoiler" ensuring Republican victories. As a weak party, however, an extreme left party might be helpful to Democrats, by getting the crazies out of the tent, decreasing the identification of 'Democrats' as radicals."

LINDSAY & CHARISMA

Charisma counts in an election, but it only makes the difference when both candidates have acceptable positions on the Social Issue. The Lindsay charisma did little for him when we consider that three of five New Yorkers voted against returning him in the mayoralty in the most liberal city in America. Had the "oppositionist" vote not been divided, even the wholly uncharismatic figure of Mario Procacino would have cleaned up the floor with him.

Lindsay, in effect, scored a "victory defeat".

"What other phrase better describes the results of an election in which a politician with national aspirations pulls only one in four votes of the 'white workingman', or if one chooses to look at Lindsay specifically as a potential Democratic candidate, what kind of recommendation is it to say that he received fewer than half the Jewish votes the last time out."
As of today, if Lindsay were nominated as a Democrat, RN would crush him. If he were nominated as a Republican, he could conceivably bring about the election of George Wallace -- so much for Big John.

MYTHS & ASSERTIONS

1. The authors proceed to explode one popular press myth after another in this volume.

Myth No. 1: The vote in the primaries and general election in 1968 was a vote "against Vietnam".

McCarthy, the "dove" in New Hampshire, only got 18% of the total vote in that state -- and a University of Michigan survey showed that 60% of the McCarthy votes were from hawks dissatisfied that LBJ had not done enough to end the war. In addition, at the time of New Hampshire, by 51 to 40 percent Americans did not want to stop the bombing; by 44 to 36 percent Americans favored an invasion of North Vietnam. Candidates and press may have been talking about it, but Vietnam was not the voting issue of 1968.

The contention that the McCarthy vote in the Wisconsin Primary was an anti-war vote seems implausible on the following grounds: That same day an anti-war amendment in dovish Madison was defeated 58-42; a law-and-order pro-LBJ Mayor (Maier) won over a liberal anti-war candidate 86-14; LBJ was still leading McCarthy two-to-one nationally; and Republicans who would later vote for "hawkish" RN crossed over by tens of thousands to vote for Eugene.

Finally, in the last Wisconsin full page ads of RN, LBJ and McCarthy, in the Wisconsin primary, not a single one mentioned the word Vietnam -- though the media played it as the key to the election.

Myth No. 2: The Conventions were rigged -- the popular choices Rockefeller and McCarthy denied nomination by the bosses.

Nonsense -- Nixon and Humphrey were far and away the popular choices of their parties -- (RN over Rocky 60-23; HHH over McCarthy 58-38) -- and thus the only Democratic choices. Rigged conventions are exceptional. The only convention in the last twenty-five years where the candidate with the widest support in his party was not nominated was Goldwater in 1964.
Myth No. 3. By forging a coalition of the young, the poor and the black and the intellectuals, the Democrats can put together a new and winning coalition. Scammon and Wattenburg believe this a prescription for disaster. First, the young and the poor and the black vote is the lowest percentage of any groups in America. Secondly, the young and the poor are hardly monolithic in voting patterns. A poor white from the Midwest was a likely Nixon voter; a poor white in the South a Wallace voter, and a poor black in the cities a Humphrey voter. Neither are the young monolithic in their voting patterns. More than any other group to vote, they tend to vote like their parents. In addition, as a group 21-29 year olds are more hawkish than the over-50s; Wallace did his best among the 21-29 group.

As for the intellectuals, those with college degrees are more likely to vote Republican than Democratic. If you are talking about Ph. D.s -- the Democratic vote is greater here -- but the number of voters is so miniscule as to be irrelevant.

True, blacks are solidly Democratic -- but it is also true that among races black voting percentages are the lowest--

"... the 'drop-off' alone in the Wallace vote in the last six weeks of the campaign was about equal to the total number of black votes cast in 1968."

We must face facts, say the authors: the average voter is unpoor, unyoung, unblack, unintellectual. The average voter is a 47-year-old housewife from Dayton, Ohio, whose brother-in-law is a cop and who is herself married to a machinist. Even if the voting age is dropped to 18 -- the average voter is still well over forty years of age.

"You can knock the 'liberal intellectuals' out of the Democratic coalition, and you've lost the front bumper; knock out the black vote, and you've lost the fenders and the back seat; but knock out labor, Middle America, or the unpoor, unyoung, unblack, and you've lost the engine, and the car won't run. This is an unpleasant fact to some, but fact it is."

Further, it is interesting to note that in 1968, 22 percent of the population could be considered "poor"; by 1972 that figure will be down to 15 percent; further:
"... of the poorest dozen states in the nation, six went for Nixon, five went for Wallace and only one for Humphrey. The richest state in the nation -- Connecticut -- went for HHH."

(However, it is true that the pool of non-voting black represents a great plus for Democrats if they can get them registered and voting, since unlike the poor and young -- blacks do vote in blocs -- Democratic blocs.

"Six in seven voters are over thirty. Nine out of ten are unpoor, nine out of ten are white."

'PACKAGING NIXON

Myth No. 4: The "packaging" of RN won him the election. Ridiculous. All candidates are packaged to one degree or another. But Stenvig won in Minneapolis with $3,600 spent. While HHH was saying he was running poorly in the polls because of RN's TV, Muskie was running 17 points ahead of Agnew in polls -- yet Agnew had the same TV exposure as RN, and Muskie as Humphrey. "Voters are not nitwits." RN was ahead because he

"...was more closely attuned to the temper of a larger segment of the electorate than was his opposition. He was a man for the season. That may sound simplistic; it is simplistic -- and accurate ... The feelings that Nixon capitalized on were not part of a Southern Strategy or a Border State Strategy -- they were part of a national strategy that was attuned to the national malaise we have discussed earlier... It may be said in fact that Agnewism as a social thought won the election for Nixon, while Agnew, the individual, almost lost it for him."

Myth No. 5: The Kennedy victory in Gary, uniting hard hats and blacks, showed how formidable he would be in a general election. Again -- no such thing, contend the authors. RFK won the blacks and the union workers; but he did not have to compete against either Wallace or HHH, each of whom would have had tremendous drawing among one or the other of these groups.

"The authors also go to lengths to show how RFK moved to the Center throughout the primaries by abandoning his early frenzied campaigning pace, by clipping his hair, speaking in low-keyed voice,
accusing McCarthy of seeking to have blacks from Watts forcibly integrated in Orange County, talking to Indiana's concern about riots, war and Communism. Say the authors, Bobby was not selling out, but simply addressing himself to concerns of a country where half the women are afraid to go out at night.

WALLACE '72

In 1972 Wallace should, as he did in 1968, take seven million votes from Nixon and three million from the Democrat.

PRIMER FOR DEMS

Chapter Twenty of the book offers Democrats a Primer on precisely how to phrase their appeal to the voters. Example:

Do Not Say: 'Well, I don't agree with the Students for a Democratic Society when they invade a college president's office, but I can understand their deep sense of frustration.'

Do Say: 'When students break the law they will be treated as lawbreakers.'

Example:

The Democrats made a disastrous error in saying "Law and order is a code word for racism." This is a losing position on the Social Issue -- they should say "I am for civil rights and against crime." They should not link the two.

ON CANDIDATES

A Presidential aspirant must above all be a "take charge guy". Humphrey would have been better off had he come down on one side or the other on Vietnam -- rather than leaving the impression of being wishy-washy.
CONCLUSION

"To know that the lady in Dayton is afraid to walk the streets alone at night, to know that she has a mixed view about blacks and civil rights because before moving to the suburbs she lived in a neighborhood that became all black, to know that her brother-in-law is a policeman, to know that she does not have the money to move if her new neighborhood deteriorates, to know that she is deeply distressed that her son is going to a community college where LSD was found on the campus -- to know all this is the beginning of contemporary political wisdom."
Given this Sca:rn:mon-Wattenburg thesis—which is right on the mark for Democrats—we are in serious danger of being driven back to our minority party posture. Our needs seem crystal clear.

1. We cannot allow the Democrats to get back on the right side of the Social Issue. This they are attempting to do right now with tough talk, etc. They have to be branded—and the brand must stick—as permissivists, as indulgent of students and black rioters, as soft on crime. This can be accomplished with their record in the last Congress. But for us to contest with them primarily on the Economic Issue—Big Spenders, etc.—as the major assault seems not a prescription for success. Republicans for forty years have been tarring Democratic Congresses with "Big Spender" labels, and Democrats have been winning those Congresses, I o, these same Forty Years.

The focus should be on tarring them with "ultra-liberalism" and "radicalism"—especially on the Social Issue where we are strong and they are weak.

2. Where are the swing voters in 1970? We must assume left-wing Democrats are going for their Democratic Candidates and Republicans are going for Republicans, come hell or high water. The swing voters are thus Democrats—law and order Democrats, conservatives on the "Social Issue", but "progressive" on domestic issues. This is the Wattenburg thesis—and it is basically correct. How to conduct ourselves then.

A. Tar the Democratic Leadership specifically with the "radical" label on social policy; tar them as well with the "obstructionist" label on the President's programs for reforming society, for getting America moving; tar them as for bussing—and against our crime control legislation.

Frankly, we should go after the "Daley Democrats"—but we cannot get these voters by using rehashed Republican arguments or stale Republican rhetoric.
"Big Spenders" is a theme that 'might work, will work, with our Republicans -- we are using it in all our GOP literature -- but will it have any real bite with the union guy to whom big spending may mean the medicare for his mom or old man? (Foot-dragging Congress does not seem charged with much electricity, either.)

3. Scammon contends that a hard-line on riots etc. by Democrats may anger "liberals", but liberals have no place to go anyhow except the Democratic Party. Just so, regular Republicans have no place to go in 1970 (no Wallace) but the GOP. So, let's go straight after the Daley Democrats.

4. We should win these Democrats to the Presidential banner by contending that RN is a progressive on domestic policy blocked by "obstructionists" in the left-wing leadership of the Democratic Party; that RN is a hard-liner on crime, drugs and pornography, whose legislation is blocked by "ultraliberals" in the Senate who care so much about the rights of the criminal that they forget about the rights of society; that the President is a man trying with veto after veto to hold down the cost of living but is being thwarted by radicals and wild spenders who would, given the chance, create the kind of inflation that would put Indonesia in its heyday in the shade; that the President is a man in foreign policy who is moving toward peace with honor but whose efforts are being attacked and undercut by unilateral disarmers and isolationists who think peace lies in an abject retreat from the world and the dismantling of the Army, Navy and Air Force. This is said strong -- but these would be the ways we could best appeal to the patriotic, hard-line pro-medicare Democrats who are the missing element in the Grand New Party.

5. There is no conflict between garnering national publicity and helping local Senate candidates -- the two are thoroughly complimentary.

The Democrats -- see Seammon's book -- are only now coming around to recognize what we knew in 1966 and 1968 -- that a strong statement in Oregon is more effective in getting to voters in New Jersey than a banal statement in Trenton, Tenafly, Newark and Elizabeth. The way to help the Senatorial Candidate is to praise him to the skies, fine -- but to hammer the national Democratic Leadership in a manner that will keep our big press corps excited and with us; that will get network time every night if possible with our message; and so help every Republican Senatorial Candidate while we are helping the local one.
All we have to do to forfeit that national publicity is run around talking about "cattle and oil" in Casper, as has been suggested already. We ought to remember also, that when we give up the television time -- on the networks -- someone else, namely our Democratic friends, gets it.

A hard-hitting tough campaign can help bring home Senators and Congressmen who live or die on a few national percentage points.

6. Clearly, from the Scammon book, we should tar the liberal Democrats as being not only the party of "bugout" but the party of bussing, the advocates of "compulsory integration," the party whose last Attorney General banged down the door in Chicago in order to testify on behalf of the Chicago Eight, the leadership that let this country turn into the porno capital of the world, and is blocking RN's effort to change that. Also, the Democratic Leadership has altered its historic foreign policy position to kow-tow to student radicals who bully-ragged those same leaders in the streets of Chicago, etc. The Democratic Leadership should be portrayed as selling out to the crazies in their own ranks -- and selling out the interests and views of the good patriotic Democrats who number in the millions. We might even say LBJ was destroyed by the "ultra-liberals" in his own party.

7. We should stay on the offensive, taken the "out" (and offensive) position even though we are the "ins" (and defensive) by hammering at the "liberal Eastern Establishment" that is responsible for what has happened to America, the "Establishment" that is frustrating our efforts to right the wrongs in Society, the Establishment whose wards are tearing up the colleges, the Establishment that indulges rioters, etc. (Of course, said in better phraseology, but the need to be on the offensive, to act as "outs" seems vital.)

8. The Economic Issue. To get into a debate on whether or not we are in a "recession" seems an utterly foolish idea -- since the very discussion of "recession" is surely not going to help us and since anyone who is hurt in the current economic situation is not likely to be convinced he is not being hurt by anybody's rhetoric. Rather than debate whether or not the investors and brokers and unemployed are being hurt, let's go after the Democratic radicals whose wild schemes are frustrating our efforts to stop the rise in prices. This is the Big Spender theme -- but in different rhetoric, tougher rhetoric, equating the Democrats with the same kind of ultraliberalism in spending that they follow on the Social Issue. Call them ultra-liberals.