

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>
47	17	2/20/1973	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Mr. Haldeman. From: Robert H. Marik. RE: The future of the data base. 19pgs.
47	17	1/1/1973	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	1972 Composite election statistics and brief analysis. 23pgs.
47	17	2/9/1973	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	To: Mr. Haldeman. From: W. Richard Howard. RE: Action Plan for the Data Base. 23pgs.
47	17		<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Report	Data Base Index. 6pgs.

Committee for the Re-election of the President

DETERMINED TO BE AN
MEMORANDUM ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING February 20, 1973
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By RS NARS, Date 2-20-73

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HALDEMAN 
FROM: ROBERT H. MARIK
SUBJECT: The Future of the Data Base

SUMMARY

This memorandum describes the computerized list of registered voters and the associated software (together referred to as the Data Base) developed for the 1972 Presidential campaign. The utility of the Data Base in future political campaigns is discussed and some specific recommendations are presented. The purpose of this analysis is to present a complete technical description of the Data Base, as one element necessary in determining what kind of organization should be established to control the system over the next four years.

DISCUSSION

Description of the Data Base

The Data Base that is presently housed in our data center in Dallas has more than \$1,000,000 invested in list development, socio-economic characteristics, algorithms, software and technical know-how. It consists of a computerized listing of nearly 22 million households (almost 30 million registered voters) in nine large states (Tab A). Additional elements of the system are listed in Tab B. It now has the capacity for the following:

- Produce computerized lists of registered voters for canvassing and get-out-the-vote, by precinct, and in alphabetical or street address sequence.
- Record voter responses from canvassing on the master file (i.e., those voters who are for, against or undecided toward the candidate).

For specialized mailings:

- Select out surnames indicating ethnic origin: Spanish, Polish, Jewish, Irish, Italian.
- Estimate the age and income level of each household listed.
- Identify the Census tract, and therefore the general demographic characteristics, of each household.

A detailed discussion of the Data Base is given in Tab C, taken from the final report of the Direct Mail Division.

Applications for the Future

The Data Base should be considered as far more than a mailing list. It can be the central part of a total campaign strategy. It provides the vehicle for voter identification through telephone or door-to-door canvassing. It allows for specific direct mail appeals to carefully segmented groups of voters. It can be used to produce final lists of favorable voters for Election Day activities. It can provide lists especially tailored for fund raising, volunteer recruitment, or other campaign functions.

It is rarely possible for local or even statewide candidates to effect such a sophisticated voter contact operation. However, with the data base already in existence and the associated computer software already developed, the President could offer a pre-packaged program to local candidates, which could increase their vote by as much as 5% to 10%.

However, in 1976, the Republican Presidential candidate will not have the uninterrupted lead time to prepare a new data base, as was possible in 1972. Therefore, it is important that the data base now in existence be kept updated so that the President will have the option to make it available in 1976. The problem is that every address list will become obsolete at the rate of 5% per year. If left alone for four years, the present list would have little value. The objective, then, is to keep the list updated for 1976, and in the process to get maximum use out of it in 1974.

Strategy for 1974

It is recommended that the Data Base be one element in a concerted national effort to maximize the Republican 1974 Congressional races. Other elements would include candidate selection, financial assistance, professional consultants, etc.

CONFIDENTIAL

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By _____ Date _____

- 3 -

The first step must be to select the target Congressional Districts. The discussion which follows does offer a selection criterion, primarily to illustrate the methods applied to develop cost estimates for use of the Data Base in the 1974 campaigns. It is anticipated that the final selection will be somewhat different, taking into account survey results, field evaluation of the races, retirement of incumbents, availability of attractive challengers, etc.

Manyon Millican has prepared an analysis of the Congressional and Gubernatorial races for 1974 (Tab D). He identifies 116 "marginal" seats. Of those seats, the winner in 1972 received 56% or less of the vote in 68 cases (39 Republican and 29 Democrat). Those have been taken as the target districts in this analysis. It will be important to strengthen the marginal Republican incumbents, because they are particularly vulnerable in the mid-term election during a Republican Administration. Twenty-six of the 39 are freshmen. Of the 29 Democrats, 11 were elected for the first time in 1972.

In Tab E, the status of Gubernatorial and Senatorial races in 1974 is summarized by state, along with the marginal house races, as defined above. Some marginal Senate races are indicated, where availability of the Data Base might make a significant difference for the Republican candidate.

In Tab F, the data processing cost to update the existing Data Base, or expand it to cover new target districts or states, is given in detail. The financial analysis extends into 1976, covering the final updating of the original Data Base for the Presidential campaign.

Operation of the Data Base for the Next Four Years

Several decisions must be made on how the Data Base will be handled in the future. The organizational structure must be determined in the light of potential legal restrictions, public relations, political considerations and finances. Several alternatives have been raised, including:

- Establish an independent trust or corporation, accountable to the interests of the President, which would make the Data Base available to selected candidates, possibly through the RNC, or directly.
- Transfer the Data Base to the RNC, with the assurance that it will remain under the control of a competent general manager.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

It is beyond the scope of this memo to recommend which form is most appropriate. It is important, however, to understand that the computer programs and voter lists are only useful when managed by someone who is thoroughly familiar with the system. There should be continuity and a high degree of professional competence in the position of General Manager.

Three people now have the experience to perform that job. L. Robert Morgan was the manager of the direct mail operation during the campaign. Bob has returned to the Reuben H. Donnelley Corporation in Chicago, but can be available for occasional consulting on the Data Base. Dr. Thomas Slivinski helped to design the Data Base, and assisted and managed all phases of its application and development. Tom is experienced in computer systems, but he is seeking more diversified experience within the Administration. He is expected to be in the Washington area, and available for consultation, subject to any limitations by Civil Service regulations. James White was a project manager on the political direct mail staff, and as such was the trouble-shooter in the systems area. His background includes both marketing and systems experience. Jim is recommended for the position of General Manager.

Tab G shows projected operating costs for the project over the next four years, including staff and administrative overhead. No operating revenue is included. The assumptions are as follows:

- Any lists or mailing labels provided for candidates are billed at net cost (no margin to cover G & A or development costs). This policy would encourage candidates to use the system and improve their own campaigns. On the other hand, a somewhat higher price would obviously reduce the operating deficit.
- No revenue from commercial sales is shown. Jim White believes that up to \$40,000 in revenue could be realized in 1973 from sales of mailing labels to charitable fund drives and similar organizations. The volume of such sales would be expected to increase in subsequent years. The margin on commercial sales is estimated to be 50% of the selling price. It should be the objective of the General Manager to develop a significant volume of commercial sales; however, until the concept is proven, no reduction in the operating deficit is projected.
- The major functions of the General Manager, beyond providing labels to candidates and commercial accounts, will be to upgrade the system, expand the lists to include additional states and Congressional districts, and manage they are updated.

CONFIDENTIAL

By _____ NARS, Date _____

- 5 -

and find ways of sharply reducing the cost of processing the data and producing mailing labels or lists. New computer hardware will become available in the next few years, allowing some data processing operations to be done far less expensively than is now the case. The research and computer programming costs shown in Tab G are partly intended to achieve cost reductions in the final product.

- All of the marginal Congressional Districts, as well as several marginal Senate races, have been covered by the activity reflected in Tab F. If it were desired to keep the net deficit to a smaller amount, certain districts could be added to the Data Base only after adequate revenue were generated from commercial accounts to cover the list expansion costs.

It can be seen in Tab G that the "severest projected cost", assuming no off-setting revenue, to maintain and update the existing Data Base for four years is \$806,000. The additional cost to expand the Data Base for target races in 1974 is \$270,000. The \$211,000 shown for list maintenance in 1976 can only be a rough estimate. Computer technology and electoral procedures may by then render obsolete the methods of 1972. There is some speculation that more states will follow the example of California and make current voter lists on computer tape available to campaign organizations at a moderate cost. The pressures in Congress to liberalize registration procedures may take the voter lists out of the hands of the township clerks and county courthouses, to a higher level of government. Such centralization could facilitate list-gathering at lower cost and with shorter lead times. For all of those reasons, it is recommended that list updating be postponed until 1976, in every area where the system will not be used in 1974. Whatever the situation in 1976, the computer software in the Data Base will assure that the data on registered voters can be used to the greatest possible benefit of the 1976 Republican Presidential candidate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That you approve the concept of preserving and updating the Data Base for use in 1974 and 1976. (The particular structure in which it will be housed is yet to be decided.)

APPROVE

DISAPPROVE

COMMENTS

DETERMINED TO
ADMINISTRATIVE
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By NARS, Date 10/11/73

CONFIDENTIAL

- 6 -

That you approve the appointment of Jim White as General Manager of the Data Base.

APPROVE _____ DISAPPROVE _____ COMMENT _____

That you approve the general operating plan described in this memo, with the understanding that the specific states and Congressional Districts to be used in 1974 can be decided at a later date (but preferably not later than November, 1973).

APPROVE _____ DISAPPROVE _____ COMMENT _____

Attachments:

TAB A
TAB B
TAB C
TAB D
TAB E
TAB F
TAB G

cc: The Honorable John N. Mitchell
Jeb S. Magruder

CONTENTS OF THE DATA BASE

<u>STATE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF VOTING HOUSEHOLDS</u>	<u>NUMBER OF REGISTERED VOTERS</u>
California	6,020,000	8,626,400
Connecticut	906,000	1,373,500
Illinois	1,787,000	1,682,300
Maryland	775,000	1,349,100
Michigan	1,798,000	1,688,600
New Jersey	2,131,200	3,196,200
Ohio	2,352,600	3,381,500
Pennsylvania	3,609,400	5,157,100
Texas	2,605,500	3,970,300
Total	21,984,700	30,425,000

ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS IN THE DATA BASE

OR AVAILABLE FROM THE CAMPAIGN

Partial lists of registered Republican voters:

Florida - 350,000 voters from ten counties

Massachusetts - 13,000 key Republicans

New Hampshire - 80,000 households (total state)

New York - 350,000 voters from 5 counties

Lists potentially available from the 1972 campaign:

Telephone program key leaders lists (2,400 names)

Telephone centers' volunteer lists (55,000 names)

State Chairmen's volunteer lists (130,000 names)

Finance Committee contributor lists (800,000 names)

Democrats for Nixon volunteer lists (2,000 names)

LIST DEVELOPMENT

DATA BASE DEVELOPMENT

The Voter Registration Data Base was established in two phases. During the first phase individual vendors were contracted to collect the voter registration lists of specific states and to computerize this information into a standard format specified by the Committee. Standard edit programs were supplied to each vendor to validate the data. In the second phase, at University Computing Company in Dallas, the base voter registration data was expanded with specific demographic information added. This section discusses the establishment of the Voter Registration Data Base.

DATA BASE ORGANIZATION

The Voter Registration Data Base was organized as sequential data sets on magnetic tape.

The basic processing entity was a county within a state. With several minor exceptions, the entire county was processed at one time. Counties were placed on separate reels of tape and were never combined. If two parts of the same county were processed separately, different county codes were assigned.

The concept of stand alone county processing was sound. The only problem arose when zip codes crossed county boundaries. In these cases, the match codes used for adding phone numbers and other data were not valid.

Within the county, each voter was supplied a unique sequence number. This number, together with the state and county codes uniquely identified the voter in the entire data base.

Members of the same family (with the same surname) who live at the same address and who belong to the same party, were combined into households. Up to four members of a household were planned for. Each member of a household was given a unique sequence member number.

In any future design, households should be defined independent of political party registration. The party affiliation should be included for each member, but all members of the household with the same surname should be combined.

Within a household, the male head of household was shown first, followed by wife and any other members. If a residence contained individuals with different surnames, these individuals were listed as separate households (the address most likely being an apartment).

The sequence numbers were assigned to voters in address sequence for mailing (i.e., by zip code and street address within zip code). Labels or other mailings could be generated for a county without a major sort of the data.

Householding in non-city delivery service areas should be limited to those individuals who can be positively identified as belonging to the same household. Very often in small towns or rural areas, several families with the same surname will live on the same rural route or receive their mail through the same general delivery post office. These individuals cannot be arbitrarily combined into households.

If supplements were required for a county, the sequence numbers for these additions began at 5,000,000. This eliminated the possibility that voters would be multiply updated.

The Voter Registration Data Base and other name lists were combined through the use of match codes. These codes are extracted from key parts of the name and address.

The match code for City Delivery Service Areas (Type 1 addresses) was: state, county, zip, last four characters of house number, first character of street name and first, third and fourth characters of surname. John Smith who lived at 1121 Elm Street, Chicago, Illinois 61610 was coded: 1L031616101121ESIT.

The match code for other type addresses was state, county, zip and first, third and fourth characters of last name. This did not always produce a valid match. Names such as DAVIS, DAVIDSON, DEVITT in the same zip code were considered equivalent.

A new match code for non-street type addresses needs to be defined. One potential code would be state, county, zip, first character of owner name and the first seven characters of the last name.

AVAILABILITY OF VOTER LISTS

In general, lists of registered voters are available from county or local registrars across the country. These lists are normally available to any candidate. Two exceptions should be noted: (a) some states or counties do not require registration; and (b) citizens vote on their personal cognizance. Also, the voter lists may be available only through political sub-divisions within the county, e.g., Michigan, where each township maintains the voting list.

The voting lists normally include name, address and party affiliation (if voters register by party). In some states (such as New Jersey and Ohio) only those voters who participate in the primary elections have party designation. In other states, there is not attempt at the county level to record party; Republican and Democratic voter lists are kept separate by the county organizations.

In determining the availability of voter lists, a primary consideration is

access to computerized voter lists. Because the cost of keypunching or optically scanning hardcopy lists is approximately 4-6 times as much as reformatting a computer tape, it is cost-efficient to obtain voter registration on magnetic tape.

The Table at TAB 14 lists all counties by state which were included in the Voter Registration Data Base. If a computerized source tape was available, the table lists the office or individual which supplied the tape.

The availability of computerized voter lists does not preclude massive conversions or data additions. Many tapes do not include zip codes for example. Others contain only one name for each household. It is not sufficient that the voter lists be computerized, but must be standardized and most often enriched.

Another critical factor in the availability of voter registration data is the date that the lists were prepared. This is critical for two reasons. First, on a national average, 20% of the population moves each year. Data which is not current decreases in value accordingly. Second, redistricting can occur between the time that the list is produced and the present election. This was an especially critical problem in the 1972 Election since many areas were under court order to reapportion the population based on the 1970 census. Therefore, it is very important to know the date of the voter registration data used.

REGISTERED VOTER LISTS VERSUS OTHER LISTS

Many direct mail corporations maintain separate lists which may be used for mailings. The Reuben H. Donnelley list is probably the most complete in coverage. This was the list used by the Committee in Michigan and Wisconsin. Experience in Michigan indicates that there are three major problems with use of such lists.

1. They do not include any political information (such as precinct). As a result, such data must be coded into the file by the canvassers.
2. They do not include county designation. Because zip codes cross county boundaries, many individual voters were placed in the wrong county.
3. One name is normally shown in each household, the male in whose name both the phone and auto are registered. Younger people and wives are not usually shown.

Specialized lists can and should be used both for individual mailings, as well as part of the overall data base.

Specific lists used in this Campaign were:

1. Farmers list owned by National Farm Journal
2. Youth list assembled by Committee's Youth Group

Potential lists which should have application:

1. Subscription lists to conservative publications such as National Review
2. Contributor lists compiled from GAO and state reports filed by Republican candidates
3. Past Nixon-Agnew volunteer lists

VOTER LIST CONVERSION

The most unique feature of the effort has been the standardization of the data base format and contents. In California, for example, where we computerized thirty-one counties all maintained their lists in different formats. Thus, unique programs were written for each county to produce walking lists, labels or other output. By standardizing the data format and contracting with individual vendors to convert the data into this single format, maximum flexibility was achieved in the use of these lists while minimizing the overall costs.

Each vendor was required to collect the voter registration lists for certain states or parts of states. Where the lists were not readily available (particularly where there was a reluctance to release computerized lists) outside Committee pressure was brought to bear.

Having obtained the data, each vendor was required to convert it to the standard format as shown in TAB 2. If the data was already on magnetic tape, this involved an analysis of the source tape codes and formats, then the writing of unique programs to convert the tape. Where the source data was in hard copy for written lists it was either keypunched or optically scanned. Each vendor wrote his own conversion software.

One of the most severe problems was the very poor quality of the source tapes available from the individual counties. In particular, these tapes often followed no real rules at all in their coding of address, name and political precinct.

Some county tapes contained no zip codes and required manual zip coding.

Address were often jumbled and streets misspelled and inconsistently coded.

Apartment numbers were inconsistent, e.g., 111 Elm St. A -- All Elmst, and Apt A 111 Elm St, all on the same file.

The same name appeared three, four or more times on the county voter lists.

Precinct codes were non-uniform. This was a great problem in California. Because voters must be grouped together by precinct for walking or phoning, it is imperative that the unique code for each precinct be determined. In California, numerous code combinations were used, most incorrect. This cost much time and extra expense in the generation of the lists.

Sex and title codes were incorrect. In Harris County, Texas, all titles were either blank or Mr. (including females).

The quality of the hard copy lists varied. Most were typed and could be easily converted. The major problems arose when they were handwritten as shown in TAB 15. Problems normally arose in zip coding the lists (many included no zip code) and in assigning meaningful codes to the political sub-divisions (precincts, wards, townships, etc.).

VENDOR APPRAISAL

Seven different vendors were used to collect and convert the data. These were as follows:

	<u>RATING</u>
1. CompuGraphics, Cleveland, Ohio (Ohio)	Unacceptable
2. C. Howard Wilson Company Van Nuys, California (California, part of Maryland, part of Texas)	Very Poor
3. Premier Printing and Mailing Houston, Texas (Harris County, Texas)	Unacceptable
4. Ed Nichols Associates Kensington, Maryland (Pennsylvania, part of Maryland, part of Texas)	Good
5. A.R.A.P. Princeton, New Jersey (New Jersey)	Satisfactory
6. Cambridge Opinion Studies, Inc. New York, New York (Connecticut)	Satisfactory
7. Cohasset Associates Chicago, Illinois (Illinois)	Satisfactory

The performance of each vendor is appraised:

CompuGraphics is headed by Terry McCarthy and has close ties with the Cuyahoga County Republican organization through William Bennett. This firm maintains the Cuyahoga County Voter Lists. This firm performed very poorly and should not be considered for any future business. They underestimated the jobs and did not have the technical management talent to accomplish the tasks. One of the Committee's staff was sent to Cleveland to direct the project.

C..Howard Wilson Company is headed by C. Howard Wilson. This company also did a very poor job. Data was in many cases 30 or more days late. Failure to check outputs for correct precinct structure in California caused numerous re-runs, cost the Committee more than \$10,000 and delayed delivery of a usable product more than four weeks in some areas. Technical management was poor. Mr. Wilson left the project to attend to other business. Numerous counties had to be removed from Wilson and given to other vendors because of his poor performance. One of the Committee's staff was sent to California to direct the project.

Although Premier Printing and Mailing had responsibility for only one county, Harris County, they were unable to perform the job and the county was sent to another vendor for conversion. This firm is operating in the dark ages of automation and should not be considered for any work of this type.

Ed Nichols Associates is headed by Edward Nichols and performed creditably for the Committee. Most of the work which was taken from other vendors was sent to Nichols. As the volume of work increased, the quality of the output went down. Nichols was not sufficiently staffed to handle the greater volumes. Second, Nichols made certain promises to Pennsylvania Republicans to allow them access to the data in exchange for their cooperation in obtaining the source data. This was done without Committee approval and against his specific instructions.

A.R.A.P. converted the data for New Jersey and wrote the Committee's edit programs. They subcontracted all programming and computer work to Automated Data Research (ADR), also of Princeton. The A.R.A.P. group was headed by Evan Gray and the ADR programmer was Robert Wickendon. Because A.R.A.P. subcontracted all programming, it is difficult to assess that aspect. However, the technical management at A.R.A.P. was not good. Wickendon was the only person who understood their software. After the last shipment, Wickendon left for a prolonged vacation and no one was available for more than two weeks to correct several problems that developed in their last shipment.

Cambridge Opinion Studies converted voter data for Connecticut. The project was headed by Richard Hochhauser. All the work was from hard copy source data. A major error was made in the position of the telephone number, which caused only the first six digits to be shown on manuscripts. Cambridge regenerated these lists for each one affected.

Cohasset Associates is headed by Bob Williams. All work was done on a subcontract basis. Work was delivered on time. The only complaint is that Williams does not stand behind his work. When errors were detected in precincting the data, causing a re-run, Williams originally agreed to cover the cost of correcting the error and regenerating the manuscript. He later reneged on this agreement.

One other vendor was used during the primary -- Compass Systems of San Diego, California. Compass was contracted to convert California data for the primary election. Tom Hoefeller was Project Manager. The firm did a very poor job -- delivering data for only 20 of the 31 counties required.

In summary, no firm which converted voter registration data did an outstanding job. Some, such as CompuGraphics, Wilson and Premier, did extremely poor jobs and should not be used in the future. Others, such as Nichols, Cohasset, A.R.A.P. and Cambridge did average jobs. In choosing any firm, three criteria must be weighed: technical experience, sufficient manpower and political backing. The greatest single fault with all of the firms with which we dealt was lack of technical management and lack of sufficient resources to do the job. It appears that the companies with political experience in data processing are so small that they lack the means to do the job properly. Similarly, the larger firms, such as UCC, do not have the political experience to handle the jobs.

DATA EDIT AND STANDARDIZATION

A standard computer edit program was developed and supplied to each of the state vendors and to UCC. The purpose of this program was to validate the data in the original county files prior to submission to UCC. The edit was designed to be run as a final processing step by the state vendors after all data had been converted into the standard format. It was also to be run by UCC to validate that the correct data has been submitted by the state vendor. The edit program was designed to validate input data, not correct errors. Thus, it was designed to display real or potential problems for manual checking rather than attempting to correct them.

The edit routine consisted of the following:

1. A set of error-checking sub-routines

2. Two error listings
3. A fatal error listing of records containing errors which precluded further processing
4. A warning error listing of potential errors (such as an alphabetic character in the house number field)
5. Two audit reports: Zip City Audit (TAB 16) showing the number of households and voters for Republicans, Democrats, Independents and others by zip code and the Political Unit Audit (TAB 17) showing the number of households and voters for each precinct, ward and township or city -- summarized by county. Initially, a third audit report containing a statistical dump of the file was envisioned. This idea was dropped as impractical because of the large size of some counties.

The key to the edit routines was the geopolitical table. This set of cards was designed to show the permissible relationships between the Zip Code, Post Office name and the political sub-divisions (city/township, ward, district, precinct, state lower and upper house district and congressional district). This table was used to standardize Post Office name spelling and to insure that each voter was assigned to the correct precinct. If the information for a voter was not consistent, this record was rejected as a fatal error.

In general, the edit routine provided a very effective audit of the data. Each field was checked to ascertain correct placement of the data and the validity of characters with the field. Extensive checking was done on the "name" fields (given name, surname, and street name) in an effort to guard against misspellings. Character sequences were checked so that such things as four contiguous consonants, three contiguous vowels, or three contiguous identical letters produced warning messages. The A.R.A.P. specifications for the edit routine are included in TAB 18.

There were three basic problems with the edit programs:

1. First, and most important, while the programs displayed errors, each vendor was left to his own resources to develop programs and procedures to correct the errors. To the maximum extent possible, the edit program should automatically correct known errors. Standard software should be developed as part of the edit package to allow either single records or groups of records to be corrected and should operate on standard file format.
2. The geo-political table should be re-designed. Defined as it was, the political table was difficult to code. Since it was necessary to specify each precinct separately in order to use the precinct name field, the table

often grew unmanageably large. Because the edit routine would not run without the table, the majority of vendors generated the table from the county file itself which, of course, defeated the purpose of the validation table. Minimally, if such a table is used, the tables of precincts and zip codes should show the zip codes within a precinct and not vice versa.

3. More time must be given to develop the edit programs. The final edit specifications were developed in mid-June and the programs delivered to vendors in mid-July. This was not sufficient time to totally de-bug the programs or to test the applicability of the various complex routines. Numerous minor problems were found in the edits after they had been delivered to vendors. This delayed the acceptance of data. Minimally, two and one half months must be allowed to write the programs after the specifications are firm. Further, vendors should be given several weeks of experience with the edit routines prior to data submission.

In determining the specifications for future editing, special attention must be given to the street name field. The correct spelling and categorization of each street name is essential if effective door-to-door canvass lists are to be produced.

The street type (street, drive, road, etc.) should be separated from the rest of the street name in a separate field.

The key to developing good reliable addresses under the tight time constraints imposed by a political Campaign must be to use other address sources which have been compiled, checked and validated at a more leisurely pace. A common directory of street names within each zip code for each metropolitan area could be used to automatically correct spellings and to flag variances. Two good sources for this are the Address Coding Guide developed by Reuben H. Donnelley and the Universal Occupant Lists also developed by the direct mail companies.

Name redundancy should be eliminated. This can easily be done by sorting the files prior to editing and then checking for consecutive repeating names. Specific field edit recommendations are shown at TAB 19.

ALGORITHMS FOR EXTENDING DATA

Ethnic origin of names was determined by comparing the surname with a precompiled list of names and by matching the last set of characters in the name against a prescribed set of endings. Procedures were developed for Spanish, Polish, Jewish, Irish and Italian groupings. The exact lists and endings used for each ethnic group are shown in TAB 20.

The greatest potential problem in determining ethnic grouping from the surname is insuring that the ethnic groupings are exclusive, i.e., insuring that if

a surname is assigned to a specific ethnic group, that the individual does indeed belong to the group. This problem is most acute in determining Jewish surnames and in separating Irish from other Angle-Saxon names. (For example, the name Schwartz can be both Jewish and German and it is a mistake to arbitrarily assign this name to a Jewish group.)

The second potential problem with the use of surnames is the standardization of prefixes. Prefixes such as 'O', 'Di', or 'D' must be in standard positions in order that these names be properly assigned.

Telephone number, census tract, age groupings and income grouping were all appended to each voter record by combining the Voter Registration Data Base with selected data elements from the Reuben H. Donnelley Universal List.

A match code was extracted for each registered voter household. For Type 1 addresses this code consisted of Zip Code, county, state, last four characters of house number, first character of street name and first, third and fourth character of last name. For Type 2 and 3 addresses, this code was Zip Code, state, county, and first, third and fourth characters of last name. A similar match code was extracted from the R.H. Donnelley Universal List. See TAB 21.

These two sets of match codes were sorted into the same sequence and compared. Each time a match was found, the telephone number, census tract, dwelling size and FIND (Family Income Detector) code were extracted from the R.H. Donnelley Universal List and appended to the Voter Registration Data Base.

The match code technique is the only feasible means of combining two separately developed name lists. However, the actual match code used is variable and can be adjusted depending upon the accuracy required.

The match code for Type 1 addresses was valid.

The match code for Type 2 and 3 addresses was not valid. The code in these instances should be changed to include more characters in the surname.

The Reuben H. Donnelley Universal lists contained 1960 census tract codes. 1970 census tract data was added to each file using the Address Coding Guide supplied by R.H. Donnelley and comparing addresses between the two files. See TAB 22.

Peripheral Urban Ethnics (PUE) and black ghettos were determined by 1970 census tract data.

All individual voters who resided in ghettos census tracts and whose surnames indicated that the voter was not one of the specified ethnic groupings (Irish, Jewish, Spanish, Italian or Polish) was designated black.

All individual voters who resided in census tracts designated as PUE were so coded.

Because some voters had not matched the R.H. Donnelley Universal list and hence contained no census tract codes, it was necessary to extend black and PUE designations through entire precincts. This was accomplished on the following basis:

1. Counts were generated for each precinct showing the total number of households in the precinct, the number of households with census tract, and the number of households designated as black or PUE based upon a match of census tracts.

2. If more than 15% of the households in a precinct contained census tract matches and if more than 50% of all census tract households were designated black or PUE, then all households in the precinct were designated black or PUE. The exception were names which had previously been identified as one of the special ethnic groupings.

1972

COMPOSITE ELECTION

STATISTICS

and

BRIEF ANALYSIS

for

1974

Prepared by:
Manyon M. Milligan
January 1973

REPUBLICAN GAINS

Due to redistricting the 24 states of the East and Midwest lost a total of 9 districts and yet showed a net gain of 6 seats.

The 13 states of the South had an increase of only 2 districts, yet gained a total of 5 new seats.

The 13 Western states, with an increase of 7 new districts, only gained 2 new seats, truly disappointing in view of the fact that our gains in the 50's and 60's came where the population increased.

	<u>gained</u>	<u>Redistricting</u>	<u>Gain</u>	<u>Total</u>
West (13)		+7 new seats	+2R	42D - 34R
South (13)	gained	+2 new seats	+6R	84D - 37R
Midwest (12)	lost	-4 seats	+3R	51D - 70R
East (12)	lost	-5 seats	+3R	65D - 52R
			+13R	242D - 193R

Voting statistics substantiate that our gains to become a majority party should come from the South and the sunbelt of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and California in addition to our base in the Midwest.

In other words, we must continue our gains in the East and Midwest and continue our giant gains in the South and the West (?). However, the West failed to make the significant gains that statistics would indicate it should.

Our gains in the South were not what they should have been in this writer's opinion. At least an additional 12 seats should have been won from this area (there are 19 marginal Democrat districts alone from this area) excluding our gain of 6 new seats. (See Table V)

Of the 121 districts in the South, there are 84D to 37R seats with 29 of the 84 Democrat seats uncontested. Nine of these were in Texas, 6 in Louisiana, 5 in Georgia and 2 in Florida.

A significant statistic is that in 1960 the South had only 8 Republican congressmen and in 12 years they are at 37. Yet the total gains should be close to 60 had proper priorities been emphasized. A critic that would suggest this to be a valid argument is that in

the same period the South went from 2 Republican Senators to 10 of 26, a gain of 500%. However, while we were making good Senate gains in the South we were losing such Republican seats as Iowa (2), Maine (2), Montana (1), New Hampshire (1), North Dakota (1), South Dakota (1), Wyoming (1), Colorado (1) and Indiana (2) - a total loss of 12 seats.

WHY NO COATTAILS? NO ORGANIZATION

It is incredible with a 60% victory by the President that we lost 4 Senate seats plus failing to keep 2 seats that were previously Republican, not to mention the meager 12 seat gain in the House.

These losses in the Senate and poor gains in the House are primarily due to lack of organization at the precinct and county level in addition to poor candidate recruitment. The third ingredient, money, was adequate in a boon Republican year for fund-raising.

We will not gain control of the Congress until we muster a national, monolithic organizational approach at the congressional district level consisting of precinct organization plans of find 'em, register 'em, vote 'em, and count 'em, plus a well-coordinated national candidate recruitment drive (plus money, of course).

It is the major responsibility of a party (nationally) to cause the aforementioned to happen. If it is not done, then we as a party cannot exploit the President's "New Majority", thus not becoming the majority party nor winning the White House in 1976.

HOUSE AND SENATE RACES IN 1974

We need 26 new seats in the House and 8 new seats in the Senate to control both. The odds are stiff to accomplish either in the next 2 years due to incumbencies and/or retirements, and just numbers in the House. However, control of either is possible in 1976 if we do our homework in 1974.

18 Democrats and 15 Republicans are up in the Senate in 1974, with 4 possible Republican retirees and only 2 possible Democrat retirees and 5 of the 18 Democrats from the Deep South (and tough to beat). However, 5 to 8 Democrats could be beaten in 1974 and, if we maintained our strength, substantial gains could be made.

CONGRESSIONAL, SENATORIAL AND GOVERNOR TALLY

* Up in 1974
* Up in 1973
P Third Party

STATES Electoral Votes: 141 / -4 over 1970)

	1970		1972		1974							
	House Districts	Senate Seats	House Districts	Senate Seats	Governors	6D - 6R						
122 House Districts	69D - 53R	24 Senate Seats	117 House Districts	65D - 52R	12 Governors							
24 Senate Seats	9D - 15R	12 Governors	24 Senate Seats	11D - 13R	* 3D - 5R							
12 Governors	4D - 8R		12 Governors	6D - 6R								
State	#	House	Senate	+ - #	House	Senate	1974	Gov.	Plurality	%	1974	
Conn.	6	4D 2R	1D 1R		6	3D 3R	1D* 1R	Ribicoff	- R*	+81,599	53.8	Meskill
Del. Ware	1	- 1R	- 2R		1	- 1R	1D 1R	---	D -	---	---	---
Maine	2	2D -	1D 1R		2	1D 1R	2D -	---	D* -	-890	49.9	Curtis
Maryland	8	5D 3R	- 2R		8	4D 4R	- 2R*	Mathias	D* -	-325,243	32.3	Mandel
Mass.	12	8D 4R	1D 1R		12	8D 4R	1D 1R	---	- R*	+259,354	51.8	Sargent
N. H.	2	- 2R	1D 1R		2	- 2R	1D 1R*	Cotton	- R*	TP+4,200	46.0	Peterson
N. J.	15	8D 7R	1D 1R		15	8D 7R	1D 1R	---	- R*	**	---	Cahill ('
N. Y.	41	23D 18R	- 2R	-2	39	22D 17R	- 2R*	Javits	- R*	+730,006	51.2	Rockefeller
Pa.	27	12D 15R	- 2R	-2	25	13D 12R	- 2R*	Schweiker	D* -	-500,175	41.7	Shapp
R. I.	2	2D -	2D -		2	2D -	2D	---	D -	---	---	---
Vermont	1	- 1R	- 2R		1	- 1R	- 2R*	Aiken	D -	---	---	---
W. Va.	5	5D -	2D -	-1	4	4D -	2D -	---	R	---	---	---
TOTAL	122	69D 53R	9D 15R	-5	117	65D 52R	11D 13R	1D 5R	* * 3D 5R			3D 5R

TABLE II

CONGRESSIONAL, SENATORIAL AND GOVERNOR TALLY

* Up in 1974

MIDWEST STATES

(Electoral Votes: 145 / -4 over 1970)

1970				1972				1974			
125 House Districts		56D - 69R		121 House Districts		51D - 70R		12 Governor		8D - 4R	
24 Senate Seats		14D - 10R		24 Senate Seats		15D - 9R		* 6D - 2R			
12 Governors		9D - 3R		12 Governors		8D - 4R					
* 5D - 3R											
States	#	House	Senate	+-	#	House	Senate	1974	Governor	Plurality	%
Illinois	24	12D 12R	1D 1R		24	10D 14R	1D 1R	---	D	---	--
Indiana	11	5D 6R	2D --		11	4D 7R	2D* -	Bayh	- R	---	--
Iowa	7	3D 4R	1D 1R	-1	6	3D 3R	2D* -	Hughes	- R*	+34,483	51 Ray
Kansas	5	1D 4R	-- 2R		5	1D 4R	-- 2R*	Dole	D* -	-71,384	54 Docking
Michigan	19	7D 12R	1D 1R		19	7D 12R	1D 1R	---	- R*	+44,111	50.4 Milliken
Minn.	8	4D 4R	2D --		8	4D 4R	2D -	---	D* -	-116,141	45.5 Anderson
Nebraska	3	-- 3R	-- 2R		3	-- 3R	-- 2R	---	D* -	-46,558	43.8 Exon
Missouri	10	9D 1R	2D --		10	9D 1R	2D* -	Eagleton	- R	---	--
N. D.	2	1D 1R	1D 1R	-1	1	-- 1R	1D 1R*	Young	D -	---	--
Ohio	24	7D 17R	-- 2R	-1	23	7D 16R	-- 2R*	Saxbe	D* -	-342,811	43.4 Gilligan
S. D.	2	2D --	2D --		2	1D 1R	2D* -	McGovern	D* -	-23,269	45.2 Kneip
Wisc.	10	5D 5R	2D --	-1	9	5D 4R	2D* -	Nelson	D* -	-125,786	44.9 Lucey
TOTAL	125	56D 69R	14D 10R	-4	121	51D 70R	15D 9R	* 5D 3R	8D 4R	---	6D 2R

TABLE II

CONGRESSIONAL, SENATORIAL AND GOVERNOR TALLY

* Up in 1974
TP Third Party

STATES (Electoral Votes: 102 / +7 over 1970)

STATE	#	1970		1972		1974		Governor	Plurality	%	1974
		House	Senate	+ -	#	House	Senate				
Alaska	1	1D -	1D 1R		1	1D -	1D* 1R	Gravel	-5,045	46.9	Egan
Arizona	3	1D 2R	- 2R	+1	4	1D 3R	- 2R*	Goldwater	+7,303	50.9	Williams
Calif.	38	20D 18R	2D -	+5	43	23D 20R	2D* -	Cranston	+501,057	52.8	Reagan
Colo.	4	2D 2R	- 2R	+1	5	2D 3R	1D 1R*	Deminick	+48,567	52.5	Love
Hawaii	2	2D -	1D 1R		2	2D -	1D* 1R	Ineuyse	-36,563	42.6	Burns
Idaho	2	- 2R	1D 1R		2	- 2R	1D* 1R	Church	-10,896	47.8	Andrus
Montana	2	1D 1R	2D -		2	1D 1R	2D -	---	---	---	---
Nevada	1	1D -	2D -		1	- 1R	2D* -	Bible	-6,297	43.8	O'Callaghan
N. Mex.	2	1D 1R	2D -		2	1D 1R	1D 1R	---	-14,195	46.4	King
Oregon	4	2D 2R	- 2R		4	2D 2R	- 2R*	Packwood	+76,072	55.5	McCall
Utah	2	1D 1R	1D 1R		2	2D -	1D 1R*	Bennett	---	---	---
Wash.	7	6D 1R	2D -		7	6D 1R	2D* -	Magnuson	---	---	---
Wyoming	1	1D -	1D 1R		1	1D -	1D 1R	---	+30,241	62.8	Hathaway
TOTAL	69	39D 30R	15D 11R	+7	76	42D 34R	15D 11R	*	7D 6R	5D 5R	

TABLE IV

CONGRESSIONAL, SENATORIAL AND GOVERNOR TALLY

* Up in 1974

** Up in 1975

*** Up in 1973

SOUTHERN STATES . (Electoral Votes: 147 / +2 over 1970)

1970				1972				1974			
119 House Districts		88D - 31R		121 House Districts		84D - 37R		13 Governors		10D - 3R	
States	#	House	Senate	#	House	Senate	1974	Governor	Plurality	%	1974
Alabama	8	5D 3R	2D -	-1	7	4D 3R	2D* -	Allen	D*	-	-----
Arkansas	4	3D 1R	2D -		4	3D 1R	2D* -	Fulbright	D*	-	-----
Florida	12	9D 3R	1D 1R	+3	15	11D 4R	1D 1R*	Gurney	D*	-	-----
Georgia	10	8D 2R	2D -		10	9D 1R	2D* -	Talmadge	D*	-	-----
Kentucky	7	5D 2R	- 2R		7	5D 2R	1D 1R*	Cook	D	-	-----
Louisiana	8	8D -	2D -		8	7D 1R	2D* -	Long	D	-	**
Mississippi	5	5D -	2D -		5	3D 2R	2D -	---	D	-	-----
N. Carolina	11	7D 4R	2D -		11	7D 4R	1D* 1R	Ervin	-	R	-----
Oklahoma	6	4D 2R	1D 1R		6	5D 1R	- 2R*	Bellmon	D*	-	-2,181 48.1
S. Carolina	6	5D 1R	1D 1R		6	4D 2R	1D* 1R	Hollings	D*	-	-29,318 45.6
Tennessee	9	5D 4R	- 2R	-1	8	3D 5R	- 2R	---	-	R*	+66,256 52.0
Texas	23	20D 3R	1D 1R	+1	24	20D 4R	1D 1R	---	D*	-	-101,369 45.0
Virginia	10	4D 6R	2D -		10	3D 7R	1D 1R	---	-	R*	***
TOTAL	119	88D 31R	18D 8R	+2	121	84D 37R	16D 10R	* * 6D 3R	10D 3R		7D 1R

SENATE INVENTORY BY REGION

	1 Democrat and 5 Republicans
AS	5 Democrats and 3 Republicans
	6 Democrats and 3 Republicans
	6 Democrats and 4 Republicans
	18 Democrats 15 Republicans

HOUSE INVENTORY (Table V)

called "safe" seats (178D and 141R) of the 435 total marginal seats (67D and 49R) to fight over for control. Democrats are most vulnerable in the South of their 67 marginal seats. We are most in the Midwest with 17 seats that are marginal.

To win the House we would have to win 67% of the total seats while not losing any of our 141 so-called "safe" seats. This is a very difficult task! That should be our objective. If we win 67% of the 116 marginal seats. Should we only win 65% of the marginal seats we will then be only 7 seats away from victory in 1976.

Our strategy must be implemented at the county and precinct level. We must win all congressional districts by our national party if we are to win the House.

We must have:

1. Candidates
2. Money
3. Organization

TABLE V

HOUSE INVENTORY

Total of Marginal and Safe Districts

EASTERN (117 Districts)

M - D	M - R	Total	S - D	S - R	Total
21	10	31	45	41	86

SOUTHERN (121 Districts)

M - D	M - R	Total	S - D	S - R	Total
19	14	33	65	23	88

MIDWESTERN (121 Districts)

M - D	M - R	Total	S - D	S - R	Total
13	17	30	38	53	91

WESTERN (76 Districts)

M - D	M - R	Total	S - D	S - R	Total
14	8	22	30	24	54

67 (58%)

178 (56%)

49 (42%)

141 (44%)

116
Total Marginal319
Total Safe

27%

73%

State makeup

Democrat 243

Republican 192

51

26 seats for majority

TABLE VI

MARGINAL CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

TP--Third Party

EASTERN STATES

SOUTHERN STATES (con.)

	House	%	Plurality		House	%	Plurality	
<u>Conn.</u>	#5-R	51.1	+5,256		La.	#3-R	51.8	+4,213
	#3-D	46.8	-14,947		Miss.	#4-R	47.1	+3,257
Del.	N O N E					#5-R	55.2	+11,628
Maine	#2-R	54.4	+13,240		N. C.	#4-D	49.7	-971
	#1-D	41.7	-26,049			#7-D	40.3	-16,623
Md.	#4-R	59.2	+25,881			#3-D ('70)	40.0	-13,841
Mass.	#4-D/TP	45.0	-9,433			#6-D	35.0	-26,954
	#5-R/TP	53.4	+18,026			#11-D	40.5	-29,544
	#12-D	49.7	-1,207		Okla.	#1-D	43.9	-19,426
N. H.	N O N E					#5-D	41.9	-16,367
<u>N. J.</u>	#1-R	52.8	+9,615		S. C.	#1-D	44.9	-11,635
	#3-D	46.7	-12,176			#6-R	52.5	+5,425
	#4-D	42.1	-25,878		Tenn.	#3-R	55.3	+19,913
	#9-D	44.2	-24,756			#5-D	37.1	-37,051
	#13-R	56.3	+22,951			#6-R	55.1	+16,441
	#15-D	47.9	-17,749			#8-R	55.5	+18,529
<u>N. Y.</u>	#3-R/TP	53.8	+52,069		Texas	#5-R	55.7	+15,236
	#6-D	47.6	-9,449			#13-R	54.8	+15,061
	#15-D/TP	43.5	-11,899			#21-D	41.9	-23,580
	#17-D	41.1	-19,224		Va.	#4-R	49.9	+11,998
	#23-R	53.4	+10,089			#6-R	54.3	+20,544
	#26-R/TP	48.7	+18,262			#8-R	44.9	+8,897
	#31-R/TP	54.3	+22,824			#10-R	56.6	+23,310
	#32-D	43.7	-20,849					
<u>Pa.</u>	#4-D	44.1	-26,965					
	#22-D	40.4	-22,602					
	#23-R	57.4	+20,536					
	#25-D	44.4	-16,050					
R. I.	N O N E							
Vermont	N O N E							
W. Va.	#4-D	40.0	-30,443					
SOUTHEASTERN STATES								
	House	%	Plurality		House	%	Plurality	
Ala.	#2-R	55.3	-19,952		<u>Ill.</u>	#10-R	51.6	+7,173
Fla.	#4-D	44.0	-18,692			#11-D	46.8	-13,268
	#5-D	44.5	-18,611			#21-R	54.8	+17,443
	#8-D	42.4	-22,315			#22-D	43.2	-26,228
	#11-D	39.8	-37,502		<u>Ind.</u>	#1-D	49.3	-1,811
	#15-D	43.4	-19,601			#2-R	54.1	+14,615
Ga.	#5-D	46.5	-9,136			#3-D	43.8	-22,456
	#7-D	40.1	-17,705			#4-D	48.4	-5,833
			-27,141			#11-R	51.1	+4,241
			-7,177		Iowa	#1-D	44.8	-16,788
						#2-D	41.3	-19,219
					Kansas	#6-R	51.4	+4,350
					Mich.	#2-D	36.8	-29,364
						#6-R	50.6	+2,239
						#12-D	49.1	-2,944
						#14-D	42.7	-25,518
						#18-R	54.9	+22,851

TABLE VI (con.)

MIDWESTERN STATES (con.)

	<u>House</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Plurality</u>
Minn.	#6-R	51.1	+4,744
	#7-D	41.0	-39,977
Neb.	N O N E		
Mo.	#4-D	42.3	-22,658
	#6-D	45.3	-19,045
	#8-D	39.3	-27,575
N. D.	N O N E		
<u>Ohio</u>	#8-R	51.7	+1,592
	#16-R	53.8	+9,711
	#23-R/TP	50.1	+3,561
S. D.	#2-R	55.0	+12,750
Wisc.	#3-R/TP	54.7	+19,886
	#8-R/TP	50.5	+3,504

WESTERN STATES

	<u>House</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Plurality</u>
Alaska	AL-D	44.8	-8,018
Ariz.	#4-R	53.5	+9,686
<u>Calif.</u>	#2-D/TP	22.5	-86,427
	#7-D/TP	38.0	-40,500
	#8-D	47.1	-11,076
	#11-D/TP	37.0	-43,925
	#12-R	54.0	+21,287
	#31-D/TP	42.5	-16,078
	#36-R/TP	52.7	+5,468
	#38-D	43.7	-17,397
Colo.	#1-D/TP	47.4	-9,639
	#4-R	51.4	+5,265
Hawaii	#1-D	45.4	-12,424
	#2-D	43.0	-19,577
Idaho	N O N E		
Mont.	#1-R	57.6	+11,407
Nev.	AL-R	51.5	+4,596
N. Mex.	N O N E		
Ore.	N O N E		
Utah	#2-D	44.9	-19,167
Wash.	#1-D	49.7	-1,090
	#4-D	47.3	-7,697
Wyo.	AL-D	48.3	-4,872

TABLE VII

MARGINAL AND SAFE DEMOCRAT AND REPUBLICAN SEATS

MIDWEST STATES	Total	M-D(#)	M-R(#)	S-D(#)	S-R(#)
<u>Illinois</u>	24	1(22)	3(10,11,21)	8(1,2,5,7, 9,23,24)	12(3,4,6,12-20)
Indiana	11	3(1,3,4)	2(2,11)	1(9)	5(5-8,10)
Iowa	6	2(1,2)	2(5,6)	1(4)	1(3)
<u>Michigan</u>	19	2(12,14)	3(2,6,18)	6(1,13,15, 16,17,19)	8(3-5,7-11)
Kansas	5	1(2)	----	----	4(1,3-5)
Minnesota	8	1(7)	1(6)	3(4,5,8)	3(1,2,3)
Nebraska	3	----	----	----	3(1,2,3)
Missouri	10	3(4,6,8)	----	6(1-3,9,10)	1(7)
N. Dakota	1	----	----	----	1(AL)
<u>Ohio</u>	23	----	3(8,16,23)	7(9,14,18-22) 13(1-7,10-13,15,17)	
S. Dakota	2	----	1(2)	1(1)	----
Wisconsin	9	----	2(3,8)	5(1,2,4,5,7)	2(6,9)
	121	13	17	38	53
WESTERN STATES					
Alaska	1	1(AL)	----	----	----
Arizona	4	----	1(4)	1(2)	2(1,3)
<u>California</u>	43	5(2,7,8 31,38)	3(6,12,36)	19(1,3-5,11, 14-16,19, 21,22,26, 29,30,34, 35,37,41)	16(10,13,17,18,20,23- 25,27,28,32,33,39, 40,42,43)
Colorado	5	1(1)	1(4)	1(3)	2(2,5)
Hawaii	2	2(1,2)	----	----	----
Idaho	2	----	----	----	2(1,2)
Montana	2	----	1(1)	1(2)	----
Nevada	1	----	1(AL)	----	----
New Mexico	2	----	1(1)	1(2)	----
Oregon	4	----	----	2(2,3)	2(1,4)
Utah	2	2(1,2)	----	----	----
Washington	7	2(1,4)	----	5(2,3,5-7)	----
Wyoming	1	1(AL)	----	----	----
	76	14	8	30	24
EASTERN STATES					
<u>Connecticut</u>	6	2(1,3)	1(5)	1(6)	2(2,4)
Delaware	1	----	----	----	1(AL)
Maine	2	1(1)	1(2)	----	----
Maryland	8	----	----	4(2,3,6,7)	4(1,4,5,8)

TABLE VII (con.)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>M-D(#)</u>	<u>M-R(#)</u>	<u>S-D(#)</u>	<u>S-R(#)</u>
Massachusetts	12	3(4,9,12)	1(5)	6(2,3,6,8,11)	2(1,10)
New Hampshire	2	----	----	----	2(1,2)
<u>New Jersey</u>	15	5(3,4,9,11, 15)	2(1,13)	3(8,10,14)	5(2,5,6,7,12)
<u>New York</u>	39	4(6,15,17, 32)	5(1,3, 23,26, 31)	17(7-14,16, 18-22,24, 28,37)	13(2,4,5,25,27,29, 30,33,34,35,36, 38,39)
<u>Pennsylvania</u>	25	3(4,22,25)	1(23)	10(1-3,6,11, 14,15,20, 21,24)	11(5,7-10,12,13, 16-19)
Rhode Island	2	----	----	2(1,2)	----
Vermont	1	----	----	----	1(AL)
West Virginia	4	1(4)	----	3(1,2,3)	----
	117	19	11	46	41

SOUTHERN STATES

Alabama	7	----	1(2)	4(3,4,5,7)	2(1,6)
Arkansas	4	----	----	3(1,2,4)	1(3)
Florida	15	5(4,5,8,11, 15)	----	6(1-3,7,13, 14)	4(6,9,10,12)
Georgia	10	2(5,7)	----	7(1-3,6,8,10)	1(4)
Kentucky	7	2(2,6)	----	3(3,1,7)	2(4,5)
Louisiana	8	----	1(3)	7(1,2,4-8)	----
Mississippi	5	----	2(4,5)	3(1,2,3)	----
North Carolina	11	3(4,7,11)	----	4(1,2,3,6)	4(5,8-10)
Oklahoma	6	2(1,5)	----	3(2-4)	1(6)
South Carolina	6	1(1)	1(6)	3(3-5)	1(2)
Tennessee	8	1(5)	3(3,6,8)	2(4,7)	2(1,2)
<u>Texas</u>	24	3(8,21,24)	2(5,13)	17(1,2,4,6,9- 12,14-20,22, 23)	2(3,7)
Virginia	10	----	4(4,6,8,10)	3(1,3,5)	3(2,7,9)
Totals	121	19	14	65	23



SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS FOR 50 STATES, D.C.

(Complete list of unofficial returns, p. 2993-3001)

West

President Nixon defeated Sen. George McGovern in 13 western states and won 102 electoral votes.

Seven Senate seats and three governorships were up this year. There were two party turnovers among the Senate races: Colorado elected a Democratic senator and New Mexico a Republican senator. There was no party turnover among the governors.

Of the 76 House districts in the West, the Democrats won 43 and the Republicans won 33. Of the seven new House seats added by reapportionment, the Republicans won four and the Democrats won three. Party control of the House seats was reversed, giving the Republicans a net gain of one representative.

Alaska. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Ted Stevens (R), 48, was elected his first full term.

House (1 D): Nick Begich (D), 40, was elected to a second term as Alaska's at-large representative. Begich appeared in a light plane while campaigning Oct. 16; less he survived, Gov. William A. Egan (D) must call a special election to replace him.

Arizona. President: Nixon won the state's six electoral votes.

House (1 D, 3 R): All three incumbents were re-elected, and a Republican was elected to the new seat created as a result of reapportionment.

California. President: Nixon won the state's 45 electoral votes.

House (23 D, 20 R): All 34 California incumbents seeking re-election were successful. Democrats gained three seats, and Republicans two, reflecting the five new House seats in California because of reapportionment.

Colorado. President: Nixon won the state's seven electoral votes.

Senator: Former State Rep. Floyd K. Haskell (D), defeated Sen. Gordon Allott (R), 65, denying him a third term.

House (2 D, 3 R): Republicans had an over-all gain of one seat. Incumbent James D. (Mike) McKevitt (R) was defeated by Patricia Schroeder (D); but Republicans won two other seats—one in a new district created when Colorado gained one seat because of reapportionment, the other in Rep. Wayne N. Aspinall's (D) district. He was defeated in a primary.

Hawaii. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

House (2 D): Both incumbents won re-election.

Idaho. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senate (1 D, 1 R): Incumbent Frank Church (D), 47, defeated Rep. Don Stump (R), 43, to replace retiring Sen. B. Jack Murphy (R).

House (2 R): Incumbent Orval Hansen (R) was elected to a third term, and Steven D. Symms (R) was elected to the seat vacated by McClure.

Nevada. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

House (1 R): Republicans took over the at-large seat as David Towell (R), 35, defeated James H. Bilbray (D). Sen. Bilbray defeated Rep. Walter S. Baring (D) in the primary.

Montana. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Lee Metcalf (D), 61, was elected to a third term.

Governor: Lt. Gov. Thomas L. Judge (D), 38, was elected, defeating State Sen. Ed Smith (R), 52. Gov. Forrest H. Anderson (D) is retiring.

House (1 D, 1 R): Both incumbents won re-election.

New Mexico: President: Nixon took the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Pete V. Domenici (R), 40, will replace retiring Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D) in the Senate. Domenici defeated former State Rep. Jack Daniels (D).

House (1 D, 1 R): Both incumbents were re-elected.

Oregon. President: Nixon won the state's six electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Mark O. Hatfield (R), 50, was elected to a second term, defeating former Sen. Wayne L. Morse (D), 71.

House (2 D, 2 R): All four incumbents were re-elected.

Utah. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Governor: Calvin L. Rampton (D), 58, won a third term.

House (2 D): Both House seats went Democratic as incumbent K. Gunn McKay (D), 47, was re-elected and attorney Wayne Owens (D), 35, defeated incumbent Sherman P. Lloyd (R), who has served five terms.

Washington. President: Nixon won the state's nine electoral votes.

Governor: Incumbent Daniel J. Evans (R), 46, was elected to a third term.

House (7 D): All six Democratic incumbents were re-elected, and the Democrats picked up the seat of retiring Rep. Thomas M. Pelly (R).

Wyoming. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Clifford P. Hansen (R), 59, was elected to a second term.

House (1 D): Teno Roncalio (D), 52, was elected to a third term as Wyoming's at-large representative.

East

Nixon carried 11 of 12 states in the East with 124 electoral votes. McGovern won in Massachusetts and the District of Columbia, the two sources of his total of only 17 electoral votes.

In the seven Senate races in the East, incumbents held five and lost two. Incumbents Margaret Chase Smith (R Maine) and J. Caleb Boggs (R Del.) both were defeated by Democrats.

There were two party turnovers in the five governors' races. In Delaware and Vermont, Democrats will replace Republicans.

Of the 117 House seats at stake, Democrats won 66 and Republicans won 51. Party control of five seats switched hands for a Republican net gain of three seats.

Connecticut. President: Nixon won the state's eight electoral votes.

House (3 D; 3 R): Three Democratic and two Republican incumbents were re-elected, but incumbent Democrat John S. Monagan, 60, lost his 5th District seat to State Rep. Ronald A. Sarasin (R), 37.

Delaware. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

Senator: Democrat Joseph R. Biden Jr., 29, unseated two-term incumbent J. Caleb Boggs (R), 63, in a major upset. An American Party candidate was third.

Governor: State house minority leader Sherman W. Tribbitt (D), 49, defeated incumbent Republican Gov. Russell W. Peterson, 55, with an American Party candidate running third.

House (1 R): Incumbent Republican Pierre S. (Pete) du Pont, 37, was elected to a second term.

Maine. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Republican Margaret Chase Smith, 74, lost to Rep. William D. Hathaway (D), 48, in an upset.

House (1 D, 1 R): Incumbent Democrat Peter N. Kyros, 46, won a fourth term, and Republican William S. Cohen, 32, mayor of Bangor, captured the Democratic seat vacated by Hathaway.

Maryland. President: Nixon won the state's 10 electoral votes.

House (4 D, 4 R): Seven incumbents—four Democrats and three Republicans—were re-elected. A Republican was elected to the new 4th District seat.

Massachusetts. President: McGovern won the state's 14 electoral votes.

Senator: Republican Edward W. Brooke, 52, was elected to a second term.

House (9 D; 3 R): Nine incumbents—seven Democrats and two Republicans—were re-elected. But Democrat Louise Day Hicks, 52, lost her 9th District seat to Boston city councilman John Joseph Moakley, 45, a Democrat who ran as an independent candidate. Republicans and Democrats split two seats vacated by Republicans. A Republican won in the 5th District and a Democrat won in the 12th.

New Hampshire. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Democrat Thomas J. McIntyre, 57, won a second full term by defeating former Gov. Wesley Powell (1959-63), 56, the Republican candidate.

Governor: Republican Meldrim Thomson Jr., 60, defeated Democrat Roger J. Crowley Jr., 59, and independent candidate Marvin Nichols, 47.

House (2 R): Both incumbents were re-elected.

New Jersey. President: Nixon won the state's 17 electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Republican Clifford P. Case, 68, was elected to a fourth term, defeating former Rep. Paul J. Krebs (D 1965-67), 60, and three minor-party candidates.

House (8 D; 7 R): Thirteen districts re-elected incumbents—five Republicans and eight Democrats. Republicans were elected to a seat being vacated by a Republican and to a new seat created by redistricting.

New York. President: Nixon won the state's 41 electoral votes.

House (22 D, 17 R): Thirty-three incumbents—20 Democrats and 13 Republicans—were re-elected to the House from New York, which lost two seats for a new total of 39. Four new Republicans and two new Democrats were elected.

Pennsylvania. President: Nixon won the state's 27 electoral votes.

House (13 D, 12 R): Incumbents were re-elected in 24 of 25 districts in Pennsylvania, which lost two seats through reapportionment. In the only race without an incumbent candidate, a Republican was elected in the new 9th District.

Rhode Island. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Democrat Claiborne Pell, 53, won a third term by defeating Republican John H. Chafee, 49, former Rhode Island governor and former secretary of the Navy.

Governor: Democrat Phillip W. Noel, 41, the mayor of Warwick, defeated Republican Herbert F. DeSimone, 42, and an independent candidate.

House (2 D): Both incumbents were re-elected.

Vermont. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

Governor: Thomas P. Salmon, 40, the Democrat-Independent Vermonters Party candidate, upset Republican Luther F. Hackett, 39, the chosen successor to retiring Gov. Deane C. Davis (R).

House (1 R): Incumbent Republican Richard W. Mallary, 43, was elected to a full term.

West Virginia. President: Nixon won the state's six electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Democrat Jennings Randolph, 70, was elected to a third full term, defeating Republican State Sen. Louise Leonard, 53.

Governor: Incumbent Republican Arch Moore, 49, defeated Democrat John D. Rockefeller IV, 35, the secretary of state.

House (4 D): Four incumbent Democrats were re-elected. A fifth Democratic seat was abolished through reapportionment.

District of Columbia. President: McGovern won the District's three electoral votes.

South

Nixon defeated McGovern in all 13 states of the South and won the region's 147 electoral votes.

In the 12 Senate races, party control switched in four states. Republicans took over in North Carolina, Oklahoma and Virginia. A Democrat will replace a Republican in the Kentucky seat.

Of the three races for governor, only in North Carolina was there a party change from Democrat to Republican.

Of the 121 House seats in the 13 states, 84 were won by Democrats and 37 by Republicans. There were changes in party control of nine seats for a net gain of five seats for the Republicans.

Alabama. President: Nixon won the state's nine electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent John J. Sparkman (D), 72, was elected to a sixth term, defeating Winton M. Blount Jr. (R), 51, and three minor-party candidates.

House: (4 D, 3 R): All seven incumbents were re-elected. Alabama lost one seat because of redistricting.

Arkansas. President: Nixon won the state's six electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent John L. McClellan (D), 76, was elected to a sixth term, defeating Wayne H. Babbitt (R), 44.

Governor: Dale L. Bumpers (D), 47, was elected to a second term, defeating Len E. Blaylock (R), 53.

House: (3 D, 1 R): The party breakdown for the delegation remains the same as before, although Rep. David H. Pryor, 33, resigned his 4th District seat to challenge McClellan in the Democratic Senate primary.

Florida. President: Nixon won the state's 17 electoral electoral votes.

House: (11 D, 4 R): Florida gained three seats through redistricting. All 12 incumbents were re-elected. Democrats captured two of the new seats, and a Republican won the third.

Georgia. President: Nixon won the state's 12 electoral votes.

Senate: Sam Nunn (D), 34, was elected, defeating Rep. Fletcher Thompson (R), 47. Sen. David H. Gambrill (D) was defeated in the primary by Nunn.

House: (9 D, 1 R): The Democrats picked up the 5th District seat vacated by Thompson.

Kentucky. President: Nixon won the state's nine electoral votes.

Senate: Walter (Dee) Huddleston (D), 46, was elected, defeating former Gov. Louie B. Nunn (R 1968-72), 48, and American Party and People's Party candidates.

House (5 D, 2 R): The party breakdown remains the same, with a Democrat replacing a retiring Democrat in the 6th District.

Louisiana. President: Nixon won the state's 10 electoral votes.

Senate: J. Bennett Johnston Jr. (D), 40, defeated Ben C. Toledano (R), 40, and John J. McKeithen (Independent), 54, a former Democratic governor (1964-72).

House (7 D, 1 R): Voters sent a Republican to Congress from the state for the first time this century, electing him in the 3rd District to replace a retiring Democrat.

Mississippi. President: Nixon won the state's seven electoral votes.

Senate: Incumbent James O. Eastland (D), 67, was elected to a sixth term, defeating Gil Carnichael (R), 45, and two independent candidates.

House: (3 D, 2 R): Republicans picked up two seats formerly held by Democrats in the 3rd and 4th Districts. Incumbents from both districts retired.

North Carolina. President: Nixon won the state's 13 electoral votes.

Senate: Jesse Helms (R), 59, defeated Rep. Nick Galifianakis (D), 44.

Governor: James E. Holshouser (R), 37, was elected, defeating Hargrove (Skipper) Bowles Jr. (D), 52, and an American Party candidate. Gov. Robert W. Scott (D) was ineligible for another term.

House: (7 D, 4 R): There was no change in the party breakdown. A Democrat won the 4th District seat vacated by Galifianakis.

Oklahoma. President: Nixon won the state's eight electoral votes.

Senate: Former Gov. Dewey F. Bartlett (R 1967-71), 53, defeated Rep. Ed Edmondson (D), 53, and three minor-party candidates. Sen. Fred R. Harris (D) did not seek re-election.

House (5 D, 1 R): Democrats picked up the 1st District seat (Tulsa) of retiring Rep. Page Belcher (R). Edmondson's seat remains Democratic.

South Carolina. President: Nixon won the state's eight electoral votes.

Senate. Incumbent Strom Thurmond (R), 69, was elected to a fifth term, defeating Eugene N. Zeigler (D), 51, and a minor-party candidate.

House (4 D, 2 R): Republicans gained one seat, in the 1st District.

Tennessee. President: Nixon won the state's 10 electoral votes.

Senate: Incumbent Howard H. Baker Jr. (R), 46, was elected to a second term, defeating Rep. Ray Blanton (D), 42.

House: (3 D, 5 R): Democrats suffered a net loss of two seats, one because of the defeat of a Democratic incumbent, William R. Anderson, in the 6th District, and the other because of redistricting which cost Tennessee one seat.

Texas. President: Nixon won the state's 26 electoral votes.

Senate: Incumbent John G. Tower (R), 47, was elected to a third term, defeating Barefoot Sanders (D), 47, and two other candidates.

Governor: Dolph Briscoe (D), 49, was elected, defeating Henry C. Grover (R), 45, and two other candidates. Incumbent Preston Smith (D) was defeated for renomination by Briscoe.

House (20 D, 4 R): The Republicans had a net gain of one seat. A Republican defeated incumbent Earle Cabell (D), in the 6th District. Incumbent Robert Price (R), defeated another incumbent, Graham Purcell (D), after redistricting forced the two into opposition in the 18th District. Democrats were elected in the two new seats created by redistricting.

Virginia. President: Nixon won the state's 12 electoral votes.

Senate: Rep. (1966-72) William Lloyd Scott (R), 57, defeated incumbent William B. Spong Jr. (D), 52.

House (3 D, 7 R): Republicans gained a seat being vacated by a retiring Democrat in the 4th District.

Midwest

Richard Nixon carried all 12 states in the Midwest and all but North Dakota in the West.

He won seven Senate seats statewide in the Midwest, two changed party control. Iowa and South Dakota both added Democrats to seats held previously by Repub-

In the seven contests for governorships, five remained in the same party column, a Democrat defeated the Republican governor of Illinois and a Missouri Republican will replace a retiring Democratic governor.

The Midwest in 121 House races chose 70 Republicans and 51 Democrats. Party control of five seats switched for a net gain of three for the Republicans.

Illinois. President: Nixon won the state's 26 electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Charles H. Percy (R), 53, was elected to a second term, defeating Rep. Roman C. Pucinski (D), 53.

Governor: Daniel Walker (D), 49, defeated incumbent Richard B. Ogilvie (R), 49.

House: (10 D, 14 R): Republicans gained two seats in Illinois. One incumbent, Abner J. Mikva, was defeated in a new district.

Indiana. President: Nixon won the state's 13 electoral votes.

Governor: Otis R. Bowen (R), 54, defeated former Gov. Matthew E. Welsh (1961-65), 60.

House (4 D, 7 R): All incumbents but one—Andrew Jacobs Jr. (D), 40—were re-elected.

Iowa. President: Nixon won the state's eight electoral votes.

Senator: Dick Clark (D), 43, defeated incumbent Jack Miller (R), 56.

Governor: Incumbent Robert Ray (R), 42, was elected to a third term, defeating Paul Frazenburg (D), 55.

House (3 D, 3 R): Because of redistricting, Iowa lost one Republican seat. John H. Kyl (R) was defeated in his race against another incumbent, Neal Smith (D). Incumbent Fred Schwengel, 65, accounted for another Republican loss, to Edward Mezynsky (D).

Kansas. President: Nixon won the state's seven electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent James B. Pearson (R), 52, was elected to a second term, defeating Arch O. Tetzlaff (D), 46, and a Conservative Party candidate.

Governor: Incumbent Robert Docking (D), 46, was elected to a fourth term, defeating Morris Kay (R), 40.

House (1 D, 4 R): All five incumbents were re-elected.

Michigan. President: Nixon won the state's 21 electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Robert P. Griffin (R), 48, was elected to a second term, defeating Frank J. Kelley (D), 47.

House: (7 D, 12 R). No seats changed parties.

Minnesota. President: Nixon won the state's 10 electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Walter F. Mondale (D), 44, was elected to a second term, defeating Philip Hansen (R), 44, and a Socialist Labor candidate.

House (4 D, 4 R): All eight incumbents were re-elected.

Nebraska. President: Nixon won the state's five electoral votes.

Senator: Incumbent Carl T. Curtis (R), 67, was elected to a fourth term, defeating Terry M. Carpenter (D), 72.

House (3 D, 3 R): All three incumbents were re-elected.

Pennsylvania. President: Nixon won the state's 12 electoral votes.

Governor: Christopher (Kit) Bond (R), 33, was elected to a first term, defeating Edward L. Dowd (D).

House (9 D; 1 R): All incumbents were re-elected.

North Dakota. President: Nixon won the state's three electoral votes.

Governor: Rep. Arthur A. Link (D), 58, was elected, defeating Lt. Gov. Richard F. Larsen (R), 36.

House (1 R): Because of reapportionment, North Dakota lost one seat held by the Democrats. Incumbent Mark Andrews (R), 46, was elected to a fifth term, defeating Richard Ista (D), 43.

Ohio. President: Nixon won the state's 25 electoral votes.

House (7 D, 16 R): Ohio lost one Republican seat as a result of redistricting.

South Dakota. President: Nixon won the state's four electoral votes.

Senator: Rep. James Abourezk (D), 41, was elected, defeating Robert Hirsch (R), 46.

Governor: Incumbent Richard F. Kneip (D), 39, was elected to a second term, defeating Carveth Thompson (R), 39.

House (1 D, 1 R): Abourezk's seat was filled by a Republican. The other Democratic incumbent was re-elected.

Wisconsin. President: Nixon won the state's 11 electoral votes.

House (5 D, 4 R): Wisconsin lost one Republican seat as a result of redistricting. (Incumbent David R. Obey (D), 33, defeated another incumbent, Alvin E. O'Konski (R), 55, to represent their combined constituencies in the new 7th District.)

(Continued from p. 2960)

HOUSE RACES

trouble defeating Republican John H. Kyl in Iowa's 4th District, while David Obey trounced 30-year-veteran Alvin E. O'Konski (R) in Wisconsin's 7th.

West

Returns from the West were dominated by California, with its rich prize of five new House seats. Neither party had the votes to pass a partisan redistricting bill, so they settled on a compromise that divided the five new seats this way: two Democratic, two Republican, one tossup. That was the way it worked out. Rep. Paul N. McCloskey Jr. (R), who led an anti-war crusade against President Nixon in the 1972 presidential primaries, moved into one of the Republican districts and won it. The other Republican district went to a popular state senator, Republican Clair M. Burgen. The two Democratic districts went to Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, a black state representative, and to former U.S. Rep. George E. Brown Jr. (D 1963-71). The tossup district went narrowly to State Rep. William M. Ketchum (R).

Colorado's new suburban district went Republican, as expected, for State Sen. William L. Armstrong. But two Colorado seats switched parties. In Denver, Democrat Patricia Schroeder won an upset victory over freshman Rep. James D. (Mike) McEvitt (R). And Republican James T. Johnson won the seat held by veteran Rep. Wayne N. Aspinwall (D), who was defeated in a primary by law professor Alan Merson.

HOUSE MEMBERSHIP IN THE 93RD CONGRESS....

ALABAMA

1. Jack Edwards (R)
2. William L. Dickinson (R)
3. Bill Nichols (D)
4. Tom Bevill (D)
5. Robert E. Jones (D)
6. John Buchanan (R)
7. Walter Flowers (D)

ALASKA

- AL Nick Begich (D)

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes (R)
2. Morris K. Udall (D)
3. Sam Steiger (R)
4. John B. Conlon (R)*

ARKANSAS

1. Bill Alexander (D)
2. Wilbur D. Mills (D)
3. John Paul Hammerschmidt (R)
4. Roy Thornton (D)*

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen (R)
2. Harold T. Johnson (D)
3. John E. Moss (D)
4. Robert E. Leggett (D)
5. Phillip Burton (D)
6. William S. Malliard (R)
7. Ronald V. Dellums (D)
8. Fortney H. (Pete) Stark (D)*
9. Don Edwards (D)
10. Charles S. Gubser (R)
11. Leo J. Ryan (D)*
12. Burt L. Talcott (R)
13. Charles M. Teague (R)
14. Jerome R. Woldie (D)
15. John J. McFall (D)
16. B. F. Sisk (D)
17. Paul N. McCloskey Jr. (R)
18. Robert B. (Bob) Mathias (R)
19. Chet Holifield (D)
20. Carlos J. Moorhead (R)*
21. Augustus F. Hawkins (D)
22. James C. Corcoran (D)
23. Del Clawson (R)
24. John H. Reusselot (R)
25. Charles E. Wiggins (R)
26. Thomas M. Rees (D)
27. Barry M. Goldwater Jr. (R)
28. Alphonzo Bell (R)
29. George E. Danielson (D)
30. Edward R. Roybal (D)
31. Charles H. Wilson (D)
32. Craig Hosmer (R)
33. Jerry L. Pettis (R)
34. Richard T. Hanna (D)
35. Glenn M. Anderson (D)
36. William M. Ketchum (R)*
37. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke (D)*
38. George E. Brown Jr. (D)*#
39. Andrew J. Hinshaw (R)*
40. Bob Wilson (R)
41. Lionel Van Deerlin (D)
42. Clair W. Engen (R)*
43. Victor V. Veysey (R)

HOUSE LINE-UP**Democrats 244**

Freshman Democrats - 27
• Freshman Representative

Republicans 191

Freshman Republicans - 42
#Former Representative

COLORADO

1. Patricia Schroeder (D)*
2. Donald G. Brutzman (R)
3. Frank E. Evans (D)
4. James T. Johnson (R)*
5. William L. Armstrong (R)*

CONNECTICUT

1. William R. Cramer (D)
2. Robert H. Steele (R)
3. Robert N. Giacino (D)
4. Stewart B. McKinney (R)
5. Ronald A. Sarasin (R)*
6. Ello T. Grosso (D)

DELAWARE

AL Pierre S. (Pete) du Pont (R)

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes (D)
2. Don Fuquo (D)
3. Charles F. Bennett (D)
4. Bill Chappell Jr. (D)
5. William D. Gunter Jr. (D)*
6. C. W. Bill Young (R)
7. Sam Gibbons (D)
8. James A. Holey (D)
9. Louis Frey (R)
10. L. A. (Skip) Sofolos (R)*
11. Paul G. Rogers (D)
12. J. Herbert Burke (R)
13. William Lehman (D)*
14. Claude Pepper (D)
15. Dante B. Fascell (D)

GEORGIA

1. Ronald B. (Bo) Ginn (D)*
2. Dawson Mathis (D)
3. Jack Brinkley (D)
4. Ben B. Elickburn (R)
5. Andrew Young (D)*
6. John J. Flynt Jr. (D)
7. John W. Davis (D)
8. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey (D)
9. Phil M. Landrum (D)
10. Robert G. Stephens Jr. (D)

HAWAII

1. Spark M. Matsunaga (D)
2. Patsy T. Mink (D)

IDAHO

1. Steven D. Symms (R)*
2. Orval Hansen (R)

ILLINOIS

1. Ralph H. Metcalfe (D)
2. Morgan F. Murphy (D)
3. Peter P. Hruska (R)*
4. Edward J. Derwinski (R)

MAINE

1. Peter N. Kyros (D)
2. William S. Cohen (R)*

MARYLAND

1. William O. Mills (R)
2. Clarence D. Long (D)
3. Paul S. Sarbanes (D)
4. Marjorie S. Holt (R)*
5. Lawrence J. Hogan (R)
6. Goodloe E. Byron (D)
7. Parren J. Mitchell (D)
8. Gilbert Gude (R)

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte (R)
2. Edward P. Boland (D)
3. Harold D. Donahue (D)
4. Robert F. Drinan (D)
5. Paul W. Cronin (R)*
6. Michael J. Harrington (D)
7. Torbert H. Macdonald (D)
8. Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D)
9. John Joseph Moakley (D)*
10. Margaret M. Heckler (R)
11. James A. Burke (D)
12. Gerry E. Studds (D)*

MICHIGAN

1. John Conyers Jr. (D)
2. Marvin L. Esch (R)
3. Garry Brown (R)
4. Edward Hutchinson (R)
5. Gerald R. Ford (R)
6. Charles E. Chamberlain (D)
7. Donald W. Riegle Jr. (R)
8. James Harvey (R)
9. Guy Vander Jagt (R)
10. Ellard A. Cederberg (R)
11. Philip E. Rupke (R)
12. James G. O'Hara (D)
13. Charles C. Diggs Jr. (D)
14. Lucien N. Nedzi (D)
15. William D. Ford (D)
16. John D. Dingell (D)
17. Martha W. Griffiths (D)
18. Robert J. Huber (R)*
19. William S. Broomfield (R)

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie (R)
2. Archer Nelsen (R)
3. Bill Frenzel (R)
4. Joseph E. Korth (D)
5. Donald M. Fraser (D)
6. John M. Zwach (R)
7. Bob Bergland (D)
8. John A. Blatnik (D)

MISSISSIPPI

1. Jamie L. Whitten (D)

244 DEMOCRATS, 191 REPUBLICANS

David R. Bowen (D)*
 G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D)
 Thad Cochran (R)*
 Trent Lott (R)*

SOUTH

William (Bill) Cloy (D)
 James W. Synington (D)
 Leonor K. Sullivan (D)
 William J. Pandolf (D)
 Richard Bolling (D)
 Jerry Litton (D)*
 Gene Taylor (R)*
 Richard H. Ichord (D)
 William L. Hungate (D)
 Bill D. Burlison (D)

ONTANA

Richard G. Shoup (R)
 John Melcher (D)

KANSAS

Charles Thone (R)
 John Y. McCollister (R)
 Dave Martin (R)

IDAHO

David Towell (R)*

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Louis C. Wyman (R)
 Jonas C. Cleveland (R)

NEW JERSEY

John E. Hust (R)
 Charles W. Sondman Jr. (R)
 James J. Howard (D)
 Frank Thompson Jr. (D)
 Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen (R)
 Edwin B. Forsythe (R)
 William B. Vinaloff (R)
 Robert A. Roe (D)

Henry Heistkosi (D)

Peter W. Rodino Jr. (D)

Joseph G. Minish (D)

Matthew J. Rinaldo (R)*

Joseph J. Morezitti (R)*

Dominick V. Daniels (D)

Edward J. Patten (D)

MEXICO

Manuel Lujan Jr. (R)
 Harold Runnels (D)

NEW YORK

Otis G. Pike (D)
 James R. Grover Jr. (R)
 Angelo D. Roncalio (R)*
 Norman F. Lent (R)
 John W. Wydler (R)
 Lester L. Wolff (D)
 Joseph P. Addabbo (D)
 Benjamin S. Finkenthal (D)

Shelley Chisolm (D)

Edith Green (D)*

15. Hugh L. Corey (D)
16. Elizabeth Holtzman (D)*
17. John M. Murphy (D)
18. Edward I. Koch (D)
19. Charles B. Rangel (D)
20. Bella S. Abzug (D)
21. Hermon Badillo (D)
22. Jonathan B. Bingham (D)
23. Peter A. Feijer (R)
24. Ogden R. Reid (D)
25. Hamilton Fish Jr. (R)
26. Benjamin A. Gilman (R)*
27. Howard W. Robison (R)
28. Samuel S. Stratton (D)
29. Corletto J. King (R)
30. Robert C. McEwen (R)
31. Donald J. Mitchell (R)*
32. James M. Hanley (D)
33. William F. Walsh (R)*
34. Frank Horton (R)
35. Barber B. Conable Jr. (R)
36. Henry P. Smith III (R)
37. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D)
38. Jack F. Kemp (R)
39. James F. Hostings (R)

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Walter B. Jones (D)
2. L. H. Fountain (D)
3. David N. Henderson (D)
4. Ike F. Andrews (D)*
5. Wilmer Mizell (R)
6. L. Richardson Preyer (D)
7. Charles G. Rose III (D)*
8. Earl B. Ruth (R)
9. James G. Martin (R)*
10. James T. Broyhill (R)
11. Roy A. Taylor (D)

NORTH DAKOTA

Al Mark Andrews (R)

OHIO

1. William J. Keating (R)
2. Donald D. Clancy (R)
3. Charles W. Whalen Jr. (R)
4. Tennyson Guyer (R)*
5. Delbert L. Latta (R)
6. William H. Harsha (R)
7. Clarence J. Brown (R)
8. Walter E. Powell (R)
9. Thomas L. Ashley (D)
10. Clarence E. Miller (R)
11. J. William Stanton (R)
12. Samuel L. Devine (R)
13. Charles A. Mosher (R)
14. John F. Seiberling (D)
15. Chalmers P. Wylie (R)
16. Ralph S. Regula (R)*
17. John M. Ashbrook (R)
18. Wayne L. Hays (D)
19. Charles J. Corney (D)
20. James V. Stanton (D)
21. John C. Munford (D)

OKLAHOMA

Alvin E. Sykes (D)*

2. Clem Rogers McSpadden (D)*
3. Carl Albert (D)
4. Tom Steed (D)
5. John Jernon (D)
6. John N. Hoppy Camp (R)

OREGON

1. Wendell Wyatt (R)
2. Al Ullman (D)
3. Edith Green (D)
4. John Dellenback (R)

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Borrett (D)
2. Robert N. C. Nix (D)
3. William J. Green (D)
4. Joshua Elberg (D)
5. John Were (R)
6. Gus Yatron (D)
7. Lawrence G. Williams (R)
8. Edward G. Biester Jr. (R)
9. E. G. Shuster (R)*
10. Joseph M. McDade (R)
11. Daniel J. Flood (D)
12. John P. Saylor (R)
13. R. Lawrence Coughlin (R)
14. William S. Moorhead (D)
15. Fred B. Rooney (D)
16. Edwin D. Estleman (R)
17. Herman T. Schneebeli (R)
18. H. John Heinz III (R)
19. George A. Goodling (R)
20. Joseph M. Gandyos (D)
21. John H. Dent (R)
22. Thomas E. Morgan (D)
23. Albert W. Johnson (K)
24. Joseph P. Vigorito (D)
25. Frank M. Clark (D)

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain (D)
2. Robert O. Tiernan (D)

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Mendel J. Davis (D)
2. Floyd Spence (R)
3. William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D)
4. James R. Mann (D)
5. Tom S. Celliers (D)
6. Edward L. Young (R)*

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Frank E. Denholm (D)
2. James Abdnor (R)*

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen (R)
2. John J. Duncan (R)
3. Lamar Alexander (R)
4. Joe L. Evans (D)
5. Richard Fulton (D)
6. Robin L. Beard Jr. (R)*
7. Ed Jones (D)
8. Leon Kaye (D)

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman (D)
2. Charles Wilson (D)*
3. James M. Cullen (R)

4. Roy Roberts (D)
5. Alan Steelman (R)*
6. Olin E. Teague (D)
7. Bill Archer (R)
8. Bob Eckhardt (D)
9. Jock Brooks (D)
10. J. J. Pickle (D)
11. W. R. Poage (D)
12. Jim Wright (D)
13. Robert Price (R)
14. John Young (D)
15. Eligio de la Garza (D)
16. Richard C. White (D)
17. Omor Burleson (D)
18. Barbara C. Jordan (D)*
19. George Mahon (D)
20. Henry B. Gonzalez (D)
21. O. C. Fisher (D)
22. Bob Casey (D)
23. Abraham Kazen Jr. (D)
24. Dale Milford (D)*

UTAH

1. K. Gunn McKay (D)
2. Wayne Owens (D)*

VERMONT

Al Richard W. Mallory (R)

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing (D)
2. G. William Whitehurst (R)
3. David E. Salterfield III (D)
4. Robert W. Daniel Jr. (R)*
5. W. C. (Don) Daniel (D)
6. M. Caldwell Butler (R)*
7. J. Kenneth Robinson (R)
8. Stanford E. Parris (R)*
9. William C. Wompler (R)
10. Joel T. Broyhill (R)

WASHINGTON

1. John Hemplemann (D)*
2. Lloyd Meeds (D)
3. Julia Butler Hansen (D)
4. Mike McCormack (D)
5. Thomas S. Foley (D)
6. Floyd V. Hicks (D)
7. Brock Adams (D)

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert H. Mollohan (D)
2. Harley O. Staggers (D)
3. John M. Slack (D)
4. Ken Hechler (D)

WISCONSIN

1. Les Aspin (D)
2. Robert W. Kostensmeier (D)
3. Vernon W. Thomson (R)
4. Clement J. Zablocki (D)
5. Henry S. Reuss (D)
6. William A. Steiger (R)
7. David R. Obey (D)
8. Howard V. French (R)*
9. Glenn R. Davis (R)

WYOMING

Al Taft Hendrick (D)

SUMMARY OF MARGINAL 1974 RACES BY STATE

<u>STATE</u>	<u>MARGINAL GOVERNOR¹</u>	<u>MARGINAL SENATOR²</u>	<u>MARGINAL HOUSE³</u>
--------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

New England

Maine	Curtis (D) 50.1	-	#2R
New Hampshire	Thomson (R) 41.6	x	-
Vermont	x	x	-
Massachusetts	x	-	#4D, #5R, #12D
Rhode Island	Noel (D) 52.9	-	-
Connecticut	Meskill (R) 53.8	Ribicoff (D) 54.3	#3D, #5R

Middle Atlantic

New York	Rockefeller (R) 52.4	Javits (R) 49.8	#3R, #6D, #26R, #31R
New Jersey	x (1973)	-	#1R, #3D, #9D, #13D
Pennsylvania	x	Schweiker (R) 51.9	#4D, #25D
Delaware	-	-	-
Maryland	x	Mathias (R) 47.8	-
West Virginia	-	-	-

South

Virginia	Holton (R) 52.7 ('73)	-	#4R, #6R, #8R
North Carolina	-	x	#4D
South Carolina West (D)	51.7	x	#1D, #6R
Georgia	x	x	#5D
Alabama	x	x	#2R
Mississippi	-	-	#4R, #5R
Louisiana	-	x	#3R
Arkansas	x	x	-
Tennessee	Dunn (R) 52.0	-	#3R, #6R, #8R
Kentucky	-	Cook (R) 51.4	#6D
Texas	Briscoe (D) 48.1	-	#5R, #13R
Oklahoma	Hall (D) 48.4	Bellmon (R) 51.7	-
Florida	x	x	#4D, #5D

Midwest

Ohio	Gilligan (D) 54.2	Saxbe (R) 51.5	#8R, #16R, #23R
Indiana	-	Bayh (D) 51.7	#1D, #2R, #4D, #11R
Illinois	-	x	#10R, #11D, #21R
Michigan	Millikan (R) 50.4	-	#6R, #12D, #18R
Wisconsin	Lucey (D) 52.4	x	#3R, #8R
Minnesota	Anderson (D) 54.0	-	#6R
Iowa	x	Hughes (D) 50.2	#1D, #6R
Missouri	-	Eagleton (D) 51.1	#6D
Kansas	x	x	-
Nebraska	Exon (D) 53.8	-	-
South Dakota	x	McGovern (D) 56.3	"
North Dakota	-	x	"

<u>STATE</u>	<u>MARGINAL GOVERNOR¹</u>	<u>MARGINAL SENATOR²</u>	<u>MARGINAL HOUSE³</u>
<u>West</u>			
Montana	-	-	-
Wyoming	x	-	(At-Large)D
Idaho	Andrus (D) 52.2	x	-
Colorado	Love (R) 52.5	x	#1D, #4R
Utah	-	Bennett (R) 53.7	#2D
Nevada	O'Call'n (D) 48.1	Bible (D) 54.8	(At-Large)R
New Mexico	King (D) 51.3	-	-
Arizona	Williams (R) 50.9	x	#4R
California	Reagan (R) 52.8	Cranston (D) 51.8	#8D, #12R, #36R
Oregon	x	Packwood (R) 50.2	-
Washington	-	x	#1D, #4D
Alaska	Egan (D) 52.4	Gravel (D) 45.1	(At-Large)D
Hawaii	x	x	#1D

Notes

1 - Where names are listed, the incumbent received less than 55% of the vote in the last election. The symbol (x) indicates other states with gubernatorial election in 1973 or 1974. The symbol (-) means no gubernatorial race in the state.

2 - Same symbols as described in note #1.

3 - House districts where the winner in 1970 received 56.0% or less of the total vote.

* - Although Senator McGovern received more than 55% of the vote in South Dakota, he is considered potentially vulnerable after the 1972 Presidential race, and therefore included on the list of marginal seats.

PROJECTED OPERATING PLANFOR UPDATING THE DATA BASE

(All costs in thousands of dollars)

MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING FILES

<u>State and Activity</u>	<u>-Costs-</u>					<u>Total</u>
	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>		
California						
1974 (3 Cong. Dists)	-	6.0				
1976 (purchase new lists)			-	60.0	66.0	
Connecticut						
1974 (update entire state)*	-	7.5				
1976 " " "			-	7.5	15.0	
Illinois						
1974 (update entire state)*	-	15.0				
1976 " " "			-	15.0	30.0	
Maryland						
1974 (update entire state)*	-	6.5				
1976 " " "			-	6.5	13.0	
Michigan						
1974 (get list from Donnelley)*	-	15.0				
1976 " " "			-	15.0	30.0	
New Jersey						
1974 (update 4 CD's)	-	8.0				
1976 (update entire state)			-	25.0	33.0	
Ohio						
1974 (update entire state)*	-	20.0				
1976 (update entire state)			-	20.0	40.0	
Pennsylvania						
1974 (update entire state)*	-	30.0				
1976 (update entire state)			-	30.0	60.0	
Texas						
1974 (update 2 CD's)	-	4.0				
1976 (update entire state)			-	32.0	36.0	
Totals to maintain existing lists:	—	—	—	—	—	—
	0	112.0	0	211.0	323.0	
Costs if candidates in states denoted by asterisk (*) pay one half the cost of updating lists.		<u>65.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>211.0</u>	<u>276.0</u>	

PROJECTED OPERATING PLAN
FOR ADDING NEW STATES AND CONG. DISTS. IN 1974

<u>Full States (Races of Interest)</u>	<u>Cost (\$ thousands)</u>
Indiana (Senate, 4 CD)*	50.0
South Dakota (Senate, 1CD)*	15.0
Nevada (1 CD) (possibly Sen. or Gov.)	7.5
Alaska (Senate, House)	5.0
Kentucky (Senate)* (1 CD)	50.0
Oklahoma (Senate)*	37.5
Iowa (Senate)* (2 CD)	25.0
Wyoming (House)	5.0
Oregon (Senate)* (data on tape from state)	5.0
Virginia (3 CD) (data on tape from state)	1.0
 Total	 <u>201.0</u>
Total if statewide candidates denoted by asterisk (*) pay one half the cost of updating the lists in those states	<u>110.0</u>

Marginal Congressional Districts in states 160.0
not having full data in the system.
 (It is estimated that each CD will cost
\$5 thousand to put into the system.
There are 32 such districts. The remaining
36 of the 68 target districts discussed in
the text of the memo are accounted for in
states where the total state has been
put in the Data Base)

The states, and number of districts in
each are as follows:

Maine (1); Massachusetts (3); New York (4);
North Carolina (1); South Carolina (2);
Georgia (1); Alabama (1); Mississippi (2);
Tennessee (3); Louisiana (1); Florida (2);
Wisconsin (2); Minnesota (1); Missouri (1);
Colorado (2); Utah (1); Arizona (1);
Washington (2); Hawaii (1).

MAINTENANCE AND USE OF THE DATA BASE

PROJECTED OPERATING STATEMENT

(NO INCOME INCLUDED)

<u>Expense Items</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>Total</u>
Data Base Maintenance ¹	-	65,000	-	211,000	276,000
Project Administration ²	60,000	90,000	60,000	90,000	300,000
Computer Programming	20,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	140,000
Research and Development	20,000	30,000	30,000	10,000	90,000
Data Base Expansion ¹	-	270,000	-	-	270,000
Totals	<u>100,000</u>	<u>495,000</u>	<u>130,000</u>	<u>351,000</u>	<u>1,076,000</u>

Notes

1 - See detail of cost by states in Tab F.

2 - Includes salary of General Manager, office space and supplies, secretary, programmers.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 9, 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR:

MR. HALDEMAN

FROM:

W. RICHARD HOWARD

SUBJECT:

Action Plan for the Data Base

Purpose:

The purpose of this memorandum is to present a plan for the utilization of the CREP data base and the volunteer/contributor files developed for "Operation Thank You." Since the election, the CREP staff has scattered and no formal arrangements have been made with respect to maintenance and utilization of the multi-million dollar voter data base. Several sets of labels have been printed and copies of data tapes have been disseminated without official approval.

This data base can be of immediate benefit in our efforts to communicate with the New American Majority. At the direction of the President, it can be of use to support Republican candidates in 1973, 1974, and 1976. If properly maintained, through periodic use and updating, it will increase in value, and become a significant tool for selected congressional and local candidates, as well as offset the cost of several million dollars for developing another data base for the 1976 Presidential elections.

This plan is presented as follows:

Description of the Data Base
Functional Use of the Data Base
Potential Uses of the Data Base
Coverage for the 1973-1974 Elections
Coverage for the 1976 Elections
Plan for the 1976 Presidential Election
Recommendations:

- #1 - Disposition of the Data Base
- #2 - Data Base Operation
- #3 - Maintenance of the Data Base
- #4 - Data Base Budget

For each of the recommendations, objections to the methods are outlined and selected alternatives are discussed.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA BASE

The CREP Voter Identification Data Base contains names, addresses, socio-economic, geo-coding and political attitude data on approximately 40 million voters in 12 states, including 8 million voters favorable to President Nixon.

States with complete coverage are:

- California
- Connecticut
- Illinois
- Maryland
- New Jersey
- New York
- Ohio
- Pennsylvania
- Texas

States with records of Republicans only are three additional states which conduct Presidential Primaries:

- Florida
- New Hampshire
- Wisconsin

For each voter record the following data is recorded:

Name and address
Household member names
Party registration
Attitude toward R. M. Nixon
Socio-economic level
Age group
Military veteran status
Ethnic Name category
Periferal urban ethnic indicator
Neighborhood type
Complete geo-coding such as precinct, ward, district, census track, zip code

In addition to the CREP Voter Identification, Data Base described above, we have developed data files for "Operation Thank You" in a compatible format which contains names and address records of CREP and GOP staffers (3,000), Campaign volunteers (300,000), and contributors of over \$100 (30,000). The RNC maintains a listing of 450,000 ethnic, civic, and special group leaders and members. The RNFC maintains 600,000 records of contributors of less than \$100.

FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE DATA BASE

During the 1972 Presidential primaries and in the general election, the Voter I.D. Data Base was used as an information systems tool to support the following campaign functions:

Political Direct Mail:
issue persuasion
volunteer recruitment
contribution solicitation

Voter Identification:
walking canvass sheets
tele center call sheets
hostess-business call sheets

Voter Information Feed Back:
Nixon attitude
other candidates
important issues
volunteer

Voter Influence:
undecided mailings
get out the vote telegrams
poll watching sheets
victory squad sheets

POTENTIAL USES OF THE DATA BASE

In addition to the previous uses made of the data base, there are several potential uses which should be developed.

#1 Developing Prospect List for GOP Fund Raising :

By selecting Republicans in higher income groups favorable to President Nixon, an excellent prospect list could be developed and tested. Bob Odell of the RNC Finance Committee has requested Jim White (our consultant) to look into the cost and feasibility of this. In addition, we have a file of local CREP contributors which RNC does not have.

#2 Issue Polling and Voter Sampling :

Selected samples of voter types can easily be retrieved for the telephone or direct mail polling for reaction to national issues.

#3 Support 1974 and 1976 Congressional Elections.

For approved candidates, we can provide direct mail labels, by voter types within a congressional district, and for the total state. For candidates running in key races, we can arrange to have canvass sheets, telephone sheets, advertising, fund raising, direct mail, and poll-watching sheets provided through a source other than the Republican Party, but using our Data Base and programs.

#4 Substantive Election Results Analysis:

Using the voter I. D. 's data, we can select voter types for questionnaire surveys at the precinct level.

#5 Advance Men Support:

The data base can be used to recruit known volunteers and local leaders to promote rally, parade, etc., turnouts for candidates or the President. Advanced announcements and reminders can be mailed by locality and by voter type .

DATA BASE COVERAGE FOR THE 1973-1974 ELECTIONS

As presently constructed, the data base can be used to support the 1973 Governor's race in New Jersey. With an adequate maintenance program, we can support up to 290 candidates in the 1974 congressional and governors' races plus various other local races as desired by the President and the RNC.

We have good state voter records for the following 1974 races:

California

Senate - Cranston - D
Governor - Reagan - R
House - 43

Connecticut

Senate - Ribicoff - D
Governor - Meskill - R
House - 6

Illinois

House - 24

Maryland

Senate - Mathias - R
Governor - Mandel - D
House - 8

New Jersey

House - 15

Ohio

Senate - Saxbe - R
Governor - Gilligan - D
House - 23

Pennsylvania

Senate - Sweiker - R
Governor - Shapp - D
House - 25

Texas

Governor - Briscoe - D
House - 24

We have incomplete voter files for the following state elections:

Florida (Republicans in large counties)

Senate - Gurney - R
Governor - Askew - D
House - 15

Massachusetts (Republicans only)

Governor - Sargent - R
House - 12

New Hampshire (Republicans only)

Senate - Cotton - R
Governor - Peterson - R
House - 2

New York (Selected Counties)

Senate - Javits - R
Governor - Rockefeller - R
House - 39

Wisconsin (Republicans only)

Senate - Nelson - D
Governor - Lucey - D
House - 9

Virginia (Selected counties)

Governor - Holton - R
House - 10

DATA BASE COVERAGE FOR THE 1976 ELECTIONS

If the Data Base is adequately maintained from 1973-1976, we can support at least 175 candidates in the 1976 congressional and state races as well as a Presidential candidate in the primaries and general election.

By 1976, we should be able to support Republican candidates in these major congressional and state elections:

California

Senator - Tunney - D
House - 43

Connecticut

Senate - Weicker - R
House - 6

Illinois

Senate - Stevenson - D
Governor - D
House - 24

Maryland

Senate - Beall - R
House - 8

New Jersey

Senate - Williams - D
House - 15

Ohio

Senate - Taft - R
House - 23

Pennsylvania

Senate - Scott - R
House - 23

Texas

Senate - Bentsen - D
House - 24

With the recommended expansion of the data base we could support another 120 GOP candidates in congressional and state contests plus provide strengthened primary races.

In addition to the above states, we should consider expanding the data base for 1976 to include the following states:

- Florida expand from Republicans in major counties to all voters due to consistent ticket-splitting and new support for GOP candidates locally by Democrats.
- Indiana At minimum we should include Republicans due to some key races and coming Republican candidates.
- Massachusetts Should be expanded from just Republicans to all voters.
- Michigan We have no list of Michigan - we had to lease a mailing house list in 1972 and return it.
- New Hampshire We need to have the best possible data for the '76 primary.
- New York We need to work closely with the GOP in New York to develop a better list.
- Tennessee We have some coming candidates and growing areas for the GOP.
- Wisconsin We need to expand and improve our GOP voters list for the '76 primary.
- Virginia The state is paying to develop the list which we can purchase and maintain in conjunction with the state GOP.

PLAN FOR THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

If the data base is properly maintained during the 1973-1976 period, it will be a valuable tool in electing a Republican president in 1976. Since the key states will not be changed drastically, and the emerging political technology of direct mail, telephone and walking canvass, voter identification, and get out the vote will not be much different from the CREP operation in 1972, we will have an edge going into the '76 campaign with an adequate data base to support these programs. The major difference between the 1972 and 1976 campaigns is that the GOP candidate may not be certain until after the convention. However, planning and development for utilization of the data base must begin at least one year before the general election in order to properly integrate the direct mail, canvass and telephone operations. Thus, while we are planning and designing our programs (as did CREP) in early 1976, the RNC may have to supply mailing labels to any GOP candidate in the primaries who can afford to pay RNC for them.

On the other hand, should a candidate warrant the unofficial support of the President, we would encourage this candidate to contract with the RNC data base support company to provide direct mail support, canvass sheets, polling, telephone sheets, volunteer recruitment, advance event advertising, and the telegrams, etc.

After the GOP convention, an agreement can be negotiated between the successful candidate, the RNC, the White House and the computer support organization, concerning the future use of the data base.

RECOMMENDATION #1

Data Base Disposition

That the Republican National Committee be given title to the data base with the written understanding that it may only be utilized under the stipulations explained in the Operating Plan (see Recommendation #2), i.e., White House approval of use, Washington base operation and maintenance, general mailing monitoring, break even cost to the GOP candidates, etc.

APPROVE _____

DISAPPROVE _____

Alternative #1 Corporate Form

A general business or non-profit corporation could be formed to hold title and operate the data base.

Disadvantages

1. Would not necessarily strengthen the GOP candidates or the RNC.
2. White House and RNC lose control unless the White House secretly controls the operation. This would present a real problem if and when the secret control was discovered.
3. The major problem with corporate form is raised by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. The Act prohibits any contribution to a political party by a corporation. It would be argued that the sales of data are bargain sales resulting in contributions to the Republican Party and therefore prohibited by the Act.
4. Additional problems are raised if the corporation is dissolved. Any distribution of the data at that time to the Republican Party would be a direct contribution of property under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. Accordingly, the corporation could not be dissolved by distributing the property to the Republican National Committee or an individual candidate.
5. In addition to the above problems under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, there would be potential

tax liability on dissolution. The normal rule is that a shareholder receives a capital gain when the property is distributed on dissolution; equal to the difference between the fair market value of the property and the shareholder's basis in the corporation.

Alternative #2 - Unincorporated Committee

1. The data could be retained by CREP or transferred to a similar unincorporated committee. This form would avoid any problems under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. This would not help strengthen the GOP and we would not have direct control.
2. The major disadvantage of this form is the lack of limited liability. The members of the committee would be individually liable for contracts. From a tax standpoint, the committee would be structured in a form that would be taxable either as a trust or corporation in order for any tax to be on the committee. This would avoid individual tax liability on the members of the committee.

Alternative #3 - Unincorporated Trust

The data base could be placed in trust for the RNC.

Disadvantages

1. The trust would be basically self-defeating since the RNC would be the benefactor, however, RNC and the White House would lose direct control to the trustees.
2. While the trust is not subject to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, such organizations may become subject to future legislation.
3. The profitable sales of labels, etc., by the trust would be taxable.
4. Accumulated income of the trust would be taxable.
5. The trust could have limited life with all of the inherent difficulties of the dissolutionment.

Specific Recommended Actions

1. That a letter be sent to U. C. C. indicating the designated represen-

tative of the President for all data base items. Since all of the Political Direct Mail and computer staff of the CREP have terminated with CREP, I recommend that our representative be either Kathleen Balsdon or Mr. Jim White(former CREP staff), who is our computer consultant. Either way, Jim is our expert in residence and would be responsible for management of the data base project.

APPROVE _____

DISAPPROVE _____

2. That the remaining assets of the computer data base which consist of extra tapes, tape racks, etc., be swapped with U.C.C. for future services including shipping the data base and further documentation of the data base. A draft contract for the desired services has been prepared.

APPROVE _____

DISAPPROVE _____

3. That the RNC arrange a suitable area for storage of a duplicate copy of the data tapes at RNC Headquarters under secure conditions.

APPROVE _____

DISAPPROVE _____

RECOMMENDATION #2

The proposed operating plan is dependent upon the approval of recommendation #1 concerning the disposition of the data base, and the approval of the budget as recommended.

The Republican National Committee will provide mailing labels or computer letter services at break even cost to any Republican candidate with the stipulation that all returned mail will be supplied for data base maintenance and that a representative will be allowed to "monitor" the use of the mailing labels.

During 1973 and early 1974, we can utilize our labels to generate some direct mail of non-political materials under the franking privilege for incumbent congressmen to help make their seats safe for the 1974 elections. This will also allow more thorough maintenance of the data for each state.

Any other use of the data base must be approved by the President (or his designated representative) upon the written explanation of the proposed use. Thus, no candidate may use the data base for

canvass sheets, poll watching, etc., without written approval from the White House.

Since the RNC does not have a computer facility nor a professional computer systems staff and no one at RNC is familiar with the data base, it must be maintained by persons who are thoroughly familiar with its coding, structure, and use. Furthermore, we have found that the White House or the RNC would have much better control of the data base and attain much more responsive service if the data base was operated here in Washington by persons who have demonstrated an understanding of responsiveness to the RNC and the White House.

All revenue from the sales of mailing labels to candidates will be applied against the maintenance cost and hopefully in the long run period will offset the total maintenance expense.

Any changes, additions, and/or deletions to the data base will be approved in writing by the RNC and the White House representative.

Recommendation

That the operation of the data base be managed as outlined above.

APPROVE _____ DISAPPROVE _____

RECOMMENDATION #3

Data Base Maintenance

That maintenance of the data base be accomplished by stipulating that all users of the list must agree to provide returned mail and that the RNC computer support organization will work with the RNC and local GOP county chairmen to obtain listings of additional voters. It is anticipated that within the four year period, the sales of labels to candidates will offset the cost of list maintenance.

APPROVE _____ DISAPPROVE _____

The maintenance of the data base encompasses many operations. These

include adding new voter names, deleting obsolete voter names, correcting records, changing portions of records and editing all of the changes. Data preparation and maintenance should be conducted for the RNC by the computer support organization. It is important that specific states be updated prior to key elections in those states.

According to the operating plan one of the stipulations for use of the data base mailing lists is that all undeliverable return mail be provided for list purging. By making the mailing labels available to Republican Senators, Congressmen, and Governors, and local officials under our monitorship, we should obtain adequate mail returns for list maintenance.

The RNC will have to work with local GOP county chairmen to obtain lists of newly registered voters. This was done successfully in obtaining lists for the CREP project. California is an exception since the Secretary of State provides updated lists.

Additional list updates can be purchased from organizations such as the telephone companies and mailing firms at a nominal cost.

Alternative #1

If the data base is not adequately maintained for the next four years, a new data base will have to be developed for 1976. This is not feasible since the cost would be excessive and since the RNC would have great difficulty getting cooperation from local officers due to loyalties to several Presidential candidates. To try to develop a data base after the convention is an impossible task.

Alternative #2

Another alternative would be to scrap the data base and let the 1976 Presidential candidate contract with mailing firms to do direct mail from an "occupant" list, and conduct canvassing with cold canvass forms. Needless to say, this is a step backward.

RECOMMENDATION #4

Operating Budget

The operating budget is illustrated at three alternative funding levels. Level 1 is a bare bones funding level for continuous data base maintenance, but no data base expansion. Level 2, provides for expansion of the data base into five additional key states which we do not now have an adequate data base. Also, a moderate research and development effort is funded to seek methods of cost cutting without impairing responsiveness. Level 3 provides funding for data base expansion into eleven additional states and the R&D budget.

All of the cost figures are based upon break even cost levels for computer services, in order to provide labels to candidates at the lowest possible costs.

Recommendation

That the proposed project be funded at Level 2, with an allocation of \$200,000 from remaining CREP funds. The cash flow, audit, and financial reporting arrangements should be administered through the Republican National Finance Committee.

Additional funding needed for 1975 and 1976 would be funded through RNC after submittal of financial statements and revised budget projections.

APPROVE _____

DISAPPROVE _____

Alternative Level 1 - (See Table 1)

The lowest alternative budget provides for funding the maintenance of the present data base with no data base expansion or improvement over the next four years. Income is based upon minimum sales of labels and \$30,000 of surplus property at U.C.C. remaining from the campaign. Expense items are for data base updating, project administration, label printing and computer programming.

This funding level is not recommended because we need to expand the data base to cover the presidential primary in Michigan and all voters in Florida, New York, and Indiana. The State of Virginia is computerizing their voter lists and they will be available at minimum cost.

Alternative Level 2 - (See Table 2)

This alternative level of funding is similar to Level 1 except that it provides for expansion of the data base in Michigan, Florida, New York, Indiana, and Virginia. It also provides for a \$20,000 per year R&D budget to lower our cost.

This funding level is recommended with the approach that we need more complete coverage in Michigan, New York and Florida. Indiana is needed for some key races in '74 and '76, and because 5 of the 11 Congressional seats are marginal, 3 Democrat and 2 Republican. Virginia is naturally a no cost inclusion and does have 4 marginal Congressional seats held by Republicans. The return on the investment of \$146,000 for this expansion will be several new seats and significant aid in holding some marginal seats.

Alternative Level 3 - (See Table 3)

The highest of the projected budgets provides for significant expansion of the data base. In addition to the five states included in level 2, it provides for inclusion of Missouri, Minnesota, Georgia, Tennessee, Washington and Oregon.

This funding level was not recommended for several reasons. Although the costs of including these six states might be significantly offset by additional sales of labels, they are not considered key states. After discussions with Jim White, I feel that if we desire to do so, he may be able to expand into the larger counties of some of these states with money which has been saved through cost reduction. The question is, would we want to apply cost savings to lowering the price of labels to candidates or to expansion into new states? We will conduct a study of the cost of including the larger counties in every state with nine or more electoral votes.



Projected Budget - Level 1

<u>Income Items</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>Total</u>
Label Sales	\$120,000	\$480,000	\$200,000	\$640,000	\$1,440,000
Surplus Property	30,000				30,000
	<u>150,000</u>	<u>480,000</u>	<u>200,000</u>	<u>640,000</u>	<u>1,470,000</u>
<u>Expense Items</u>					
Data Base Maintenance	50,000	250,000	200,000	100,000	600,000
Project Administration	60,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	300,000
Label Printing	60,000	240,000	100,000	320,000	720,000
Computer Programming	20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
	<u>190,000</u>	<u>580,000</u>	<u>390,000</u>	<u>510,000</u>	<u>1,670,000</u>
<u>Deficit</u>	<u>(\$40,000)</u>	<u>(\$100,000)</u>	<u>(\$190,000)</u>	<u>\$130,000</u>	<u>(\$200,000)</u>

Table 1 - Projected Budget : Alternative Level 1



Projected Budget - Level 2

<u>Income Items</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Label Sales - Old D. B.	\$120,000	\$480,000	\$200,000	\$640,000	\$1,440,000
Label Sales - Expanded D. B.		80,000	24,000	180,000	284,000
Surplus Property	30,000				30,000
	<u>150,000</u>	<u>560,000</u>	<u>224,000</u>	<u>820,000</u>	<u>1,754,000</u>
<u>Expense Items</u>					
Data Base Maintenance	50,000	160,000	180,000	200,000	590,000
Project Administration	60,000	90,000	90,000	120,000	360,000
Label Printing	60,000	240,000	112,000	400,000	812,000
Computer Programming	20,000	40,000	20,000	40,000	120,000
Research & Development	20,000	20,000	20,000	15,000	75,000
	<u>210,000</u>	<u>550,000</u>	<u>422,000</u>	<u>775,000</u>	<u>1,957,000</u>
<u>List Expansion</u>					
Michigan		15,000			15,000
Florida		30,000			30,000
New York		60,000			60,000
Indiana		40,000			40,000
Virginia		1,000			1,000
		<u>146,000</u>			<u>146,000</u>
<u>Deficit</u>	<u>(\$60,000)</u>	<u>(\$136,000)</u>	<u>(\$198,000)</u>	<u>+\$45,000</u>	<u>(\$349,000)</u>

Table 2 - Projected Budget: Alternative Level 2



Projected Budget - Level 3

<u>Income Items</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Label Sales - Old D. B.	\$120,000	\$480,000	\$200,000	\$640,000	\$1,440,000
Label Sales - Expanded D. B.		80,000	40,000	310,000	430,000
Surplus	30,000				30,000
	<u>150,000</u>	<u>560,000</u>	<u>240,000</u>	<u>950,000</u>	<u>1,900,000</u>
<u>Expense Items</u>					
Data Base Maintenance	50,000	160,000	210,000	210,000	630,000
Project Administration	60,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	330,000
Label Printing	60,000	240,000	120,000	425,000	845,000
Computer Programming	20,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	140,000
Research & Development	20,000	30,000	30,000	10,000	90,000
	<u>210,000</u>	<u>560,000</u>	<u>490,000</u>	<u>775,000</u>	<u>2,035,000</u>
<u>Data Base Expansion</u>					
Michigan		15,000			15,000
Florida		30,000			30,000
New York		60,000			60,000
Indiana		40,000			40,000
Virginia		1,000			1,000
Missouri			16,000		16,000
Minnesota			14,000		14,000
Georgia			12,000		12,000
Tennessee			12,000		12,000
Washington			10,000		10,000
Oregon			5,000		5,000
	<u>146,000</u>	<u>69,000</u>			<u>215,000</u>
<u>Deficit</u>	<u>(\$60,000)</u>	<u>(\$146,000)</u>	<u>(\$319,000)</u>	<u>+\$175,000</u>	<u>(\$350,000)</u>

Table 3 - Projected Budget: Alternative Level 3



DATA BASE INDEX

Title	Count
<u>Category A - Voters Lists</u>	
A-1 California Voters	
A-2 Connecticut Voters	
A-3 Florida Republican Voters	
A-4 Illinois Voters	
A-5 Maryland Voters	
A-6 New Hampshire Republican Voters	
A-7 New Jersey Voters	
A-8 New York Voters	
A-9 Ohio Voters	
A-10 Pennsylvania Voters	
A-11 Texas Voters	
A-12 Wisconsin Republican Voters	
<u>Category B - Contributors</u>	
B-1 Contributors \$100-999 FCREP	16,253
B-2 Contributors \$100-999 Rep. Con. Comm.	7,413
B-3 Contributors \$1,000 FCREP	3,560
B-4 Contributors above \$1,000 FCREP	3,200
B-5 Direct Mail Contributors - Rep.	
B-6 Direct Mail Contributors - Demo.	
B-7 Contributors - Florida Primary	
B-8 Primary contributors - New Hampshire	601
B-9 Primary contributors - Michigan	459
B-10 Contributors to local CREP	
B-11 Primary contributors - Maryland	77
B-12 Primary contributors - Wisconsin	850
B-13 Sustaining contributors - spec. list	
<u>Category C - Volunteers</u>	
C-1 Local CREP volunteers	90,237
C-2 CREP telephone center volunteers	31,381
C-3 CREP telephone center supervisors	2,682
C-4 State CREP volunteers	
C-5 Washington CREP volunteers	113
C-6 RNC Washington volunteers	310

Title	Count
C-7 Rep. primary volunteers	
C-8 Volunteers - hostess-business	2,228
C-9 Hosts & Hostesses for Nixon	190
C-10 Rep. Direct Mail Volunteers	
C-11 Primary volunteers - Florida	5,033
C-12 Primary volunteers - New Hampshire	257
C-13 Primary volunteers - Michigan	849
C-14 Direct Mail contributors - Demo.	
C-15 Primary volunteers - Maryland	8,053
C-16 Primary volunteers - Wisconsin	1,485

Category D - Campaign Staff, Political Chairmen & Leaders

D-1 State CREP Committee members	137
D-2 State CREP staff	591
D-3 State CREP top 6 performers	367
D-4 CREP - Wash. staff directors	
D-5 CREP - Wash. staff	375
D-6 RNC - Wash. staff directors	184
D-7 RNC - Wash. staff	
D-8 County/Reg. Rep. and CREP Chairmen	3,907
D-9 Hostess/Business Chairmen	1,106
D-10 State Press staff	90
D-11 CREP officers	
D-12 County finance chairmen	
D-13 County Republican chairmen	
D-14 Ballot Security	
D-15 State Finance Committee	
D-16 Asst. to Ballot Security Chairman	
D-17 Ballot security lawyers	
D-18 Women leaders for Nixon	
D-19 GOP convention delegates '72	1,189
D-20 GOP alternate delegates '72	1,178
D-21 Cal. campaign - Anne Graham	215
D-22 Cal. speakers - Anne Graham	419
D-23 European Committee Chairmen	
D-24 City Chairmen for Nixon	533
D-25 Special Ballots directors	1
D-26 State CREP staff	165
D-27 CREP state chairmen	28
D-28 CREP co-chairmen	27
D-29 CREP vice chairmen	3
D-30 CREP exec. directors	23
D-31 Hutar co-chairmen list	28

Title	Count
D-32 Hutar volunteer chairmen list	36
D-33 Hutar Advisory List	148
D-34 CREP county chairmen	385
D-35 CREP state & local surrogates	560
D-36 Nat'l Comm. members	165
D-37 State Central Comm. Chairmen	60
D-38 State Central Comm. Vice Chairmen	111
D-39 County Chairmen	3,707
D-40 State Exec. Comm. members	93
D-41 County vice chairmen	2,146
D-42 Campaign surrogates	31
D-43 Economic spokesmen	7
D-44 CREP state chairmen	8
D-45 Women spokesmen for Admin.	36
D-46 CREP youth field staff	7
D-47 Nixonette Chairmen - general	446
D-48 Nixonette key list	21

Category E - Nationalities/Ethnics

E-1 Ethnics - undefined	147
E-2 Spanish-speaking	
E-3 Jewish	
E-4 Catholics	
E-5 Black voters	
E-6 Nationalities/Heritage	
E-7 Latin Americans	20
E-8 Korean Americans	1
E-9 Latvian Americans	39
E-10 Lebanese Americans	2
E-11 Lithuanian Americans	29
E-12 Polish Americans	39
E-13 Puerto Rican Americans	1
E-14 Rumanian Americans	15
E-15 Russian Americans	15
E-16 Scandinavian Americans	14
E-17 Serbian Americans	12
E-18 Silesian Americans	2
E-19 Slovak Americans	6
E-20 Slovenian Americans	16
E-21 Thai Americans	3
E-22 Ukrainian Americans	63
E-23 Spanish-speaking	1,087
E-24 Mexican American Comm	
E-25 Mexican Americans CREP	114

Title	Count
E-26 Ethnic/nationalities leaders	4
E-27 Albanian Americans	4
E-28 Arabic Americans	2
E-29 Armenian Americans	14
E-30 Bohemian Americans	1
E-31 Byelorussian Americans	34
E-32 Bulgarian Americans	11
E-33 Chinese Americans	26
E-34 Cossack Americans	3
E-35 Croatian Americans	9
E-36 Cuban Americans	9
E-37 Czech Americans	8
E-38 Estonian Americans	16
E-39 Filipino Americans	20
E-40 French Americans	1
E-41 German Americans	47
E-42 Greek Americans	13
E-43 Hungarian Americans	70
E-44 Indian Americans	1
E-45 Irish Americans	5
E-46 Italian Americans	51
E-47 Japanese Americans	152
E-48 Jewish field leaders	67
E-49 Chinese Americans	100
E-50 Ethnics/Nationalities	13
E-51 Spanish-speaking state chairmen	18
E-52 Black state chairmen	27
E-53 Black dinner participants	40
E-54 Black dinner participants volunteering to speak	535
E-55 Black Steering Committee	80
E-56 Black surrogates	16

Category F - New American Majority - Other Categories

F-1	Volunteers - local Democrats	
F-2	Youth for Nixon	4, 573
F-3	Older Americans	173
F-4	Veterans	30
F-5	Farm families - ranchers	73
F-6	labor leaders	301
F-7	Veteranse leaders	98
F-8	State farm chairmen	54
F-9	Key agricultural volunteers	59
F-10	County farm chairmen	661

Title	Count
F-11 Agri-business leaders	26
F-12 State farm committees	412
F-13 Veterans	
F-14 Veterans speakers	28
F-15 Democrats for Nixon	76
F-16 Veterans state chairmen	57
F-17 Veterans - card list	248
F-18 Older volunteers - state	
F-19 Democrat supporters	1,386
F-20 Farmers CREP	71
F-21 Labor Task Force - CREP	41
F-22 Older American state chairmen	52
F-23 Veterans for Re-election	75
F-24 Older American county chairmen	15
F-25 Senior Voters for Action	38
F-26 Demo. VIP's favorable	22
F-27 Demo. contributors - Nixon	1
F-28 Demo. volunteers - DFN	2,319
F-29 Demo. vice chairmen - DFN	15
F-30 Farmers for Nixon state chairmen	136
F-31 Student fieldmen	104
F-32 Young voters	38
F-33 Youth spokesmen	600
F-34 College organizations for Nixon	138
F-35 State youth convention directors	64
F-36 College directors for Nixon	40

Category G - Citizens Groups

G-1 Lawyers for Nixon	108
G-2 Physicians for Nixon	1
G-3 Citizens	211
G-4 Lawyers	38
G-5 Business & Industry leaders	61
G-6 State Citizens Comm.	73
G-7 Optometrists	11
G-8 Business women	
G-9 Physicians & health professors - favorable	
G-10 Physicians CREP	70
G-11 Dentists CREP	72
G-12 Farmers CREP	71
G-13 Regional business and industrial leaders	23
G-14 State business and industrial leaders	75
G-15 Lawyers for Re-election	176

Title	Count
G-16 Citizens state directors	46
G-17 Architects & Engineers - favorable	43
G-18 Environmentalists/Professionals	7
G-19 Veterinarians	67
G-20 Pharmacists	50
G-21 Motorcyclists	57
G-22 Community leaders	54
G-23 High performance Industry leaders	55
G-24 Optometrists	60
G-25 CPA's	58
G-26 New car dealers	55
G-27 Insurance agents	47
G-28 Travel agents	58
G-29 Real estate brokers	59
G-30 Life underwriters	70
G-31 Petroleum marketers	47
G-32 Hair dressers	57
G-33 Savings & Loan execs.	47
C-34 Securities industry execs.	40
G-35 Volunteer firemen	16
G-36 Mutual savings bank execs.	7
G-37 Hot rodders	56
G-38 Business & industry leaders	4, 287
G-39 Young Lawyers Adv. Comm.	50
G-40 Lawyers Nat'l. Adv. Comm.	28
G-41 Lawyers State Comm.	368

Category H - VIP's, Local Politicians, Athletes, Celebrities

H-1	VIP list - Republicans	
H-2	VIP list - Democrats	
H-3	Misc. VIP list	111
H-4	Athletes for the President	496
H-5	Celebrities - Secretaries	4
H-6	Favorable mayors	
H-7	Favorable state legislators	
H-8	Favorable athletes and sports execs.	132
H-9	State legislators	25
H-10	Favorable mayors	40
H-11	Favorable county officials	19