

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
39	1	06/24/1968	Memo	To Chapin, Mitchell, Stans, Haldeman, Flanigan, Kleindienst, Garment from Ellsworth Re: Notes on strategy and tactics through November 5. 23 pages
39	1	06/24/1968	Report	Appendix A to memo dated 6/24/1968. 18 pages

June 24, 1968

Reading

MEMORANDUM

TO: DC
Mitchell
Stans
✓ Haldeman
Flanigan
Kleindienst
Garment

FROM: Ellsworth

RE: Notes on Strategy and Tactics through November 5.

This is an up-dated revision of my memo of June 9, revised to reflect the substantial changes in public opinion reported in the Gallup Poll of June 10, and a staff reassessment of states.

SUMMARY: The campaign in 1968 has become a national campaign in a more complete sense than ever before. The old politics of regional geographical campaigns, and the old politics of ideological and class campaigns, have to a substantial extent given way to the new politics of media campaigning (as suggested in the Haldeman memorandum of 1967) with tactics based on demographic analysis.

One of the deep running currents in American politics today is the demand for a change in leadership: the opening theme of the Nixon campaign, the Johnson abdication, the Kennedy and McCarthy campaigns (netting some 75% of the vote in recent Democratic primaries), and the Wallace campaign -- all give evidence of this current. One

effect of the RFK killing and TV coverage is to heighten the sense that the "ins" have failed to govern effectively and to intensify the pressure for changes in policies and leadership.

Assuming that Nixon and Humphrey* are the nominees of the two major parties, Wallace would be the main competitor against Nixon for the votes of those who desire substantial change. In addition, Wallace will tap a substantial regional popularity in the South, plus the residual racism of the South, plus whatever white backlash may have been generated in recent years in the rest of the country.

Given the nationwide character of the "new politics" campaign that is indicated this year, it remains that the President has to be elected (according to the Constitution) by the electoral college. This means that local and regional factors must be taken into account, that the demography of the principal states has to be read and accounted for, and that the Wallace candidacy has a double potential for mischief: in that Wallace may win a substantial number (27 or more) of electoral votes, and in that he might drain off enough "we want a change", anti-Humphrey and white backlash votes in several states to deprive Nixon of electoral votes by throwing those states to Humphrey.

* A source close to Secretary Fowler says LBJ will now accept a draft at the Convention.

In thinking about campaign tactics, it is also necessary to keep in mind that we will have 25 candidates for Senate seats (including incumbents running for reelection) who appear to have a reasonable chance of winning. All of those votes in the Senate will be important to Nixon as President.

The foregoing points: (1) the national quality of the election campaign, (2) the electoral college effect, and (3) the Senate candidates effect -- are analysed in some detail on the following pages, and at the end the campaign efforts -- budget, non-candidate efforts, the Vice Presidential candidate's effort and the Presidential candidate's effort -- are assessed in light of the entire analysis.

I. The campaign in 1968 has become a national campaign in a more complete sense than ever before. The old politics of regional geographical campaigns and the old politics of ideological and class campaigns, have to a substantial extent given way to the new politics of media campaigning with tactics based on demographic analysis.

Politicians tend to think in terms of states or geographical regions, and while it is necessary to take account of regions and states later, it is better to start with a look at the national electorate. It may be a truism that the American people have become homogenized, but it is certainly true that television and other national media, together with the great mobility of large numbers of the working class (not to mention the sales, business and professional classes) -- all accelerated and strengthened by mass college education -- have made Presidential politics genuinely national.

In fact, Presidential politics today are to a large extent non-partisan. When George Gallup talks about the Republican Party being a third party (43% Democrats, 30% Independents, and 27% Republicans) he is ^{not} talking about ^{in Presidential elections.} how people vote. The fact is, both parties are minority parties in terms of Presidential politics in the United

States -- and have been since World War II. In the last 5 Presidential elections, the Democrats have received a majority of the popular vote only once -- in 1964. Moreover, when all the votes cast for President in the last 5 elections are added up, the Democrats come out with 49.6%, the Republicans with 49.1% and others with 1.3%.

Thus: modern mass media permit -- even require -- a truly national Presidential campaign. On historical form the two major Presidential candidates can expect to have an equal chance at winning, regardless of their party identification, and the politically potent issues appear to be genuinely nationwide.

That being the case, what are some of the nationwide demographic groupings in which the Nixon candidacy may be expected to have strength, and where may problem areas expect to be encountered? How large are these different groups in terms of votes? Answers to these questions are important so that the campaign can be designed to emphasize the appeal to and build up the vote turn-out in the strong groups, largely through organizational efforts -- and at the same time design appeals to the problem areas for the purpose of minimizing antagonisms and emphasizing possible positive appeals. No accurate study has been made in this area; one is needed.

In a rough and preliminary way, we have developed a highly speculative analysis, based on the June 1968 Gallup Poll and designed to show relative strength and weakness with basic groups of people as used by Gallup. (In instances where figures were not available from the June poll, average figures from other recent polls were used.)

I want to emphasize that the following figures are included in this memorandum only to indicate the utility and importance of a professional demographic analysis being developed quickly for use in this campaign.

The figures that follow on page 7 are so extrapolated, converted and estimated that they cannot be taken as anything other than indicative.

NIXON-HUMPHREY RELATIVE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS

CATEGORY	EXPECTED NUMBER OF 1968 VOTERS	NIXON STRENGTH (+) OR WEAKNESS (-) VIS-A-VIS HUMPHREY AND WALLACE
<u>I. Sex</u>		
Men	36,200,000	even
Women	38,100,000	+1,500,000
<u>II. Education level</u>		
Some college	18,000,000	+1,400,000
Some high school	38,800,000	even
Some grade school	17,800,000	-1,800,000
<u>III. Occupation</u>		
Professional & business	15,900,000	even
White collar	10,700,000	-3,100,000
Farmers	3,700,000	+1,200,000
Manual	41,700,000	-8,400,000
<u>IV. Religion</u>		
Protestant	27,200,000	+ 600,000
Catholic	18,600,000	-7,100,000
<u>V. Geography</u>		
East	20,500,000	-2,400,000
Midwest	22,700,000	even
South	17,400,000	+ 700,000
West	13,400,000	+1,600,000
<u>VI. Income</u>		
Over \$7,000/year	30,800,000	-1,900,000
\$5,000-\$7,000	21,700,000	-4,300,000
\$3,000-\$5,000	13,800,000	-2,200,000
Below \$3,000	10,800,000	-1,100,000
<u>VII. Size of Community</u>		
Over 500,000	12,700,000	-2,800,000
50,000-500,000	16,000,000	-3,500,000
2,500-50,000	13,800,000	+ 300,000
Under 2,500	10,800,000	+2,500,000

The immediate political uses of such figures are perhaps self-evident. For example, one should emphasize getting out the vote of highly educated residents in communities of under 50,000 and farmers. Nixon has great appeal to these groups. For another example, it is interesting to note -- in the "Geography" section -- the strengths in the South and West very nearly balance the weakness in the East. This is not to say that one should ignore the East -- only that one should not focus one's campaign on the East at the risk of diminishing the enthusiasm in the Midwest, South and West. Other examples could be given -- the point is, a demographic/political analysis, professionally and accurately done is needed. It will be useful.

On a national basis, the Wallace candidacy holds dangers. The Gallup Poll in June 1968 shows the following figures:

NIXON	36
HUMPHREY	42
WALLACE	14
UNDECIDED	8

Until we can get more precise research, it is difficult to know what the full effect of the Wallace candidacy will be. His percentages are very high in the South and quite low in the rest of the country. The 14% showing

in the national polls is an average. According to the May 1968 Gallup Poll, Wallace receives 30% of the vote in the 13 Southern states; 53% in the Deep South (Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina); and 7% in the 37 states outside the South.

A February 1968 poll in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution showed Wallace with 28%. A Nebraska poll conducted in mid-April showed Wallace with 4%. A 4% vote for Wallace in Nebraska would probably not affect the disposition of Nebraska's electoral votes; a 4% vote for Wallace in Pennsylvania would: it might throw Pennsylvania's electoral votes to Humphrey. (In fact, our own poll shows Wallace with 12% in Pennsylvania.) However, a study of Wallace's relative positions in Harris polls over the spring gives some hint that, when Humphrey is a candidate, Wallace support tends to come from Humphrey or from undecideds, rather than from Nixon. A professional study of the Wallace effect in key states outside the South needs to be made.

In general: it has been said that, as election day approaches, Wallace's appeal will fade and his percentage of the vote will be greatly lower than his percentage in various polls. This is good campaigning but not an inevitable development. The hope might be based on the

historical experiences of 1948, when Thurmond and Henry Wallace are supposed to have run less well in the election than they did in the polls, and on the experiences of 1965 when William Buckley ran less well in the New York City mayor election than he had been running in the polls. However, careful research shows that while it did happen to Henry Wallace and Buckley, this did not happen to Thurmond. Instead, he got a higher percentage of votes than the polls showed he might. A Crossley poll, taken shortly before the election of 1948, showed Thurmond with about 1.6% of the vote. Gallup showed Thurmond getting about 2%. On election day, Thurmond got over 2% of the total national vote, performing better than might have been predicted on the basis of the polls.

Thus it can be seen that, although Henry Wallace did get only about half the vote that had been expected for him, Thurmond actually got a little more than what he had been polling, on a national basis.

Truman ignored Thurmond on the right, correctly assessing his appeal as intense but limited to a small number of voters. Instead, Truman came out hard for federal medical care and active government generally, berating and ridiculing the "Republicans" for a do-nothing record. Thus

he occupied Wallace's ground by promising federal action for the masses and drove Wallace to an untenable Communistic left position.

The Nixon campaign should continue to occupy the center as it has done so far, and should undercut Wallace by stressing that Nixon represents a substantial change from present leadership policies while Humphrey does not, both in terms of domestic policies (government and private capital to draw blacks fully into American life, bloc grants for decentralization of power, judicial balance and crime control for law and order) and foreign policies (peace, no more Vietnams, use of economic and diplomatic power with military balance vis-a-vis the USSR to insure stability in the world). Nixon cannot compete with Wallace on regional appeal or racism, but he certainly can on the change of leadership issue.

Wallace's great weakness, even in the South, is his lack of experience in Washington and the doubt that he could manage the federal government. Nixon could.

II. Given the nationwide character of the "new politics" campaign that is indicated this year, it remains that the President has to be elected (according to the Constitution) by the electoral college.

At the present time I count 13 states solid for Nixon with 73 electoral votes and 16 states leaning toward Nixon with 173 electoral votes, for a total of 29 states solid or leaning toward Nixon with a total of 246 electoral votes -- 6 states (including D. C.) solid for Humphrey with 81 electoral votes and 6 states leaning toward Humphrey with 69 electoral votes, for a total of 12 states solid or leaning toward Humphrey with 150 electoral votes -- 3 states solid for Wallace with 27 electoral votes -- and 7 battleground states with a total of 115 electoral votes.

The breakdown is as follows:

SOLID FOR NIXON		LEANING TOWARD NIXON			
Arizona	5	Alaska	3	Virginia	12
Idaho	4	Colorado	6	Washington	9
Indiana	13	Delaware	3	Wisconsin	<u>12</u>
Iowa	9	Florida	14	TOTAL	173
Kansas	7	Hawaii	4		
Maine	4	Illinois	26		
Montana	4	Kentucky	9		
Nebraska	5	Nevada	3		
New Hampshire	4	Ohio	26		
Oklahoma	8	Oregon	6		
Utah	4	South Dakota	4		
Vermont	3	Tennessee	11		
Wyoming	<u>3</u>	Texas	25		
TOTAL	73				

SOLID FOR HUMPHREY

Dist. of Col.	3
Massachusetts	14
Minnesota	10
New York	43
Rhode Island	4
West Virginia	<u>7</u>

TOTAL 81

LEANING TOWARD HUMPHREY

Arkansas	6
Connecticut	8
Georgia	12
Maryland	10
New Mexico	4
Pennsylvania	<u>29</u>

TOTAL 69

SOLID FOR WALLACE

Alabama	10
Louisiana	10
Mississippi	<u>7</u>

TOTAL 27

BATTLEGROUND STATES

California	40
Michigan	21
Missouri	12
New Jersey	17
No. Carolina	13
No. Dakota	4
So. Carolina	<u>8</u>

TOTAL 115

A rough, preliminary demographic analysis of the several states (similar to the rough national demographic analysis explained above) is attached as Appendix A. This should be refined and used for political analysis.

The electoral votes of California, or of any two of the following states: North Carolina, New Jersey, Missouri, Michigan -- when added to the electoral votes of the solid and leaning toward Nixon states -- provide enough electoral votes to win the Presidency. Clearly, the demographic data for all these states are of great political significance. For example, within the top four battleground

states the business and professional class, in which Nixon is even with Humphrey, runs at about the national average or a little above (expressed as a percentage of the total population). Farmers in these states, on the other hand, run substantially below the national average. Manual workers, with whom Nixon is not strong, run at or slightly above the national average.

The political implication is clear for these key states: strong get-out-the-Nixon vote efforts should be organized among the business and professional classes; Nixon should campaign to manual workers on themes (such as law and order) that appeal to them and stay away from economic themes that alienate them, and he should avoid talking about farm problems.

In the same states (except for California), relatively small percentages of the population live in rural areas and as has already been seen by the minuscule percentages of people engaged in farming, most of these are probably suburbanites or exurbanites. In any case, Nixon has great strength among people who live in communities of under 2,500 and substantial strength among people who live in communities between 2,500 and 50,000. The opposition has great strength among people who live in communities of over 50,000. What is indicated is a strong get-out-the-vote drive among the suburbs.

In general, more effort should go into the battle-ground states than into the Nixon states, and the least effort should go into the Humphrey and Wallace states.

III. In thinking about campaign tactics, it is necessary to keep in mind that we will have 25 candidates for Senate seats who appear to have a reasonable chance of winning.

They are as follows:

STATE	SENATE CANDIDATE	STATUS	ELECTORAL VOTES
Oregon	Packwood	Leaning to RN	6
California	Rafferty	Battleground	40
Nevada	Fike	Leaning to RN	3
Idaho	Hansen	Nixon state	4
Utah	Bennett	Nixon state	4
Arizona	Goldwater	Nixon state	5
Colorado	Dominick	Leaning to RN	6
No. Dakota	Young	Battleground	4
So. Dakota	Gubbrud	Leaning to RN	4
Kansas	Dole	Nixon state	7
Oklahoma	Bellmon	Nixon state	8
Missouri	Curtis	Battleground	12
Iowa	Stanley, Ray, Johnson	Nixon state	9
Wisconsin	Leonard	Leaning to RN	12
Indiana	Ruckelshouse	Nixon state	13
Kentucky	Cook	Leaning to RN	9
Florida	Gurney	Leaning to RN	14
Ohio	Saxbe	Leaning to RN	26
Maryland	Mathias	<u>Leaning to HHH</u>	10
Penn.	Schweiker	Leaning to HHH	29
New York	Javits	Leaning to HHH	43
Conn.	May or Sibal	Leaning to HHH	8
New Hamp.	Cotton	Nixon state	4
Vermont	Aiken	Nixon state	3
Alaska	Rasmussen	Leaning to RN	3

At least for the first few months of a Nixon Presidency, it would be beneficial to the White House to have personally helped in the campaign of every one of these men -- even the old-timers.

IV. The various campaign efforts must be assessed and assigned priorities so as to produce the maximum effect, within the limits of the time, money and personnel that will be available for the campaign.

(1) Budget Priorities.

In the broadest terms, budget priorities should be assigned as follows, from lowest priority to highest:

(a) Lowest priority: those states regarded as solid for Humphrey or Wallace.

(b) Next priority: those states regarded as solid for Nixon.

(c) Highest priority: those states regarded as battlegrounds.

As a general rule, the Candidate's effort, being the most important, should be expected to consume the most money.

The Vice Presidential candidate's effort may be considered in the same category, but of course would not consume as much money as the Presidential candidate.

men: National Committeeman Bud Wilkinson, Senators Baker and Hatfield, Governors Agnew, Volpe and Hickel, and Congressmen Brock, Bush, Morse, Rumsfeld and MacGregor.

The telephone-personal visit operation used so successfully in Oregon involves the limited but active involvement of thousands of men and women, for the most part within metropolitan areas. Briefly: paid professionals telephone and recruit volunteers to hand-carry packets of campaign material to 5 neighbors. The original successful calls of course are followed up with direct mail and with a further follow-up telephone call. This has worked well not only in Oregon but in a number of other cities in the West. It can be modified in various ways. The principal advantage of such an operation is that it actively involves tens of thousands of individuals directly in the campaign and thus is very much in line with the new so-called "participatory politics".

(3) The Vice Presidential Effort.

The Vice Presidential candidate, acting as an alternate Presidential candidate, should design his campaign, his media presentations and his personal appearances so as

to appeal, on a national basis, to those elements of the electorate with which the Presidential candidate may not have the greatest strength. For example, if there are age groups or occupation groups or even ethnic groups -- in the national electorate and more particularly the battleground states -- where the demographic analyses show the Vice Presidential candidate to have substantially more potential, his campaign should focus upon those elements in those areas.

The Vice Presidential candidate cannot substitute for the Presidential candidate, however, in the Senatorial candidate area.

(4) The Presidential Candidate's Effort.

Fifty-eight calendar days lie between Labor Day, the traditional start of Presidential campaigns, and election day. Assuming that the Candidate can sustain a high intensity effort 5 days out of every 7, that means 41 days are available for high intensity campaigning.

Assuming the Candidate can do with 6 hours' sleep each day, that provides 738 hours. Assuming that no more than one-third of those hours (i.e., 6 hours a day) can be given to public appearances (including backgrounders, conferences with political leaders, time actually spent with staff) -- that leaves 246 hours for public appearances by the Candidate during the general election campaign.

In attempting to arrive at a theoretical basis for utilization of the Candidate's time (total 246 hours), it is my feeling that at least 10% should be set aside for personal visits with the leading figures of the national press, radio and TV. The time that has been devoted to this purpose during the last several months has been time well spent. That leaves approximately 225 hours.

Although I assume most of the television advertising production will be out of the way by Labor Day, it is quite possible that some issue may come up requiring the production of new advertising material by the Candidate during the campaign itself. Ten percent of the Candidate's time should be reserved for this eventuality. That leaves approximately 200 hours. These hours should be apportioned so as to put the greatest effort in those places where the greatest effort is needed and where it has the best chance of paying off.

Analysing the political situation in the several states, eliminating those states solid for Humphrey or Wallace, assigning to each Nixon state its own electoral vote, assigning to each Battleground state double its own electoral vote, then adding to each Senate Candidate state that state's electoral vote -- and then dividing the 200 public appearance hours among the states on the basis of the relative weights

thus assigned to them, the Candidate's public appearance time should be spent in various states approximately as follows:

STATES (by region)	CANDIDATE'S TIME (hours)	STATES (by region)	CANDIDATE'S TIME (hours)
<u>East</u>		<u>Midwest</u>	
Maine	1	Ohio	15
Vermont	1	Michigan	8
New Hampshire	1	Indiana	5
Massachusetts	0	Wisconsin	7
Connecticut	5	Illinois	15
Rhode Island	0	Minnesota	0
New York	0	Iowa	3
Pennsylvania	17	Missouri	7
New Jersey	7	No. Dakota	2
West Virginia	0	So. Dakota	2
Maryland	6	Nebraska	1
Delaware	1	Kansas	3
Dist. of Columbia	0		
TOTAL	39	TOTAL	68
<u>South</u>		<u>West</u>	
Virginia	5	Montana	1
Kentucky	5	Wyoming	1
No. Carolina	5	Colorado	3
Tennessee	4	New Mexico	1
So. Carolina	3	Idaho	1
Georgia	4	Utah	1
Alabama	0	Arizona	2
Mississippi	0	Washington	3
Arkansas	2	Oregon	3
Oklahoma	3	Nevada	2
Texas	10	California	24
Louisiana	0	Alaska	2
Florida	8	Hawaii	1
TOTAL	48	TOTAL	45

NB: It should be recognized that New York, because of its preeminence in the communications world and because of the nationwide implications of anything that is done or not done in New York, represents a special case.

NB: South Carolina also represents a special case. If Senator Thurmond campaigns for the Republican ticket in the manner and to the extent he has indicated, and if he or Harry Dent desires the Candidate in South Carolina, the Candidate must give serious consideration to going.

NB: It is essential that the "unity" theme which has been stressed so successfully and so effectively so far in 1968 -- effectively in terms of primary results, effectively in terms of favorable standings in national polls and effectively in terms of reactions of commentators such as Wicker and Broder -- be given tangible, concrete form in the conduct of the general election campaign. In detail, this means campaigning, and thus appearing to be concerned with, all of the major geographical sections of the country. This will be relatively easy as there are in fact either battleground states or states with Senate candidates in every section of the country.

It also means campaigning to the two groups that are most alienated from the rest of the country and that are

causing the most trouble: the blacks and the young people. I do not suggest that the Candidate modify his positions on the issues or his views on either domestic matters or foreign policies -- only that he campaign to these groups, thus reassuring the rest of the country that, as President, he would pursue a policy of national unification rather than continued drift or further division.

"Probably every generation sees itself as charged with remaking the world. Mine, however, knows that it will not remake the world. But its task is perhaps even greater, for it consists in keeping the world from destroying itself.

Albert Camus, on receiving
the Nobel Prize for Literature,
1957.

APPENDIX A

Prof. & Business	I
White Collar	II
Farmers	III
Manual	IV

NORTHEASTERN REGION

CONN. 2,915,000

I.	44%
II.	30%
III.	0.6%
IV.	25%

DELAWARE 524,000

I.	24%
II.	17%
III.	3%
IV.	47%

MAINE 973,000

I.	18%
II.	16%
III.	3%
IV.	58%

MARYLAND 3,682,000

I.	17%
II.	21%
III.	2%
IV.	47%

MASSACHUSETTS 5,421,000

I.	23%
II.	15%
III.	0.5%
IV.	56%

NEW HAMPSHIRE 686,000

I.	19%
II.	12%
III.	2%
IV.	61%

NEW JERSEY 7,003,000

I.	24%
II.	16%
III.	0.5%
IV.	54%

NEW YORK 18,336,000

I.	24%
II.	18%
III.	1%
IV.	52%

PENNSYLVANIA 11,629,000

I.	19%
II.	14%
III.	2%
IV.	60%

RHODE ISLAND 900,000

I.	19%
II.	15%
III.	0.5%
IV.	59%

VERMONT 417,000

I.	19%
II.	12%
III.	9%
IV.	59%

Prof. & Business	I
White Collar	II
Farmers	III
Manual	IV

WESTERN REGION

ALASKA 272,000

I.	29%
II.	10%
III.	0.5%
IV.	51%

ARIZONA 1,634,000

I.	23%
II.	12%
III.	2%
IV.	57%

CALIFORNIA 19,153,000

I.	24%
II.	14%
III.	2%
IV.	52%

COLORADO 1,975,000

I.	25%
II.	13%
III.	6%
IV.	49%

HAWAII 739,000

I.	20%
II.	12%
III.	2%
IV.	60%

IDAHO 699,000

I.	20%
II.	9%
III.	16%
IV.	51%

MONTANA 701,000

I.	20%
II.	10%
III.	15%
IV.	49%

NEVADA 444,000

I.	24%
II.	10%
III.	3%
IV.	58%

N. MEXICO

I.	26%
II.	11%
III.	5%
IV.	55%

OREGON 1,999,000

I.	22%
II.	12%
III.	5%
IV.	59%

UTAH 1,024,000

I.	24%
II.	13%
III.	5%
IV.	53%

WASHINGTON 3,087,000

I.	24%
II.	13%
III.	4%
IV.	54%

WYOMING 315,000

I.	23%
II.	9%
III.	10%
IV.	55%

U.S.A. 197,863,000

I.	21%
II.	14%
III.	5%
IV.	55%

Prof. & Business	I
White Collar	II
Farmers	III
Manual	IV

MIDWESTERN REGION

ILLINOIS 10,893,000

I.	20%
II.	15%
III.	4%
IV.	54%

INDIANA

I.	15%
II.	12%
III.	6%
IV.	59%

IOWA 2,753,000

I.	17%
II.	12%
III.	22%
IV.	44%

KANSAS 2,275,000

I.	20%
II.	13%
III.	15%
IV.	48%

MICHIGAN

I.	19%
II.	13%
III.	3%
IV.	60%

MINNESOTA 3,582,000

I.	20%
II.	13%
III.	15%
IV.	47%

MISSOURI 4,603,000

I.	19%
II.	14%
III.	10%
IV.	50%

NEBRASKA 1,435,000

I.	18%
II.	12%
III.	23%
IV.	42%

NORTH DAKOTA 639,000

I.	18%
II.	9%
III.	34%
IV.	35%

OHIO 10,458,000

I.	20%
II.	13%
III.	3%
IV.	56%

OKLAHOMA 2,495,500

I.	22%
II.	13%
III.	9%
IV.	52%

SOUTH DAKOTA 674,000

I.	17%
II.	9%
III.	31%
IV.	39%

W. VA. 1,798,000

I.	17%
II.	11%
III.	3%
IV.	63%

WISCONSIN 4,189,000

I.	17%
II.	12%
III.	10%
IV.	35%

Prof. & Business	I
White Collar	II
Farmers	III
Manual	IV

SOUTHERN REGION

ALABAMA 3,540,000

I.	17%
II.	11%
III.	8%
IV.	61%

ARKANSAS

I.	17%
II.	10%
III.	12%
IV.	46%

FLORIDA 5,995,000

I.	25%
II.	14%
III.	2%
IV.	54%

GEORGIA 4,509,000

I.	18%
II.	13%
III.	6%
IV.	58%

KENTUCKY 3,189,000

I.	19%
II.	11%
III.	14%
IV.	55%

LOUISIANA 3,662,000

I.	20%
II.	12%
III.	5%
IV.	59%

MISSISSIPPI 2,348,000

I.	16%
II.	9%
III.	15%
IV.	57%

NORTH CAROLINA 5,029,000

I.	15%
II.	11%
III.	11%
IV.	57%

SO. CAROLINA 2,599,000

I.	15%
II.	11%
III.	8%
IV.	62%

TENNESSEE 3,892,000

I.	17%
II.	12%
III.	10%
IV.	58%

TEXAS 10,869,000

I.	22%
II.	13%
III.	6%
IV.	48%

VIRGINIA 4,536,000

I.	20%
II.	13%
III.	6%
IV.	56%

POPULATION IN CITIES OF 500,000 OR MORE

Alabama	0	Montana	0
Alaska	0	Nebraska	0
Arizona	0	Nevada	0
Arkansas	0	New Hampshire	0
California	3,783,000	New Jersey	0
Colorado	0	New Mexico	0
Connecticut	0	New York	8,313,000
Delaware	0	N. Carolina	0
D.C.	763,900	N. Dakota	0
Florida	0	Ohio	1,378,000
Georgia	0	Oklahoma	0
Hawaii	0	Oregon	0
Idaho	0	Pa.	2,606,000
Illinois	3,550,000	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	0	S. Carolina	0
Iowa	0	S. Dakota	0
Kansas	0	Tennessee	0
Kentucky	0	Texas	1,617,000
Louisiana	627,000	Utah	0
Maine	0	Vermont	0
Maryland	939,024	Virginia	0
Massachusetts	697,000	Washington	557,000
Michigan	1,670,144	W. Virginia	0
Minnesota	0	Wisconsin	741,000
Missouri	750,000	Wyoming	0
Mississippi	0		

RURAL POPULATION

Alabama	1,472,000	Montana	336,000
Alaska	140,000	Nebraska	646,000
Arizona	332,000	Nevada	84,000
Arkansas	1,021,000	New Hampshire	254,000
California	2,144,000	New Jersey	693,000
Colorado	461,000	New Mexico	326,000
Connecticut	550,000	New York	2,451,000
Delaware	154,000	N. Carolina	2,754,000
D.C.	0	N. Dakota	409,000
Florida	1,291,000	Ohio	2,584,000
Georgia	1,763,000	Oklahoma	863,000
Hawaii	149,000	Oregon	668,000
Idaho	350,000	Pa.	3,217,000
Illinois	1,941,000	Rhode Island	117,000
Indiana	1,753,000	S. Carolina	1,401,000
Iowa	1,294,000	S. Dakota	414,000
Kansas	850,000	Tennessee	1,703,000
Kentucky	1,685,000	Texas	2,393,000
Louisiana	1,196,000	Utah	223,000
Maine	472,000	Vermont	240,000
Maryland	847,000	Virginia	1,749,000
Massachusetts	846,000	Washington	910,000
Michigan	2,084,000	W. Virginia	1,149,000
Minnesota	1,293,000	Wisconsin	1,430,000
Mississippi	1,357,000	Wyoming	142,000
Missouri	1,443,000		

POPULATION IN CITIES OF 2500 TO 50,000

Alabama	922,110	Montana	218,800
Alaska	79,140	Nebraska	298,542
Arizona	302,200	Nevada	74,100
Arkansas	518,110	New Hampshire	346,242
California	4,124,000	New Jersey	2,823,000
Colorado	505,300	New Mexico	476,800
Connecticut	1,604,000	New York	3,138,000
Delaware	48,900	N. Carolina	951,582
D.C.	0	N. Dakota	228,500
Florida	1,332,000	Ohio	3,062,700
Georgia	1,154,000	Oklahoma	815,100
Hawaii	142,900	Oregon	484,600
Idaho	338,300	Pa.	3,904,800
Illinois	3,192,000	Rhode Island	437,600
Indiana	1,522,700	S. Carolina	546,400
Iowa	761,600	S. Dakota	197,200
Kansas	719,100	Tennessee	768,100
Kentucky	653,070	Texas	2,529,300
Louisiana	728,800	Utah	297,900
Maine	711,000	Vermont	272,900
Maryland	653,900	Virginia	517,400
Massachusetts	2,940,000	Washington	697,200
Michigan	1,213,964	W. Virginia	443,300
Minnesota	1,103,800	Wisconsin	1,194,725
Mississippi	635,500	Wyoming	183,900
Missouri	1,255,600		

POPULATION IN CITIES OF 50,000 TO 500,000

Alabama	772,000	Nebraska	429,000
Alaska	0	Nevada	115,000
Arizona	659,000	New Hampshire	88,000
Arkansas	102,000	New Jersey	1,719,000
California	3,744,000	New Mexico	201,000
Colorado	654,000	New York	1,730,000
Connecticut	869,000	N. Carolina	724,000
Delaware	95,000	N. Dakota	0
D.C.	0	Ohio	2,116,000
Florida	1,354,000	Oklahoma	646,000
Georgia	999,000	Oregon	422,000
Hawaii	294,000	Pa.	1,202,000
Idaho	51,000	Rhode Island	422,000
Illinois	974,000	S. Carolina	228,000
Indiana	1,411,000	S. Dakota	65,000
Iowa	695,000	Tennessee	908,000
Kansas	474,000	Texas	2,746,000
Kentucky	449,000	Utah	189,000
Louisiana	429,000	Vermont	0
Maine	72,000	Virginia	1,402,000
Maryland	258,000	Washington	328,000
Massachusetts	1,543,000	W. Virginia	223,000
Michigan	1,467,000	Wisconsin	344,000
Minnesota	951,000	Wyoming	0
Mississippi	194,000		
Missouri	702,000		
Montana	107,000		

Population by sex: 1960 Census, Statistical Abstract p.26

Education, 1960 Census, Statistical Abstract p.115

Persons 25 years old or over

Grade school - 8 years or less completed

High school - 1-4 years completed

College - 1 or more years completed

Breakdown by Age: Statistical Abstract, 1960 p.25

18-44 years old

45-64 years old

65+ over

voting age 1960, RNC Study

(1968) voting populations projections, RNC Study

Alabama

Male	1,591,709	48½%
Female	1,675,031	51½%
Grade School	823,000	25%
High School	650,000	20%
College	196,000	6%
Total 25+	1,670,000	51%
18-44	1,201,000	37%
45-64	658,000	20%
65+	284,000	9%
Voting age	1,825,000	56%
(1968)	2,037,000	
TOTAL	3,276,000	

California

Male	7,836,707	50%
Female	7,880,497	50%
Grade School	2,512,000	16%
High School	4,298,000	27%
College	2,059,000	13%
Total over 25	8,869,000	56%
18-44	6,683,000	47%
45-64	3,575,000	23%
65+	1,579,000	9%
Voting age	9,219,000	59%
(1968)	12,052,000	
Total	15,717,000	

Alaska

Male	128,811	57%
Female	97,356	43%
Grade School	28,000	13%
High School	54,000	22%
College	23,000	9%
Total over 25	105,000	46%
18-44	108,000	48%
45-64	36,000	17%
65+	6,000	3%
Voting age	83,000	35% (55% in
(1968)	151,000	1968)
TOTAL	228,000	

Colorado

Male	870,467	50%
Female	883,480	50%
Grade School	284,000	16%
High School	440,000	25%
College	217,000	13%
Total Over 25	941,000	54%
18-44	684,000	39%
45-64	359,000	21%
65+	170,000	9%
Voting age	1,007,000	57%
(1968)	1,211,000	
TOTAL	1,754,000	

Arizona

Male	654,928	50%
Female	647,233	50%
Grade School	234,000	18%
High School	291,000	22%
College	135,000	11%
Total over 25	661,000	51%
18-44	556,000	43%
45-64	268,000	21%
65+	118,000	9%
Voting Age	680,000	52%
(1968)	1,003,000	
TOTAL	1,302,000	

Connecticut

Male	1,244,229	49%
Female	1,291,005	51%
Grade School	551,000	22%
High School	658,000	26%
College	272,000	11%
Total over 25	1,482,000	58%
18-44	971,000	38%
45-64	610,000	24%
65+	265,000	9%
Voting age	1,590,000	60%
(1968)	1,813,000	
TOTAL	2,535,000	

Arkansas

Male	878,987	49%
Female	907,285	51%
Grade School	505,000	28%
High School	352,000	20%
College	106,000	6%
Total over 25	964,000	54%
18-44	628,000	35%
45-64	388,000	22%
65+	208,000	12%
Voting Age	1,029,000	58%
(1968)	1,188,000	
TOTAL	1,786,000	

Delaware

Male	221,136	49%
Female	225,156	51%
Grade School	86,000	20%
High School	114,000	24%
College	45,000	10%
Total over 25	246,000	55%
18-44	176,000	40%
45-64	95,000	21%
65+	39,000	8%
Voting age	264,000	57%
(1968)	306,000	
TOTAL	449,000	

D.C.

Male	358,171	47%
Female	405,785	53%
Grade School	152,000	20%
High School	190,000	25%
College	120,000	16%
Total 25+	461,000	61%
18-44	282,000	37%
45-64	178,000	24%
65+	72,000	9%
Total	764,000	

Florida

Male	2,436,783	50%
Female	2,514,777	50%
Grade School	1,067,000	22%
High School	1,282,000	26%
College	498,000	10%
Total 25+	2,845,000	58%
18-44	1,974,000	40%
45-64	1,099,000	22%
65+	719,000	13%
Voting Age (1968)	3,099,000	61%
TOTAL	4,952,000	

Georgia

Male	1,925,913	49%
Female	2,017,203	51%
Grade School	1,002,000	25%
High School	740,000	19%
College	273,000	7%
Total 25+	2,015,000	51%
18-44	1,582,000	40%
45-64	795,000	20%
65+	319,000	1.7%
Voting Age (1968)	2,342,000	56%
TOTAL	3,943,000	

Hawaii

Male	338,173	54%
Female	294,599	46%
Grade School	117,000	19%
High School	141,000	22%
College	51,000	8%
Total over 25	309,000	49%
18-44	274,000	43%
45-64	116,000	19%
65+	36,000	5½%
Voting age (1968)	321,000	56%
TOTAL	633,000	

Idaho

Male	338,421	51%
Female	328,770	49%
Grade School	106,000	16%
High School	168,000	25%
College	66,000	10%
Total 25+	340,000	51%
18-44	224,000	33%
45-64	134,000	19%
65+	63,000	9%
Voting age (1968)	372,000	56%
TOTAL	667,000	

Illinois

Male	4,952,866	49%
Female	5,128,292	51%
Grade School	2,320,000	23%
High School	2,562,000	25%
College	927,000	9%
Total 25+	5,808,000	58%
18-44	3,522,000	35%
45-64	2,290,000	23%
65+	1,044,000	10%
Voting Age (1968)	6,244,000	60%
TOTAL	10,084,000	

Indiana

Male	2,298,738	49%
Female	2,363,760	51%
Grade School	967,000	21%
High School	1,233,000	26%
College	350,000	8%
Total 25	2,550,000	55%
18-44	1,642,000	35%
45-64	964,000	21%
65+	467,000	10%
Voting Age (1968)	2,784,000	58%
TOTAL	4,663,000	

Iowa

Male	1,359,047	49%
Female	1,398,490	51%
Grade School	584,000	21%
High School	710,000	26%
College	247,000	9%
Total 25+	1,541,000	56%
18-44	850,000	31%
45-64	565,000	21%
65+	343,000	13%
Voting Age (1968)	1,699,000	59%
Total	2,757,000	

Kansas

Male	1,081,377	50%
Female	1,097,234	50%
Grade School	424,000	19%
High School	562,000	26%
College	230,000	11%
Total 25+	1,216,000	56%
18-44	738,000	34%
45-64	447,000	21%
65+	254,000	11%
Voting Age	1,315,000	60%
(1968)	1,339,000	
TOTAL	2,180,000	

Kentucky

Male	1,508,448	49.4%
Female	1,529,708	50.6%
Grade School	926,000	30.4%
High School	506,000	17%
College	178,000	6%
Total 25+	1,610,000	53%
18-44	1,077,000	36%
45-64	608,000	
65+	310,000	10%
Voting age	1,876,000	62%
(1968)	2,062,000	
TOTAL	3,038,000	

Louisiana

Male	1,592,254	49%
Female	1,664,768	51%
Grade School	850,000	26%
High School	570,000	17%
College	220,000	7%
Total 25+	1,639,000	50½%
18-44	1,209,000	37%
45-64	640,000	20%
65+	264,000	8%
Voting Age	1,770,000	54%
(1968)	2,032,000	
TOTAL	3,256,000	

Maine

Male	479,054	49½%
Female	490,211	50½%
Grade School	194,000	20%
High School	265,000	27%
College	75,000	8%
Total 25+	534,000	55%
18-44	319,000	33%
45-64	195,000	20%
65+	111,000	11%
Voting Age	574,000	58½%
(1968)	596,000	
TOTAL	969,000	

Maryland

Male	1,533,200	49½%
Female	1,567,489	50½%
Grade School	694,000	22%
High School	707,000	23%
College	292,000	9%
Total 25+	1,693,000	55%
18-44	1,274,000	41%
45-64	682,000	22%
65+	255,000	7%
Voting Age	1,819,000	57%
(1968)	2,168,000	
Total	3,101,000	

Massachusetts

Male	2,486,235	48%
Female	2,662,343	52%
Grade School	990,000	19%
High School	1,473,000	28½%
College	547,000	11%
Total 25+	3,011,000	58%
18-44	1,762,000	34%
45-64	1,155,000	23%
65+	603,000	12%
Voting age	3,230,000	63%
(1968)	3,379,000	
TOTAL	5,149,000	

Michigan

Male	3,882,868	49½%
Female	3,940,326	50½%
Grade School	1,556,000	20%
High School	2,035,000	26%
College	627,000	8%
Total 25+	4,217,000	54%
18-44	2,783,000	36%
45-64	1,645,000	21%
65+	701,000	9%
Voting Age	4,519,000	57%
(1968)	4,853,000	
TOTAL	7,823,000	

Minnesota

Male	1,692,952	49½%
Female	1,720,902	50½%
Grade School	755,000	22%
High School	759,000	22%
College	330,000	10%
Total 25+	1,845,000	54%
18-44	1,110,000	33%
45-64	699,000	20%
65+	387,000	11%
Voting age	2,003,000	59%
(1968)	2,097,000	
TOTAL	3,413,000	

Mississippi

Male	1,067,933	49%
Female	1,110,208	51%
Grade School	549,000	25%
High School	383,000	17½%
College	132,000	6%
Total 25+	1,065,000	49%
18-44	748,000	34%
45-64	415,000	19%
65+	201,000	9%
Voting age	1,163,000	54%
(1968)	1,308,000	
TOTAL	2,178,000	

Missouri

Male	2,108,279	49%
Female	2,211,534	51%
Grade School	1,159,000	27%
High School	985,000	23%
College	349,000	8%
Total 25+	2,493,000	58%
18-44	1,455,000	34%
45-64	952,000	22%
65+	525,000	12%
Voting Age	2,651,000	61%
(1968)	2,770,000	
TOTAL	4,320,000	

Montana

Male	343,743	51%
Female	331,024	49%
Grade School	125,000	18½%
High School	161,000	24%
College	70,000	10%
Total 25+	356,000	53%
18-44	227,000	34%
45-64	137,000	20%
65+	66,000	9½%
Voting Age	387,000	56%
(1968)	412,000	
TOTAL	675,000	

Nebraska

Male	700,026	49½%
Female	711,304	50½%
Grade School	280,000	20%
High School	374,000	26½%
College	138,000	10%
Total 25+	791,000	56%
18-44	461,000	33%
45-64	291,000	21%
65+	174,000	12%
Voting Age	857,000	59%
(1968)	891,000	
TOTAL	1,411,000	

Nevada

Male	147,521	51½%
Female	137,757	48½%
Grade School	39,000	14%
High School	86,000	30%
College	34,000	12%
Total Over 25	160,000	56%
18-44	171,000	60%
45-64	79,000	28%
65+	23,000	8%
Voting Age	174,000	61%
(1968)	285,000	
TOTAL	285,000	

New Hampshire

Male	298,107	49%
Female	308,814	51%
Grade School	132,000	22%
High School	159,000	26%
College	55,000	9%
Total 25+	345,000	57%
18-44	227,000	37%
45-64	135,000	22%
65+	73,000	11%
Voting Age	367,000	61%
(1968)	418,000	
TOTAL	607,000	

New Jersey

Male	2,971,991	49%
Female	3,094,791	51%
Grade School	1,401,000	23%
High School	1,619,000	27%
College	580,000	9½%
Total 25+	3,600,000	59%
18-44	2,355,000	39%
45-64	1,485,000	24½%
65+	629,000	9%
Voting Age	3,827,000	63%
(1968)	4,402,000	
TOTAL	6,067,000	

New Mexico

Male	479,770	50½%
Female	471,253	49½%
Grade School	108,000	11%
High School	135,000	14%
College	91,000	10%
Total 25+	445,000	47%
18-44	344,000	36%
45-64	163,000	17%
65+	60,000	6%
Voting age	491,000	51%
(1968)	562,000	
TOTAL	951,000	

New YorkOklahoma

Male	8,123,239	48½%
Female	8,659,065	51½%
Grade School	3,876,000	23%
High School	4,542,000	27%
College	1,706,000	10%
Total 25+	10,124,000	60½%
18-44	6,175,000	37%
45-64	4,098,000	24%
65+	1,850,000	11%
Voting age	10,788,000	64%
(1968)	11,773,000	
Total	16,782,000	

Male	1,147,851	49½%
Female	1,180,433	50½%
Grade School	537,000	23%
High School	535,000	23%
College	228,000	9½%
Total 25+	1,300,000	56%
18-44	830,000	36%
45-64	502,000	21½%
65+	268,000	11%
Voting age	1,399,000	61%
(1968)	1,546,000	
TOTAL	2,328,000	

North CarolinaOregon

Male	2,247,069	50½%
Female	2,309,086	49½%
Grade School	1,171,000	26%
High School	828,000	18½%
College	308,000	7%
Total 25+	2,307,000	46%
18-44	1,818,000	41%
45-64	898,000	20%
65+	354,000	7½%
Voting Age	2,521,000	57%
(1968)	2,919,000	
TOTAL	4,556,000	

Male	879,951	50%
Female	888,736	50%
Grade School	312,000	18%
High School	488,000	28%
College	196,000	11%
Total 25+	996,000	55½%
18-44	647,000	37%
45-64	409,000	23%
65+	203,000	11½%
Voting Age	1,089,000	61%
(1968)	1,193,000	
TOTAL	1,769,000	

North DakotaPennsylvania

Male	323,208	51%
Female	309,238	49%
Grade School	158,000	25%
High School	111,000	17½%
College	55,000	9%
Total 25+	324,000	51%
18-44	210,000	33%
45-64	125,000	20%
65+	62,000	10%
Voting Age	350,000	56%
(1968)	370,000	
TOTAL	632,000	

Male	5,509,851	49%
Female	5,809,515	51%
Grade School	2,775,000	25%
High School	2,998,000	26%
College	832,000	7%
Total 25+	6,606,000	58%
18-44	3,848,000	34%
45-64	2,603,000	23%
65+	1,189,000	10%
Voting age	7,102,000	62%
(1968)	7,234,000	
TOTAL	4,319,000	

OhioRhode Island

Male	4,764,228	49%
Female	4,942,169	51%
Grade School	1,978,000	20½%
High School	2,613,000	27%
College	787,000	8%
Total 25+	5,378,000	55%
18-44	3,453,000	36%
45-64	2,056,000	21%
65+	948,000	9%
Voting Age	5,833,000	59%
(1968)	6,235,000	
TOTAL	9,706,000	

Male	421,845	49%
Female	437,643	51%
Grade School	211,000	25%
High School	222,000	26%
College	66,000	8%
Total 25+	498,000	58%
18-44	305,000	35½%
45-64	192,000	22%
65+	95,000	11%
Voting Age	533,000	61%
(1968)	561,000	
TOTAL	859,000	

Male	1,175,818	49½%
Female	1,206,776	50½%
Grade School	595,000	25%
High School	389,000	16%
College	152,000	6%
Total 25+	1,136,000	48%
18-44	924,000	39%
45-64	432,000	18%
65+	169,000	7%
Voting Age	1,227,000	52%
(1968)	1,455,000	
Total	2,383,000	

Male	444,924	50%
Female	445,703	50%
Grade School	91,000	10%
High School	223,000	25%
College	106,000	12%
Total 25+	419,000	47%
18-44	340,000	38%
45-64	161,000	18%
65+	68,000	8%
Voting Age	469,000	53%
(1968)	562,000	
Total	891,000	

South Dakota

Male	344,271	50½%
Female	336,243	49½%
Grade School	157,000	23%
High School	141,000	21%
College	62,000	9%
Total 25+	360,000	53%
18-44	209,000	31%
45-64	132,000	19%
65+	77,000	12%
Voting Age	388,000	56%
(1968)	370,000	
TOTAL	680,000	

Vermont

Male	191,743	49%
Female	198,138	51%
Grade School	82,000	21%
*High School	95,000	24%
Total 25+	213,000	54½%
18-44	130,000	33%
45-64	81,000	21%
65+	45,000	11%
Voting Age	230,000	59%
(1968)	244,000	
TOTAL	390,000	
*College	36,000	9%

Tennessee

Male	1,740,690	49½%
Female	1,826,399	50½%
Grade School	1,019,000	29%
High School	660,000	19%
College	233,000	7%
Total 25+	1,912,000	54%
18-44	1,365,000	47%
45-64	755,000	21½%
65+	336,000	10%
Voting Age	2,079,000	59%
(1968)	2,361,000	
TOTAL	3,517,000	

Virginia

Male	1,979,372	49½%
Female	1,987,577	50½%
Grade School	934,000	24%
High School	791,000	20%
College	358,000	9%
Total 25+	2,083,000	52%
18-44	1,650,000	42%
45-64	817,000	21%
65+	320,000	8%
Voting Age	2,244,000	57%
(1968)	2,690,000	
Total	3,966,000	

Texas

Male	4,744,981	49¼%
Female	4,834,696	50½%
Grade School	2,054,000	21%
High School	2,082,000	22%
College	894,000	9%
Total 25+	5,031,000	52½%
18-44	3,710,000	39%
45-64	1,962,000	20%
65+	854,000	8½%
Voting Age	5,329,000	55½%
(1968)	6,289,000	
TOTAL	9,580,000	

Washington

Male	1,435,037	50½%
Female	1,418,177	49½%
Grade School	456,000	16%
High School	790,000	28%
College	331,000	12%
Total 25+	1,577,000	55%
18-44	990,000	35%
45-64	612,000	21½%
65+	298,000	10%
Voting Age	1,703,000	59%
(1968)	1,838,000	
Total	2,853,000	

West Virginia

Male	915,035	49%
Female	945,386	51%
Grade School	540,000	29%
High School	346,000	19%
College	114,000	6%
Total 25+	1,000,000	54%
18-44	595,000	32%
45-64	383,000	21%
65+	182,000	10%
Voting Age	1,085,000	59%
(1968)	1,073,000	
TOTAL	1,860,000	

Wisconsin

Male	1,964,512	50%
Female	1,987,265	50%
Grade School	930,000	24%
High School	912,000	23%
College	333,000	8%
Total 25+	2,175,000	55%
18-44	1,308,000	33%
45-64	837,000	21%
65+	439,000	11%
Voting Age	2,373,000	60%
(1968)	2,484,000	
TOTAL	3,952,000	

Wyoming

Male	169,015	51%
Female	161,051	49%
Grade School	50,000	15%
High School	87,000	26%
College	36,000	11%
Total 25+	174,000	53%
18-44	108,000	33%
45-64	65,000	20%
65+	29,000	9½%
Voting Age	186,000	57%
(1968)	202,000	
Total	330,000	

HOURS OF CAMPAIGN TIME

