

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
Contested Materials Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
46	5	8/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Teeter to MacGregor RE: why to avoid registering younger voters in the 1972 election. Marked-up duplicate attached. 4 pgs.
46	5	8/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to RN RE: campaign strategizing. 2 pgs.
46	5	8/2/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Teeter to Haldeman RE: thoughts on scheduling the First Family during the 1972 campaign. Handwritten notes added by unknown. Duplicates attached. 24 pgs.
46	5	8/1/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Strachan to Higby RE: a discussion with Teeter about McGovern's pollster, Pat Caddell. Handwritten note added by Higby. 1 pg.

[Handwritten: Enter name]

COMMITTEE FOR THE RE-ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

August 14, 1972

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

By Emp MARK, Date 6-17-80

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE CLARK MAC GREGOR

FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER

SUBJECT: Non-Registered Youth Vote

Several questions have been raised regarding the advisability of registration of young voters as a result of the Gallup finding that the President had the edge with non-registered young voters. This question has been raised especially in the context of a proposed registration drive of young military personnel. Our findings on this subject from the second wave of campaign polls is outlined herein.

Our data for several key states (California, New York, Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania) shows the non-registered young voters to be voting for President Nixon at the same rate as registered young voters:

Voters 17 to 24 Years

	<u>Non-College</u>			<u>College</u>		
	<u>Reg.</u>	<u>Not Reg.</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Reg.</u>	<u>Not Reg.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Nixon	34%	35%	35%	32%	35%	33%
McGovern	61	58	60	65	60	63
Undecided	5	6	5	3	5	4

Conclusions

We believe that any mass registration drives involving this voter bloc such as the one proposed for low echelon military personnel involves a great deal of risk and we would recommend against any such efforts at this time.

The Gallup studies indicate that with non-registered young voters the President has a slight edge over McGovern. Our surveys show a different result because our studies are drawn from our priority states while the Gallup study uses a national sample. This means that the Gallup national sample over-represents those areas where we are particularly strong such as the south and farm states. In

making a decision on whether to have a mass registration drive the differing samples become important. We would expect military voters to reflect the same voting patterns as voters in their home state. If the Gallup finding is true for the entire country, this would still not help us in states where we are running poorly with young voters, such as New York and California. Therefore, a bad situation would only be aggravated and we would only be helped in states where we are already ahead.

It has been suggested, however, that military personnel will have a greater propensity to vote for the President. This may not necessarily be true among young enlisted men. The ranks of this lower echelon are made up of men from lower socio-economic classes which have been traditionally voting Democratic. I would expect no overwhelming and instantaneous turnout in favor of a Republican. The single most important factor in determining how new voters vote, particularly non-college, is still how their parents voted.

Overall, we would recommend that no massive registration drive be undertaken for younger voters and in particular military voters, because our data shows this group to be composed of younger voters who favor McGovern over Nixon by large margins in key states. We can speculate that the attitudes of the group of military voters are somewhat different than all young people; however, our data generally shows that young voters as a whole are more similar as a group than they are different. Therefore, a registration drive aimed at this group is undertaken with a high risk that the speculation of a high favorable vote for Nixon may be incorrect. Between relying on our data versus speculation about attitudes, we suggest that no registration drive be undertaken until contrary data supporting the drive is uncovered.

Of course, where we can identify voters leaning for the President, we should make every attempt to register them. However, our information indicates this identification cannot be accomplished with servicemen.

CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY

COMMITTEE FOR THE RE-ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

August 14, 1972

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102  
By lmp NARS, Date 6-12-80

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE CLARK MAC GREGOR  
FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER  
SUBJECT: Non-Registered Youth Vote

Several questions have been raised regarding the advisability of registration of young voters as a result of the Gallup finding that the President had the edge with non-registered young voters. This question has been raised especially in the context of a proposed registration drive of young military personnel. Our findings on this subject from the second wave of campaign polls is outlined herein.

Our data for several key states (California, New York, Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania) shows the non-registered young voters to be voting for President Nixon at the same rate as registered young voters:

Voters 17 to 24 Years

	<u>Non-College</u>			<u>College</u>		
	<u>Reg.</u>	<u>Not Reg.</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Reg.</u>	<u>Not Reg.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Nixon	34%	35%	35%	32%	35%	33%
McGovern	61	58	60	65	60	63
Undecided	5	6	5	3	5	4

Conclusions

We believe that any mass registration drives involving this voter bloc such as the one proposed for low echelon military personnel involves a great deal of risk and we would recommend against any such efforts at this time.

The Gallup studies indicate that with non-registered young voters the President has a slight edge over McGovern. Our surveys show a different result because our studies are drawn from our priority states while the Gallup study uses a national sample. This means that the Gallup national sample over-represents those areas where we are particularly strong such as the south and farm states. In

making a decision on whether to have a mass registration drive the differing samples become important. We would expect military voters to reflect the same voting patterns as voters in their home state. If the Gallup finding is true for the entire country, this would still not help us in states where we are running poorly with young voters, such as New York and California. Therefore, a bad situation would only be aggravated and we would only be helped in states where we are already ahead.

It has been suggested, however, that military personnel will have a greater propensity to vote for the President. This may not necessarily be true among young enlisted men. The ranks of this lower echelon are made up of men from lower socio-economic classes which have been traditionally voting Democratic. I would expect no overwhelming and instantaneous turnout in favor of a Republican. The single most important factor in determining how new voters vote, particularly non-college, is still how their parents voted.

Overall, we would recommend that no massive registration drive be undertaken for younger voters and in particular military voters, because our data shows this group to be composed of younger voters who favor McGovern over Nixon by large margins in key states. We can speculate that the attitudes of the group of military voters are somewhat different than all young people; however, our data generally shows that young voters as a whole are more similar as a group than they are different. Therefore, a registration drive aimed at this group is undertaken with a high risk that the speculation of a high favorable vote for Nixon may be incorrect. Between relying on our data versus speculation about attitudes, we suggest that no registration drive be undertaken until contrary data supporting the drive is uncovered.

Of course, where we can identify voters leaning for the President, we should make every attempt to register them. However, our information indicates this identification cannot be accomplished with servicemen.

CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH As Requested)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Have received the poll briefing and while the findings on the issue are unexceptional, the conclusions that are drawn are wrong, I think -- if I do not mistake them. Our surrogates and the Vice President should not spend a disproportionate amount of their time defending our record on unemployment, and economic management. By most everyone's judgment, our record is not considered as that good; this is our "weakest" point -- and a national debate over whether we managed the economy well is perhaps the one debate with McGovern we can lose.

Agreed that Vietnam, inflation, etc. are the crucial issues. We can win on these issues by not so much verbally defending our record, but by portraying McGovern as disastrous to the stock market, disastrous to the job market with his budget cuts in defense and space, disastrous to the security of the U.S., disastrous to the price situation, because of his \$1000 program, or his \$6500 welfare giveaway. In short, let's not so much defend our record, which is subject to criticism, as to attack McGovern with being a clear and present danger to the prosperity we now have.

The point is this: If the Democrats had nominated Harpo Marx, the Teeter polls would have said Vietnam, economy, inflation are the major issues. Would we, in a race with Harpo, talk about those issues -- or would the winning issues rather be the manifest lack of qualification of their candidate -- despite our record.

The decision in November and our rhetoric must not focus upon their issues -- i. e., "unemployment" and the unequal economic record of the last four years -- it must focus upon our issues -- i. e., the extremism, elitism, radicalism, kookism, of McGovern's person, campaign, and programs, against the solid, strong, effective leadership of the President. The first campaign described above is the only way we can lose in 1972 -- and if I am not mistaken,

this is something close to what the Teeter folks recommend, when they say we ought to talk up the economy, and spend an inordinate amount of time defending our record on unemployment.

Nor should we forget the capacity of a candidate (i. e., Kennedy and the "missile gap," Goldwater and "extremism") to create issues, on which elections turn, sometimes legitimate issues, sometimes illegitimate. When we portray McGovern's ideas as preposterous, foolish, and even dangerous to U.S. security and the nation's economy, we are right now pushing against an open door -- with the media at large, as well as the country.

The campaign should turn, we should make it turn, upon the manifest unqualification of this character and his ilk to even be in the Presidential contest -- not whether a damn referendum in our spotty economic performance, which talking, talking, talking about the economy and jobs, and unemployment would make it. So, I disagree strongly with what I view as the central thrust of recommendations of the Teeter polls.

Buchanan

Item N-6

Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

August 2, 1972

DETERMINED TO BE AN ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102

By amp NAR, Date 6-17-80

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. H. R. HALDEMAN  
FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER *RM*  
SUBJECT: Scheduling

*P. must also do some activities to generate and publicize and authorship for him.*

As requested this is a supplemental memo summarizing my recommendations for the scheduling of the President, Vice President, and First Family.

I think the purpose of each appearance by the President, with the possible exception of the very last few days of the campaign should be exclusively to persuade people to vote for him who are not now committed to do so. Appearances by the First Family and Vice President should be both to gain Nixon supporters and to reinforce our current supporters.

Assuming this purpose, the President should go exclusively to the large, close states and to those specific areas where the greatest number of ticket-splitters are located. We have done a ticket-splitting analysis by county of each of the priority states and by ward/township for the metropolitan areas within each of these states. This data, along with the total vote for each area and Republican strength data has been displayed on maps and is available from Dan Evans in my office. Dwight Chapin and Dave Parker have been working with Evans on this data.

This ticket-splitter information should be, however, interpreted along with total vote data. For example, given one area with 500,000 total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 20% and another area of a million total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 10%, I would go to the million vote area even though they theoretically have the same number of ticket-splitters. The large area simply has more voters who can be affected by a Presidential visit. The total number of votes we can potentially affect should be the final determinate.

*Agree*

In my judgment this data, not the polls, should govern our selection of sites for Presidential appearances. Polling data then can be of some guidance in determining the subject matter, particularly for the Vice President and First Family. While choice of subject matter may be important in some Presidential visits, most of the visits will be in fact national events and should be considered national appeals to a major degree even though they should have a local appeal.



*What is it!*

The Presidential appearances should be used primarily to articulate the basic theme of the campaign, to tie that basic theme to specific issues important in that area, and to explain how administration policies and programs are designed to help solve the problems of that area. I do not think we have been as successful as we might be in communicating the fact that the purpose of the President's policies and programs is to improve the lives of individual citizens and not to improve the situations of various special interest groups and institutions. Members of the First Family can be particularly effective in doing this.

*agree*

For example, Mrs. Nixon and one of the girls could be very effective in explaining to a group of suburban parents how the President's program to stop the importation of drugs from Turkey and France is designed to lessen the availability of drugs for their children or to explain that the reason why the President is pressing Congress to hold down spending is because many individual families simply cannot afford increased taxes. Also, while the President will undoubtedly have a number of large rallies and motorcades and I think it will be important that he make some appearances which are covered by television that are low keyed and allow him to talk to average citizens, showing his concern for their problems. In these appearances, it would be helpful if he could explain how he thinks we should go about solving these problems.

*good*

It is difficult for me to recommend specific types of appearances for the First Family as I do not know what events might be available nor do I know what they do particularly well. Obviously they can be used to cover places the President will miss and to generate enthusiasm among our workers. I also think that they can be particularly effective in communicating the concern and compassion of the President for the American people. They could also be effective in communicating the President's concern and programs in areas of special interest to the various voting blocs -- particularly women, young voters, senior citizens, -- and to those with interest in specific subject areas, -- health, the environment, retarded children, etc.

*Right*

Regarding the Vice President, I believe that as long as we continue to maintain a substantial lead he should be used primarily to reinforce our voters and to say complimentary things about the President that he cannot say himself. As long as we maintain our

*Right*

*but concentrate on ethnics & union members*

lead and in light of the Eagleton fiasco, we should keep him on positive issues and use him to attack the Democratic ticket only if it is absolutely necessary. As long as the McGovern campaign continues to have problems and the press produces negative comment, we ought to seize the opportunity to make the Vice President a statesman. This would, it seems to me, take away one of the Democrats major points of attack. None of our data indicates that the Vice President has any large or unique constituency of his own, independent of the President, although he is especially popular with our own loyalists.

*Agree*

The following is a list of the priority states ranked by my judgment of their importance for Presidential visits, along with the specific areas the voting data indicates which would be most affected by a personal appearance. Some suggested subjects and issues for emphasis in those areas are also included.

New York  
Suburban New York City particularly Nassau, Suffolk and Queens

*we are NOT going to "kick off" the campaign.*  
This would be an ideal place to kick off the campaign and to set the theme for the campaign. We should use Rockefeller, Buckley and Javits at the initial appearance and emphasize a broad appeal. New York is the media center of the country and visits to these areas would cover key portions of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey, all priority states.

California

*good point*

Both Waves I and II data indicate that attitudes toward the President are more deeply set in California than in other states. Therefore, Presidential visits may have less impact than in other states. This is particularly true of campaign visits and any visits by the President should be Presidential in nature.

*Right*

The key to California appears to be organization and making sure we get every possible Nixon vote. This means some visits to our own supporters for reinforcement by the Vice President and First Family may be useful.

Los Angeles

Los Angeles does not have as high ticket-splitting but it is simply the largest area. The economy is key, both jobs and inflation.

San Francisco  
(San Mateo and Marin  
Counties) Sacramento

✓ The ticket-splitting rate is high and there is a large undecided vote. Persuasive visits would have most effect and Vietnam and environment are very important.

San Diego

✓ This is a strong Republican area where we are not running as well as we should. It is a perfect place for a speech on national defense and why a strong national defense is the best means to peace.

Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia

*Wrong  
(ask Rizzo)*

The ticket-splitting rate is not as high as Pittsburgh but we need to do better in the City of Philadelphia. Some joint appearances with Rizzo and with Spector (in Jewish areas) should be made. Jobs, crime and drugs are all important but we should be careful of the crime issue as we are now getting 20% of blacks and need to keep them. Unemployment and jobs are also very important and would appeal to both blacks and whites.

✓ The President should visit this area himself.

Pittsburgh

✓ The entire southwestern portion of Pennsylvania has been key to Republican victory in this state. Allegheny County is the media center of this area. Taxes, crime, drugs and the environment are all of particular interest although the tax issue probably has the broadest appeal to the entire region.

✓ I also think the President should visit Pittsburgh himself.

Harrisburg

✓ The Vice President or First Family needs to visit Harrisburg. It is the capitol and Shapp is very unpopular largely due to tax increases. Drugs are the most important issue.

*Not yet*

Wilkes Barre

While I realize the President was there, Shapp is now attacking the President and the federal government regularly on delivery of flood relief services. This is a good place to send the Vice President on a red-tape cutting mission.

New Jersey

No New Jersey media center covers this state with the coverage coming from New York and Philadelphia. Issues should be taxes and inflation.

New Jersey needs to be visited by the Vice President and First Family to enthuse our organization. Presidential visits to New York and Philadelphia will cover large portions of the state through the media; however, a Presidential visit might flatter local citizens.

?

Illinois

Chicago suburbs, particularly in the western and northern Cook County, DuPage and Lake County.

Taxes and inflation are the most important issues but we should be very careful of the tax issue in light of Ogilvie's low approval rating and his probable large loss. Ogilvie's problems stem largely from a tax increase.

Percy is running very well with young voters and blacks in Chicago areas. This is an ideal spot for a youth appeal with Percy.

?

There is no need for the President to go downstate.

Ohio

Cleveland, western city wards, eastern suburbs -- Lake and Geauga Counties. Akron/Canton area.

Jobs will have strong appeal throughout the industrialized northeast part of Ohio, and appeal to both white and black working voters. Government spending, taxes, and revenue sharing will tie directly to current financial problems in Cleveland and with Mayor Perk's main problem.

Both Akron and Canton have popular and effective Republican mayors (John Ballard-Akron and Stanley Cmich-Canton). Revenue sharing is a good subject.

Cincinnati/Columbus

These are strong Republican areas with low ticket-splitting. Visits should be made by the Vice President and First Family. Preston Wolfe of the Columbus Dispatch is a good friend of ours and Columbus has new Republican mayor (Tom Moody).

Toledo Area

Toledo has high ticket-splitting, and the Toledo media dominates the entire northwestern portion of the state. Crime and environment are particularly important issues. Support of Toledo Blade is very important for entire area and the President should spend some time with Paul Block (publisher who is personally very interested in the environment). President could easily do Cleveland and Toledo in the same trip.

*Someone else has  
to win over publishers etc* No

Dayton Area

This is a large area with high ticket-splitting. Jobs, as tied to national defense would be good issue as there is considerable apprehension of the future of Wright-Patterson and jobs is the number one issue in the area. The newspapers are both liberal and Democratic.

Texas  
Houston

Houston is a large area with the highest ticket-splitting in the state. The entire Gulf Coast has relatively high ticket-splitting, particularly Corpus Christi. Important problems in Harris County are drugs and inflation, and Harris County is quite similar to the state as a whole. National defense is particularly important in the Beaumont/Port Arthur area.

The President should go to Houston.

Dallas

Dallas has lower ticket-splitting but there is still a large concentration of voters. Crime and drugs are important issues and probably could be handled by the Vice President.

Midland/Odessa/Lubbock  
(West Central Texas)

These are relatively high ticket-splitting areas and should be visited by someone but not necessarily the President. Taxes and national defense are important issues.

Amarillo

This area has high ticket-splitting but does not have a particularly large concentration of voters. There are a great number of older voters, particularly concerned with health care. Mrs. Nixon could handle this area and subject matter very well.

Michigan  
Detroit suburbs, particularly western Wayne and Macomb Counties.

The President should visit both western Wayne County and Oakland County emphasizing jobs and the revitalization of the economy. Taxes is an important issue, however, there is a property tax relief proposal on the ballot in November sponsored by Governor Milliken. Governor Milliken is very popular in the City of Detroit.

*? P. should provy  
not bussing  
money!*

Bussing might be best handled by Attorney General Kleindeinst or the Vice President to discuss intervention in bussing law suit. Bussing visit should be to western Wayne or Macomb counties.

Flint/Saginaw/Bay City

This area has high ticket-splitting and the media here also covers the populous thumb area (Saginaw/Bay City). Taxes, and particularly property taxes for education is by far the most important issue. This area has always been very receptive to campaigns oriented to inflation and taxes.

Grand Rapids

Grand Rapids is a large area with moderate ticket-splitting, and we are not doing quite as well as we should. P  
Appearances here could be handled well by the Vice President or the First Family. The President's Welfare Reform proposals would be popular.

Note:

Environmental concern about the Great Lakes is important here and throughout Michigan.

Maryland  
Baltimore County

✓ Personal safety and drugs are by far  
the most important issues.

Montgomery County

✓ This is a high ticket-splitting area  
and deserves some independent attention.  
It might be useful to use one of the  
surrogates from outside Washington  
along with First Family.

Connecticut  
Hartford & Fairfield  
Counties

✓ These counties have the most people  
and the highest ticket-splitting.  
Jobs and unemployment particularly in  
the Hartford area are important.  
Personal safety and drugs have special  
concern in Fairfield County. It is  
probably useful to give Connecticut,  
particularly New York suburbs some  
independent attention by First Family  
from New York City.

CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY

Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

August 2, 1972

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING  
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102  
By smP NARS, Date 6-17-80

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. H. R. HALDEMAN  
FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER *RMTE*  
SUBJECT: Scheduling

As requested this is a supplemental memo summarizing my recommendations for the scheduling of the President, Vice President, and First Family.

I think the purpose of each appearance by the President, with the possible exception of the very last few days of the campaign should be exclusively to persuade people to vote for him who are not now committed to do so. Appearances by the First Family and Vice President should be both to gain Nixon supporters and to reinforce our current supporters.

Assuming this purpose, the President should go exclusively to the large, close states and to those specific areas where the greatest number of ticket-splitters are located. We have done a ticket-splitting analysis by county of each of the priority states and by ward/township for the metropolitan areas within each of these states. This data, along with the total vote for each area and Republican strength data has been displayed on maps and is available from Dan Evans in my office. Dwight Chapin and Dave Parker have been working with Evans on this data.

This ticket-splitter information should be, however, interpreted along with total vote data. For example, given one area with 500,000 total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 20% and another area of a million total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 10%, I would go to the million vote area even though they theoretically have the same number of ticket-splitters. The large area simply has more voters who can be affected by a Presidential visit. The total number of votes we can potentially affect should be the final determinate.

In my judgment this data, not the polls, should govern our selection of sites for Presidential appearances. Polling data then can be of some guidance in determining the subject matter, particularly for the Vice President and First Family. While choice of subject matter may be important in some Presidential visits, most of the visits will be in fact national events and should be considered national appeals to a major degree even though they should have a local appeal.

The Presidential appearances should be used primarily to articulate the basic theme of the campaign, to tie that basic theme to specific issues important in that area, and to explain how administration policies and programs are designed to help solve the problems of that area. I do not think we have been as successful as we might be in communicating the fact that the purpose of the President's policies and programs is to improve the lives of individual citizens and not to improve the situations of various special interest groups and institutions. Members of the First Family can be particularly effective in doing this.

For example, Mrs. Nixon and one of the girls could be very effective in explaining to a group of suburban parents how the President's program to stop the importation of drugs from Turkey and France is designed to lessen the availability of drugs for their children or to explain that the reason why the President is pressing Congress to hold down spending is because many individual families simply cannot afford increased taxes. Also, while the President will undoubtedly have a number of large rallies and motorcades and I think it will be important that he make some appearances which are covered by television that are low keyed and allow him to talk to average citizens, showing his concern for their problems. In these appearances, it would be helpful if he could explain how he thinks we should go about solving these problems.

It is difficult for me to recommend specific types of appearances for the First Family as I do not know what events might be available nor do I know what they do particularly well. Obviously they can be used to cover places the President will miss and to generate enthusiasm among our workers. I also think that they can be particularly effective in communicating the concern and compassion of the President for the American people. They could also be effective in communicating the President's concern and programs in areas of special interest to the various voting blocs -- particularly women, young voters, senior citizens, -- and to those with interest in specific subject areas, -- health, the environment, retarded children, etc.

Regarding the Vice President, I believe that as long as we continue to maintain a substantial lead he should be used primarily to reinforce our voters and to say complimentary things about the President that he cannot say himself. As long as we maintain our

lead and in light of the Eagleton fiasco, we should keep him on positive issues and use him to attack the Democratic ticket only if it is absolutely necessary. As long as the McGovern campaign continues to have problems and the press produces negative comment, we ought to seize the opportunity to make the Vice President a statesman. This would, it seems to me, take away one of the Democrats major points of attack. None of our data indicates that the Vice President has any large or unique constituency of his own, independent of the President, although he is especially popular with our own loyalists.

The following is a list of the priority states ranked by my judgment of their importance for Presidential visits, along with the specific areas the voting data indicates which would be most affected by a personal appearance. Some suggested subjects and issues for emphasis in those areas are also included.

New York  
Suburban New York City  
particularly Nassau, Suffolk  
and Queens

This would be an ideal place to kick off the campaign and to set the theme for the campaign. We should use Rockefeller, Buckley and Javits at the initial appearance and emphasize a broad appeal. New York is the media center of the country and visits to these areas would cover key portions of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey, all priority states.

California

Both Waves I and II data indicate that attitudes toward the President are more deeply set in California than in other states. Therefore, Presidential visits may have less impact than in other states. This is particularly true of campaign visits and any visits by the President should be Presidential in nature.

The key to California appears to be organization and making sure we get every possible Nixon vote. This means some visits to our own supporters for reinforcement by the Vice President and First Family may be useful.

Los Angeles

Los Angeles does not have as high ticket-splitting but it is simply the largest area. The economy is key, both jobs and inflation.

San Francisco  
(San Mateo and Marin  
Counties) Sacramento

The ticket-splitting rate is high and there is a large undecided vote. Persuasive visits would have most effect and Vietnam and environment are very important.

San Diego

This is a strong Republican area where we are not running as well as we should. It is a perfect place for a speech on national defense and why a strong national defense is the best means to peace.

Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia

The ticket-splitting rate is not as high as Pittsburgh but we need to do better in the City of Philadelphia. Some joint appearances with Rizzo and with Spector (in Jewish areas) should be made. Jobs, crime and drugs are all important but we should be careful of the crime issue as we are now getting 20% of blacks and need to keep them. Unemployment and jobs are also very important and would appeal to both blacks and whites.

The President should visit this area himself.

Pittsburgh

The entire southwestern portion of Pennsylvania has been key to Republican victory in this state. Allegheny County is the media center of this area. Taxes, crime, drugs and the environment are all of particular interest although the tax issue probably has the broadest appeal to the entire region.

I also think the President should visit Pittsburgh himself.

Harrisburg

The Vice President or First Family needs to visit Harrisburg. It is the capitol and Shapp is very unpopular largely due to tax increases. Drugs are the most important issue.

Wilkes Barre

While I realize the President was there, Shapp is now attacking the President and the federal government regularly on delivery of flood relief services. This is a good place to send the Vice President on a red-tape cutting mission.

New Jersey

No New Jersey media center covers this state with the coverage coming from New York and Philadelphia. Issues should be taxes and inflation.

New Jersey needs to be visited by the Vice President and First Family to enthuse our organization. Presidential visits to New York and Philadelphia will cover large portions of the state through the media; however, a Presidential visit might flatter local citizens.

Illinois

Chicago suburbs, particularly in the western and northern Cook County, DuPage and Lake County.

Taxes and inflation are the most important issues but we should be very careful of the tax issue in light of Ogilvie's low approval rating and his probable large loss. Ogilvie's problems stem largely from a tax increase.

Percy is running very well with young voters and blacks in Chicago areas. This is an ideal spot for a youth appeal with Percy.

There is no need for the President to go downstate.

Ohio

Cleveland, western city wards, eastern suburbs -- Lake and Geauga Counties. Akron/Canton area.

Jobs will have strong appeal throughout the industrialized northeast part of Ohio, and appeal to both white and black working voters. Government spending, taxes, and revenue sharing will tie directly to current financial problems in Cleveland and with Mayor Perk's main problem.

Both Akron and Canton have popular and effective Republican mayors (John Ballard-Akron and Stanley Cmich-Canton). Revenue sharing is a good subject.

Cincinnati/Columbus

These are strong Republican areas with low ticket-splitting. Visits should be made by the Vice President and First Family. Preston Wolfe of the Columbus Dispatch is a good friend of ours and Columbus has new Republican mayor (Tom Moody).

Toledo Area

Toledo has high ticket-splitting, and the Toledo media dominates the entire northwestern portion of the state. Crime and environment are particularly important issues. Support of Toledo Blade is very important for entire area and the President should spend some time with Paul Block (publisher who is personally very interested in the environment). President could easily do Cleveland and Toledo in the same trip.

Dayton Area

This is a large area with high ticket-splitting. Jobs, as tied to national defense would be good issue as there is considerable apprehension of the future of Wright-Patterson and jobs is the number one issue in the area. The newspapers are both liberal and Democratic.

Texas  
Houston

Houston is a large area with the highest ticket-splitting in the state. The entire Gulf Coast has relatively high ticket-splitting, particularly Corpus Christi. Important problems in Harris County are drugs and inflation, and Harris County is quite similar to the state as a whole. National defense is particularly important in the Beaumont/Port Arthur area.

✓ The President should go to Houston.

Dallas

Dallas has lower ticket-splitting but there is still a large concentration of voters. Crime and drugs are important issues and probably could be handled by the Vice President.

Midland/Odessa/Lubbock  
(West Central Texas)

These are relatively high ticket-splitting areas and should be visited by someone but not necessarily the President. Taxes and national defense are important issues.

Amarillo

This area has high ticket-splitting but does not have a particularly large concentration of voters. There are a great number of older voters, particularly concerned with health care. Mrs. Nixon could handle this area and subject matter very well.

Michigan  
Detroit suburbs, particularly western Wayne and Macomb Counties.

The President should visit both western Wayne County and Oakland County emphasizing jobs and the revitalization of the economy. Taxes is an important issue, however, there is a property tax relief proposal on the ballot in November sponsored by Governor Milliken. Governor Milliken is very popular in the City of Detroit.

Bussing might be best handled by Attorney General Kleindeinst or the Vice President to discuss intervention in bussing law suit. Bussing visit should be to western Wayne or Macomb counties.

Flint/Saginaw/Bay City

This area has high ticket-splitting and the media here also covers the populous thumb area (Saginaw/Bay City). Taxes, and particularly property taxes for education is by far the most important issue. This area has always been very receptive to campaigns oriented to inflation and taxes.

Grand Rapids

Grand Rapids is a large area with moderate ticket-splitting, and we are not doing quite as well as we should. Appearances here could be handled well by the Vice President or the First Family. The President's Welfare Reform proposals would be popular.

Note:

Environmental concern about the Great Lakes is important here and throughout Michigan.

Maryland  
Baltimore County

Personal safety and drugs are by far the most important issues.

Montgomery County

This is a high ticket-splitting area and deserves some independent attention. It might be useful to use one of the surrogates from outside Washington along with First Family.

Connecticut  
Hartford & Fairfield  
Counties

These counties have the most people and the highest ticket-splitting. Jobs and unemployment particularly in the Hartford area are important. Personal safety and drugs have special concern in Fairfield County. It is probably useful to give Connecticut, particularly New York suburbs some independent attention by First Family from New York City.

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

August 2, 1972

DETERMINED TO BE AN  
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

E.O. 12065, Section 6-102  
By OMP NARS, Date 6-17-80

MEMORANDUM FOR:

MR. H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

ROBERT M. TEETER *Rmt*

SUBJECT:

Scheduling

As requested this is a supplemental memo summarizing my recommendations for the scheduling of the President, Vice President, and First Family.

I think the purpose of each appearance by the President, with the possible exception of the very last few days of the campaign should be exclusively to persuade people to vote for him who are not now committed to do so. Appearances by the First Family and Vice President should be both to gain Nixon supporters and to reinforce our current supporters.

Assuming this purpose, the President should go exclusively to the large, close states and to those specific areas where the greatest number of ticket-splitters are located. We have done a ticket-splitting analysis by county of each of the priority states and by ward/township for the metropolitan areas within each of these states. This data, along with the total vote for each area and Republican strength data has been displayed on maps and is available from Dan Evans in my office. Dwight Chapin and Dave Parker have been working with Evans on this data.

This ticket-splitter information should be, however, interpreted along with total vote data. For example, given one area with 500,000 total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 20% and another area of a million total votes and a ticket-splitting rate of 10%, I would go to the million vote area even though they theoretically have the same number of ticket-splitters. The large area simply has more voters who can be affected by a Presidential visit. The total number of votes we can potentially affect should be the final determinate.

In my judgment this data, not the polls, should govern our selection of sites for Presidential appearances. Polling data then can be of some guidance in determining the subject matter, particularly for the Vice President and First Family. While choice of subject matter may be important in some Presidential visits, most of the visits will be in fact national events and should be considered national appeals to a major degree even though they should have a local appeal.

The Presidential appearances should be used primarily to articulate the basic theme of the campaign, to tie that basic theme to specific issues important in that area, and to explain how administration policies and programs are designed to help solve the problems of that area. I do not think we have been as successful as we might be in communicating the fact that the purpose of the President's policies and programs is to improve the lives of individual citizens and not to improve the situations of various special interest groups and institutions. Members of the First Family can be particularly effective in doing this.

For example, Mrs. Nixon and one of the girls could be very effective in explaining to a group of suburban parents how the President's program to stop the importation of drugs from Turkey and France is designed to lessen the availability of drugs for their children or to explain that the reason why the President is pressing Congress to hold down spending is because many individual families simply cannot afford increased taxes. Also, while the President will undoubtedly have a number of large rallies and motorcades and I think it will be important that he make some appearances which are covered by television that are low keyed and allow him to talk to average citizens, showing his concern for their problems. In these appearances, it would be helpful if he could explain how he thinks we should go about solving these problems.

It is difficult for me to recommend specific types of appearances for the First Family as I do not know what events might be available nor do I know what they do particularly well. Obviously they can be used to cover places the President will miss and to generate enthusiasm among our workers. I also think that they can be particularly effective in communicating the concern and compassion of the President for the American people. They could also be effective in communicating the President's concern and programs in areas of special interest to the various voting blocs -- particularly women, young voters, senior citizens, -- and to those with interest in specific subject areas, -- health, the environment, retarded children, etc.

Regarding the Vice President, I believe that as long as we continue to maintain a substantial lead he should be used primarily to reinforce our voters and to say complimentary things about the President that he cannot say himself. As long as we maintain our

lead and in light of the Eagleton fiasco, we should keep him on positive issues and use him to attack the Democratic ticket only if it is absolutely necessary. As long as the McGovern campaign continues to have problems and the press produces negative comment, we ought to seize the opportunity to make the Vice President a statesman. This would, it seems to me, take away one of the Democrats major points of attack. None of our data indicates that the Vice President has any large or unique constituency of his own, independent of the President, although he is especially popular with our own loyalists.

The following is a list of the priority states ranked by my judgment of their importance for Presidential visits, along with the specific areas the voting data indicates which would be most affected by a personal appearance. Some suggested subjects and issues for emphasis in those areas are also included.

New York

Suburban New York City particularly Nassau, Suffolk and Queens

This would be an ideal place to kick off the campaign and to set the theme for the campaign. We should use Rockefeller, Buckley and Javits at the initial appearance and emphasize a broad appeal. New York is the media center of the country and visits to these areas would cover key portions of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey, all priority states.

California

Both Waves I and II data indicate that attitudes toward the President are more deeply set in California than in other states. Therefore, Presidential visits may have less impact than in other states. This is particularly true of campaign visits and any visits by the President should be Presidential in nature.

The key to California appears to be organization and making sure we get every possible Nixon vote. This means some visits to our own supporters for reinforcement by the Vice President and First Family may be useful.

Los Angeles

Los Angeles does not have as high ticket-splitting but it is simply the largest area. The economy is key, both jobs and inflation.

San Francisco  
(San Mateo and Marin  
Counties) Sacramento

The ticket-splitting rate is high and there is a large undecided vote. Persuasive visits would have most effect and Vietnam and environment are very important.

San Diego

This is a strong Republican area where we are not running as well as we should. It is a perfect place for a speech on national defense and why a strong national defense is the best means to peace.

Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia

The ticket-splitting rate is not as high as Pittsburgh but we need to do better in the City of Philadelphia. Some joint appearances with Rizzo and with Spector (in Jewish areas) should be made. Jobs, crime and drugs are all important but we should be careful of the crime issue as we are now getting 20% of blacks and need to keep them. Unemployment and jobs are also very important and would appeal to both blacks and whites.

The President should visit this area himself.

Pittsburgh

The entire southwestern portion of Pennsylvania has been key to Republican victory in this state. Allegheny County is the media center of this area. Taxes, crime, drugs and the environment are all of particular interest although the tax issue probably has the broadest appeal to the entire region.

I also think the President should visit Pittsburgh himself.

Harrisburg

The Vice President or First Family needs to visit Harrisburg. It is the capitol and Shapp is very unpopular largely due to tax increases. Drugs are the most important issue.

Wilkes Barre

While I realize the President was there, Shapp is now attacking the President and the federal government regularly on delivery of flood relief services. This is a good place to send the Vice President on a red-tape cutting mission.

New Jersey

No New Jersey media center covers this state with the coverage coming from New York and Philadelphia. Issues should be taxes and inflation.

New Jersey needs to be visited by the Vice President and First Family to enthuse our organization. Presidential visits to New York and Philadelphia will cover large portions of the state through the media; however, a Presidential visit might flatter local citizens.

Illinois

Chicago suburbs, particularly in the western and northern Cook County, DuPage and Lake County.

Taxes and inflation are the most important issues but we should be very careful of the tax issue in light of Ogilvie's low approval rating and his probable large loss. Ogilvie's problems stem largely from a tax increase.

Percy is running very well with young voters and blacks in Chicago areas. This is an ideal spot for a youth appeal with Percy.

There is no need for the President to go downstate.

Ohio

Cleveland, western city wards, eastern suburbs -- Lake and Geauga Counties. Akron/Canton area.

Jobs will have strong appeal throughout the industrialized northeast part of Ohio, and appeal to both white and black working voters. Government spending, taxes, and revenue sharing will tie directly to current financial problems in Cleveland and with Mayor Perk's main problem.

Both Akron and Canton have popular and effective Republican mayors (John Ballard-Akron and Stanley Cmich-Canton). Revenue sharing is a good subject.

Cincinnati/Columbus

These are strong Republican areas with low ticket-splitting. Visits should be made by the Vice President and First Family. Preston Wolfe of the Columbus Dispatch is a good friend of ours and Columbus has new Republican mayor (Tom Moody).

Toledo Area

Toledo has high ticket-splitting, and the Toledo media dominates the entire northwestern portion of the state. Crime and environment are particularly important issues. Support of Toledo Blade is very important for entire area and the President should spend some time with Paul Block (publisher who is personally very interested in the environment). President could easily do Cleveland and Toledo in the same trip.

Dayton Area

This is a large area with high ticket-splitting. Jobs, as tied to national defense would be good issue as there is considerable apprehension of the future of Wright-Patterson and jobs is the number one issue in the area. The newspapers are both liberal and Democratic.

Texas  
Houston

Houston is a large area with the highest ticket-splitting in the state. The entire Gulf Coast has relatively high ticket-splitting, particularly Corpus Christi. Important problems in Harris County are drugs and inflation, and Harris County is quite similar to the state as a whole. National defense is particularly important in the Beaumont/Port Arthur area.

The President should go to Houston.

Dallas

Dallas has lower ticket-splitting but there is still a large concentration of voters. Crime and drugs are important issues and probably could be handled by the Vice President.

Midland/Odessa/Lubbock  
(West Central Texas)

These are relatively high ticket-splitting areas and should be visited by someone but not necessarily the President. Taxes and national defense are important issues.

Amarillo

This area has high ticket-splitting but does not have a particularly large concentration of voters. There are a great number of older voters, particularly concerned with health care. Mrs. Nixon could handle this area and subject matter very well.

Michigan  
Detroit suburbs, particularly western Wayne and Macomb Counties.

The President should visit both western Wayne County and Oakland County emphasizing jobs and the revitalization of the economy. Taxes is an important issue, however, there is a property tax relief proposal on the ballot in November sponsored by Governor Milliken. Governor Milliken is very popular in the City of Detroit.

Bussing might be best handled by Attorney General Kleindeinst or the Vice President to discuss intervention in bussing law suit. Bussing visit should be to western Wayne or Macomb counties.

Flint/Saginaw/Bay City

This area has high ticket-splitting and the media here also covers the populous thumb area (Saginaw/Bay City). Taxes, and particularly property taxes for education is by far the most important issue. This area has always been very receptive to campaigns oriented to inflation and taxes.

Grand Rapids

Grand Rapids is a large area with moderate ticket-splitting, and we are not doing quite as well as we should. Appearances here could be handled well by the Vice President or the First Family. The President's Welfare Reform proposals would be popular.

Note:

Environmental concern about the Great Lakes is important here and throughout Michigan.

Maryland  
Baltimore County

Personal safety and drugs are by far the most important issues.

Montgomery County

This is a high ticket-splitting area and deserves some independent attention. It might be useful to use one of the surrogates from outside Washington along with First Family.

Connecticut  
Hartford & Fairfield  
Counties

These counties have the most people and the highest ticket-splitting. Jobs and unemployment particularly in the Hartford area are important. Personal safety and drugs have special concern in Fairfield County. It is probably useful to give Connecticut, particularly New York suburbs some independent attention by First Family from New York City.

CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

August 1, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR:

LARRY HIGBY

FROM:

GORDON STRACHAN

SUBJECT:

McGovern's Pollster

*MS  
Tell Bob  
+ bank  
G No priority  
need the  
other stuff  
much more  
2*

Discussion with Bob Teeter last night disclosed the following preliminary information regarding Pat Caddell, McGovern's pollster:

- 1) Pat Caddell owns his own polling company, a small outfit called Cambridge Research Group;
- 2) However, Cambridge Research Group uses a fairly standard list of Democratic supervisors to do the actual interviewing;
- 3) Caddell also works for Kelly, the candidate opposing Griffin in Michigan, so Teeter will have access to Caddell's questionnaire;
- 4) Teeter believes that Caddell also may be using Quayle for some of the interviewing;
- 5) Teeter doubts that Caddell uses as much open-ended questions as he claims in his press interviews;
- 6) He does not use as much "scaling" as we do;
- 7) Instead, many of the questions that Caddell uses are similar to the Harris Domestic Issue Poll of last September -- that is, one general question followed up by three or four specific;
- 8) Much of Caddell's interviewing is done by telephone because the massive samples (11,000) indicate that it would be impossible to pay for full field interviews;
- 9) Teeter will pursue the question of the type of polling Caddell does and will report to us in one week. He says there is almost no risk of him being discovered.