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November 30, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: RN
FROM: Ellsworth

Rita Hauser was on French TV in Paris on Thursday night, November 28. The show was a two-hour special on Nixon, and Rita was on, from time to time, speaking beautiful French.

She is a spectacular female intellectual, obviously fluent in French and perceived in France as being extraordinarily close to Nixon, having been not only co-chairman of Citizens for Nixon in New York, (in fact she was identified on TV as being "President of the Republican Committee of New York"), but also having been a strong Nixon advocate, supporter and worker long before the Convention.
TO: Bob Haldeman
FROM: The President

Franklin Murphy thought that it would be immensely important, from the standpoint of our future relations with the Los Angeles Times, if I could have Norman, Otis and himself to breakfast at the White House on Sunday after the Gridiron Dinner.

This idea appeals to me, primarily because I could let Norman be the man to whom the invitation would be issued (something which Murphy agrees would be the right way to proceed).

Put it on my calendar and when we get closer to the date (about two to three weeks away) we will go forward on it unless something intervenes.
MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

In talking with Franklin Murphy last night the suggestion came up that you might want to invite Norman Chandler to join you informally for breakfast Sunday morning, March 16th, the morning after the Gridiron dinner. Franklin suggested that you ask Norman to bring Otis and Franklin with him. His thought is that this would be an excellent way to solidify relations with the whole Chandler family and that this is important because of the overtures being made on a strong and consistent basis by Teddy Kennedy, especially to Otis and his wife.

H. R. HALDEMAN
MEMORANDUM

TO: DWIGHT CHAPIN
    KEN COLE
    JOHN EHRlichMAN
    BOB HALDEMAN
    HENRY HYDE
    JOHN MITCHELL
    ROSE MARY WO0DS

FROM: JOHN WHITAKER

I am enclosing the September and October calendars and schedules of the 1968 campaign for your files.

Cheers,

[Signature]
I am enclosing for the Richard M. Nixon Yorba Linda Library a complete summary record of the '68 campaign for the period September 4-November 5 which includes:

(1) RN calendars and schedules (John Whitaker, Henry Hyde)
(2) Agnew calendars and schedules (Nick Ruwe, Ernie Minor)
(3) Tricia and Julie Nixon and David Eisenhower calendars and schedules (Bill Killgallon)
(4) Surrogate candidates' calendars and schedules (Jeff Kimball)
   A. Senator Mark Hatfield - Oregon
   B. Senator Howard Baker - Tennessee
   C. Governor John Volpe - Massachusetts
   D. Governor Walter Hickel - Alaska
   E. Congressman F. Bradford Morse - Massachusetts
   F. Congressman Donald Rumsfeld - Illinois
   G. Congressman George Bush - Texas
   H. Congressman Clark MacGregor - Minnesota
   I. Congressman William Brock - Tennessee
   J. Congressman Richard Roudebush - Indiana
   K. "Bud" Wilkinson - Oklahoma
(5) Calendars for "Political Stars" (Hank Berliner)
   A. Senator John Tower - Texas (you will notice some duplication below in the Southern group calendars)
   B. Senator Charles Percy - Illinois
   C. Senator Edward Brooke - Massachusetts
   D. Governor Ronald Reagan - California
   E. Governor George Romney - Michigan
   F. Governor Dan Evans - Washington
   G. Governor Raymond P. Shafer - Pennsylvania
   H. Governor John Chafee - Rhode Island
   I. Governor Nelson Rockefeller - New York
   J. Mayor John Lindsay - New York
   K. Former Senator Barry Goldwater - Arizona
   L. Former Governor William Scranton - Pennsylvania
(6) Southern and Border States Speakers group (Fred LaRue, Manley Molpus)
   A. Senator Strom Thurmond - South Carolina
   B. Senator Paul Fannin - Arizona
   C. Governor Louie Nunn - Kentucky
   D. Governor Claude Kirk - Florida
   E. Congressman Albert Watson - South Carolina
   F. Congressman Donald Lukens - Ohio
   G. General Mark Clark
   H. General Bernard Schreiber
   I. Young Republican National Chairman Jack McDonald
   J. Howard Callaway - Georgia National Committeeeman
From the period September 4-November 5, RN has

(1) Travelled 50,083 miles
(2) Delivered 110 speeches defined as 15 minute-or-more addresses
(3) Uncountable brief informal remarks at airport arrivals, hotel arrivals, etc.
(4) Held 6 formal press conferences defined as 30-45 minute meetings with the press
(5) Held 9 press availabilities defined as 5-15 minute meetings with the press
(6) Uncountable questions by local press at airport arrivals, hotel arrivals and to and from various events
(7) Completed 18 televised Q&A sessions of which 8 were statewide Q&A sessions with citizens' panels and 10 were head to head interviews and of these 10, 2 were network ("Meet the Press", "Face the Nation")
(8) There have been 2 Q&A sessions before large audiences.
(9) There have been 8 inspection visits and briefings
(10) There have been 22 network radio broadcasts varying from 15-30 minutes
(11) There have been 3 editorial board meetings
    A. New York Times
    B. Associated Press
    C. UPI Editors and Publishers

It's been a pleasure!

CHEERS,

John
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date February 9

For Bob Haldeman

From Ted Hullin

John thought you would get a charge out of this one.
February 5, 1971

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. Lawrence M. Higby
Staff Assistant
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Larry:

Here is Dival's letter.

I'm handling.

Regards,

Herbert W. Kalmbach

HWK/ah
Enclosure
January 11, 1971

Dear Mr. Ogden:

Recently, I have been made aware that I should have received a finders fee for my part in influencing the President into buying the old Cotton Estate.

Several newsmen have asked me what I received for my efforts. Friends and family have asked as well. They all agree that I should have received something.

They are the ones who have prompted me to write to you at such a late date. I would like to know what your feelings are in view of all of the newspaper coverage confirming my participation.

In some of these news stories Presidential aides have let my role be known. My parents have told me that Carson Rasmussen believes I should have gotten something.

Please let me know what you think is fair.

Respectfully,

Fred Divel
February 5, 1971

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. John D. Ehrlichman
Assistant to the President
For Domestic Affairs
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear John:

Chuck Horning of Latham & Watkins (attorney for the former owners of the Cotton Estate) handed me the enclosed copy when I saw him in Los Angeles yesterday.

I'd like to talk to you about this and about a couple of other matters when I see you next week.

Regards,

Herbert W. Kalmbach

HWK/ah
Enclosure
January 11, 1971

Dear Mr. Ogden:

Recently, I have been made aware that I should have received a finders fee for my part in influencing the President into buying the old Cotton Estate.

Several newsmen have asked me what I received for my efforts. Friends and family have asked as well. They all agree that I should have received something.

They are the ones who have prompted me to write to you at such a late date. I would like to know what your feelings are in view of all of the newspaper coverage confirming my participation.

In some of these news stories Presidential aides have let my role be known. My parents have told me that Carson Rasmussen believes I should have gotten something.

Please let me know what you think is fair.

Respectfully,

Fred Divel
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 20, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALEMEN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN

SUBJECT: Finch Memorandum for The President on California Delegation, Convention, and Campaign

Finch acquired some of the information relayed to you in California by a memorandum from Leonard Firestone (attached at Tab A).

Finch's interpretation of this information and a DMI telephone poll raise the following points (original memorandum attached at Tab B):

1) The selection of the California delegation represents a power play by Reagan's people (Tom Reed, Holmes Tuttle, and Bob Walker, and Eleanor Ring). It is Finch's view that the delegation will not help carry California in November; further that delegation may raise money which will not go to the campaign.

2) Authority is requested to recommend to Mitchell these steps:

   (a). Reed should submit suggested delegates to Firestone for review and recommendation to the Attorney General;
   (b). An agreement about funds should be reached soon;
   (c). No public announcements in August about delegate selection should be made; "records" should not be kept by Reed; future polls in California should be controlled by the campaign.

Recommendation:
That Finch's memorandum be forwarded to the Attorney General with a notation that the President did not see.

Approve  Disapprove  

Comment  Joe Finch directed his memo to AB - at P's instigation.
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 20, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALEMAN
FROM: GORDON STRACHAN
SUBJECT: Finch Memorandum for The President on California Delegation, Convention, and Campaign

Finch acquired some of the information relayed to you in California by a memorandum from Leonard Firestone (attached at Tab A).

Finch's interpretation of this information and a DMI telephone poll raise the following points (original memorandum attached at Tab B):

1) The selection of the California delegation represents a power play by Reagan's people (Tom Reed, Holmes Tuttle, and Bob Walker, and Eleanor Ring). It is Finch's view that the delegation will not help carry California in November; further that delegation may raise money which will not go to the campaign.

2) Authority is requested to recommend to Mitchell these steps:

(a). Reed should submit suggested delegates to Firestone for review and recommendation to the Attorney General;

(b). An agreement about funds should be reached soon;

(c). No public announcements in August about delegate selection should be made; "records" should not be kept by Reed; future polls in California should be controlled by the campaign.

Recommendation:

That Finch's memorandum be forwarded to the Attorney General with a notation that the President did not see.

Approve

Disapprove

Comment
LKF Notes on Meeting
9:00 AM - Thursday, July 8, 1971
Holmes Tuttle residence, Los Angeles

attended by
Leonard Firestone
Holmes Tuttle
Tom Reed
Mr. French Smith

After some small talk and pleasant chatter, Tom Reed produced the attached memorandum, which we all went over, discussing various points.

At the outset, Reed informed the group that the program outlined in the memorandum has been discussed with and was approved by the Attorney General in Washington, D.C. on June 29, 1971, as noted at the end of the memorandum.

Reed indicated they wanted a broad-based delegation, representing all elements of the Party, and that, in order to keep the heat off the Governor, they were going to have a small organizing committee that would be responsible for picking the delegation.

LKF asked him if it was the intention to broaden the Organizing Committee into a selection committee, including legislators and other interested groups. Reed responded that he felt it would not be wise to do so, and that the selection committee should be the five named on the Organizing Committee.

LKF suggested that it would be very necessary for the campaign group to be able to select and invite delegates, based on such factors as contributions to the campaign, desire and ability to work in the campaign, and other considerations that would benefit the campaign committee.

Reed agreed this was necessary, but thought that the Organizing Committee could bear these factors in mind as they were making their selections.

Holmes Tuttle said, "That's the reason you (LKF) were asked to join the Committee, since you are close to the President and the Administration.

LKF made it clear that he had accepted on the basis of the Governor asking him, and that he had received no request or instruction from anyone else to serve on the Committee.

It was announced that Bill Smith will act as Counsel to the Organizing Committee and the delegation, and will be in charge of operations of the delegation, under Reed. However, since he is Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of California, the Governor did not want to have Smith's name made public in this connection."
Bill Smith suggested that August was a little early to announce the Organizing Committee, but Reed insisted it should be done at that time, in order to stop speculation around the State, and in Sacramento in particular.

There was some discussion as to the possibility of a competing delegation, but, generally, we all felt that McCluskey would wash out and would probably not be a threat.

With regard to the schedule item in the memorandum that, late in March 1972, the delegation list would be submitted to the Governor for approval, LNF asked if, since it would be essentially a delegation for President Nixon, it was not the intention that the President would also approve the list?

Reed said we would assume the Governor would take it up with the President.

Finally, Holmes Tuttle said to Reed, "Well, do you want to bring up that other matter?"

Reed sort of mumbled, "What other matter?"

Tuttle said, "Well, you know, about the campaign."

Reed: "Oh, yes. I talked to the Attorney General about it, and he agreed that there would be nothing done on the campaign until the whole thing could be structured at one time and the Attorney General had had a chance to talk about it on the spot here in California."

LNF: "In that connection, I think I should tell you -- you probably are aware of the fact that there was an announcement about three weeks ago that was, to say the least, premature. I don't understand how it got out, but the way I have been explaining it is that, because of my association with the Nixon Foundation, the Californians for Revenue Sharing program, and the Citizens for Nixon organization in Washington, D.C., someone might have gotten mixed up and come to the conclusion that I was heading up something else out here. However, the article was simply confused. I talked personally with the Attorney General after that article came out, and simply told him I would be willing to do anything he asked me to do."

LNF also told the group about the call he received from the Governor while in Pebble Beach on Sunday, June 27th.

Bill Smith said the Governor hadn't meant to say that he didn't want LNF, or that LNF would be disruptive. The Governor was only trying to indicate that he didn't think any one name should be put up at this time. Instead, should wait until the full leadership group for the campaign could be structured.
Bill Smith again said the Governor was only implying about waiting to fill out the whole structure.

LRF: "I'm the one who talked to the Governor and I'm telling you what he said."

Bill Smith: "I don't think he meant that. He doesn't consider you disruptive."

LRF concluded by saying he didn't think he was disruptive or divisive and repeated the strong support he has given to Governor Reagan in two campaigns, and also to Senator Murphy last year. He added that he thought he would be able to do the job to the satisfaction of the Party and all concerned, and that, if asked, he would do it.

During the discussion, Reed spoke up and said he thought the Governor meant only that he didn't want one name put up there in front, to be shot at.

* * * * *

next meeting of Organizing Committee scheduled for September 14, 1971.
MEMORANDUM for the File

Telephone Conversation, LK and RR
Sunday, June 27, 1971

RR telephoned LKF, approx. 10:00 AM, Sunday, June 27th, at Pebble Beach. (LK had come down to Pebble Beach about midnight, Saturday June 26th, from San Mateo, after attending Margaret Healey’s wedding and had learned that Holmes Tuttle was staying with the Davises for the week-end at Pebble Beach, but LKF did not have occasion to talk with either of them)

LKF feels sure that RR could have known of LKF’s travel plans only through Mr. Davis or Mr. Tuttle, and he is inclined to believe that it was Mr. Tuttle who “programmed” the telephone call.

At the outset, the telephone conversation was about the wedding, golf, and things of a general nature, all in a pleasant exchange.

RR then said: “I was talking to the Attorney General a few days ago about the delegation. In the course of the conversation, the article that was in last Sunday’s Los Angeles Times came up.”

At that point, LKF said: “Yes, Ron, that was sort of premature. Fortunately, I had to leave for Akron, and did not have to comment on it to the press. However, when I got back to San Francisco, several of my friends asked me about it, and I simply told them that, since I am head of the President’s Foundation, and have also been head of the California Revenue-sharing support program, I could only assume someone had jumped to the conclusion I might be heading up a Citizens for Nixon campaign, and in the speculation this kind of an article got published.”
That response seemed to slow him down a little. However, he said: "The reason I called you is to tell you that, since we are good friends, I didn’t want you to feel I was talking behind your back, and I told the Attorney General I didn’t think it would be a good idea for you to serve as Chairman."

He went on to say that the Party had been badly fractured in the past, that the cracks had been painted over with a thin layer, and we just couldn’t disrupt things again.

He said: "Of course, we couldn’t have Salvatori in the job, from one side of the spectrum, or you (meaning LKF) in the job from the other side of the spectrum."

When he was through, LKF said: "Non, you have every right to your opinion, and I respect your thoughts, but I simply can’t accept the concept that I am divisive in the Party, or would be disruptive. You will recall that I have supported you very liberally on two occasions, and that I probably gave as much or more to George Murphy campaign than anyone, and I have always supported the Party."

He responded: "Oh, you should be in the campaign, but it probably should be run by means of a co-chairman or committee arrangement, in some manner we could all agree on."

LKF resisted the temptation of asking RR who he had in mind, as he didn’t want to bring that up. LKF simply replied that he was always to the re-election of the President, and that he had told the Attorney
General wanted him to serve, adding "I want you to know that if either of them ask me to serve as Campaign Chairman, that is what I am going to do."

LKF further told RR that "if I am asked to do it, I have already told the Attorney General the first thing I would do would be to come to see you and discuss the possibility of you being Honorary Chairman, and to go over the general campaign plans and strategy with you."

RR said he was also going to work hard for the re-election of the President.

LKF said one thing he could suggest for RR to do was to get hold of Reinecke, Younger and Flournoy, and anybody else in the Republican Party who was working now for 1974 and tell them that they are to keep their eyes on 1972 until the President is re-elected. LKF pointed out the fund-raising dinners that Reinecke and Younger are planning.

RR knew about this, but said the trouble was the Democrats are all running now for 1974, to the point where you can't find anyone in Sacramento.

LKF ended up the conversation by commenting we would just have to wait and see how things develop, and said he hoped to see RR soon.
POLICY FOR SELECTION OF THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION TO THE 1972 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

MAKEUP:

66 delegates: 2 from each congressional district, 10 at large (no more than 4 from each congressional district), and 96 alternates.

LEADERSHIP:

Governor Reagan, Chairman of delegation. T. C. Reed, Vice-Chairman. Delegation firmly pledged to the renomination of President Nixon.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

T. C. Reed, Chairman; Eleanor Ring, Governor Reagan (to be represented by one staff member); Holmes Tuttle, Leonard Firestone.

Counsel (not for public announcement): W. F. Smith.

Staff: To be selected by Chairman (Reed) with approval of the Committee. Initially, Helen Hasley will act as Secretary of the Committee.

Records and Files: Office of the National Committeeman.

SCHEDULE:

August 1971 - Public announcement of organizing committee.
September-December 1971 - Informal "hearings." Luncheon meetings with key leadership. Somewhat formal "hearings" by Reed and Ring at ASGOC State Convention, October 1-3.
January 1972 - Committee commences deliberations as a group, including others as appropriate.
Late March 1972 - (After New Hampshire, Wisconsin, primaries)
Submit list to Governor for approval. List to include suggested officers of delegation. No "draft" lists to be released prior to this date.
March 8, 1972 - Earliest date to file for primary.
April 7, 1972 - Latest date to file for primary.

PRIMARY CAMPAIGN MANAGEMENT:

To be determined by the President and the Governor in the spring of 1972 in light of apparent challenges.

PROCEDURES:

Every effort will be made to involve the rank and file of the Republican Party in California in the nominating process; to avoid problems under
rule was adopted at the 1968 convention; to assure that as many communities and constituencies as possible are represented; and to build political strength for the President and the Governor consistent with the above. Computer time-sharing and file maintenance will be used to assure the retention and analysis of all nominations.

POLLING:

The Organizing Committee will undertake regular surveys to analyze the probability and nature of a primary challenge to this delegation, and to ascertain the opinions of all Republicans.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION AT THE CONVENTION:

To be the responsibility of the National Committeeman and Committeewoman (Reed and Ring). Financial arrangements to be started by the Organizing Committee.

The above discussed with and approved by RR, 7/5/71, Sacramento.

The above policy, but not specific memo, discussed with and approved by John Mitchell, 6/29/71, Washington, D.C.
MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: ROBERT H. FINCH
SUBJECT: California Delegation, Convention and Campaign

The two attached memoranda from Tom Reed regarding the selection of the California delegation represent a power play with potentially disastrous consequences.

The very existence of this material and the polls in them is inexcusable.

Several things are obvious:

1. In terms of fund raising party unity and symbolism, you cannot separate the delegation from the California campaign. This is strongly reinforced if San Diego is the convention site.

2. The delegation must be structured solely on the basis of what will help carry California in November.

Any delegation picked by a committee chaired by Reed and composed of Reagan, his designee (Bob Walker), Tuttle, Eleanor Ring, and your designee (i.e. Firestone it is presumed) will not meet this standard.

In 1968 you will recall, Tuttle "assessed" each delegate $5,000 or $10,000 for the "Reagan Fund." As in 1956 and 1964, a so-called "Host Committee" headed by the national committeeman, national committeewoman and state chairman, will raise a substantial sum of money for favors and gifts to delegates. This is money which will be denied us for the campaign.
I plan to meet with John Mitchell as soon as he returns and would like to recommend the following:

1. Reed should be advised that suggestions for delegates would be welcomed from each of the persons Reed proposed for his committee (except Bob Walker), plus each statewide Republican office holder as well as Republican congressmen from California and state legislators.

   To keep it away from the White House, I would suggest Firestone or someone else -- clearly your man -- be designated as the person who will make final recommendations to Mitchell for the composition of the President's delegation.

2. There should be an agreement as soon as possible on "assessments" or other monies raised from delegates or others in connection with the convention. I would suggest that a given quota be established with one-half to be set aside for convention purposes and one-half for the Nixon campaign in California. There must be an accounting of these funds.

3. The other steps in the memos which must be countered are:

   (a) No public announcements in August about delegation selection.

   (b) "Records and Files" not in Reed's office.

   (c) If further polls in California are taken someone from the Nixon organization should help formulate as well as have access to results -- who is paying for them? We certainly don't need any other polls on "If Richard Nixon does not run for President ...."

   (d) OR memos saying "Nixon is in trouble in California."

4. This is your delegation, your convention, your campaign. Reagan should be chairman but if the Reeds and Walkers run wild with the kind of stupidity reflected in these documents and if they run the campaign we are in trouble.
POLICY FOR SELECTION OF THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION
TO THE 1972 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

MAKEUP:

96 delegates: 2 from each congressional district, 10 at large (no more
than 4 from each congressional district), and 96 alternates.

LEADERSHIP:

Governor Reagan, Chairman of delegation. T. C. Reed, Vice-Chairman.
Delegation firmly pledged to the renomination of President Nixon.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

T. C. Reed, Chairman; Eleanor Ring; Governor Reagan (to be represented
by one staff member); Holmes Tuttle; Leonard Firestone.

Counsel (not for public announcement): W. F. Smith.

Staff: To be selected by Chairman (Reed) with approval of the Committee.
Initially, Helen Healey will act as Secretary of the Committee.

Records and Files: Office of the National Committeeman.

SCHEDULE:

August 1971 - Public announcement of organizing committee.
September-December 1971 - Informal "hearings." Luncheon meetings
with key leadership. Somewhat formal "hearings" by Reed and
Ring at RSCCC State Convention, October 1-3.
January 1972 - Committee commences deliberations as a group,
including others as appropriate.
Late March 1972 - (After New Hampshire, Wisconsin, primaries)
Submit list to Governor for approval. List to include suggested
officers of delegation. No "draft" lists to be released prior
to this date.
March 8, 1972 - Earliest date to file for primary.
April 7, 1972 - Latest date to file for primary.

PRIMARY CAMPAIGN MANAGEMENT:

To be determined by the President and the Governor in the spring of
1972 in light of apparent challenges.

PROCEDURES:

Every effort will be made to involve the rank and file of the Republican
Party in California in the nomination process; to avoid problems under
rule 14 adopted at the 1968 convention; to assure that as many communities and constituencies as possible are represented; and to build political strength for the President and the Governor consistent with the above. Computer time-sharing and file maintenance will be used to assure the retention and analysis of all nominations.

POLLLING:

The Organizing Committee will undertake regular surveys to analyze the probability and nature of a primary challenge to this delegation, and to ascertain the opinions of all Republicans.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION AT THE CONVENTION:

To be the responsibility of the National Committeeman and Committee-woman (Reed and Ring). Financial arrangements to be started by the Organizing Committee.

The above discussed with and approved by RR, 7/5/71, Sacramento.

The above policy, but not specific memo, discussed with and approved by John Mitchell, 6/29/71, Washington, D.C.
MEMO TO: Delegation Organizing Committee

FROM: Thomas C. Reed, Chairman

Confirming my conversations with each of you, the Organizing Committee will meet for lunch at the Los Angeles Club at 12:00 noon on Tuesday, 14 September 1971. At that time we should plan to work out the basic ground rules for the selection process.

To facilitate communication, I understand the addresses and phone numbers of the committee members to be as follows:

Thomas C. Reed, Chairman 415 + 456-7310
503 D Street
San Rafael, Ca. 94901

The Honorable Ronald Reagan
State Capitol
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Attention of Mr. Robert C. Walker 916 + 445-0875
Mrs. Eleanor Ring 714 + 435-4524
801 Tolita Avenue
Coronado, Ca. 92113

Mr. Leonard K. Firestone 213 + 583-4411
10375 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, Ca. 90024

Mr. Holmes Tuttle 213 + 933-5911
145 North La Brea Avenue
Los Angeles, Ca. 90036

Counsel:

Mr. William Frenzen Smith 213 + 620-9300
634 South Spring Street
Memo to: Delegation Organizing Committee
13 July 1971

To better understand the nature of the challenge we may face in 1972, I have undertaken several surveys on the President's strengths and weakness. I enclose two memoranda resulting from these polls.

Prior to our September meeting we will have taken an August survey to update these and will have started work on a simple computer file maintenance system for our name lists.

Thanks very much for your help.

Enclosures:
"Presidential Job Rating and the Issues in California" 6/8/71
"The 1972 Presidential Primary in California" 6/11/71
The 1972 Presidential Primary in California.

California's presidential primary will be held a year from now. The earliest filing date is March 8. The latest is April 7, subsequent to the Alaska, Florida, New Hampshire and Wisconsin primaries.

To adequately plan and select a Presidential primary slate in California, one should be aware of the possible challengers - both within and without the party. For this purpose we asked* two types of questions throughout California.

First of all, "If Richard Nixon did not run again for President in 1972, who would you personally like to see become the next President of the United States?" The open-ended nature of the question allows one to measure interest now - a year before the primary. The results, among Republicans, are listed below, and are compared to a published statewide Marvin Field poll (S.F. Chronicle, May 12, 1971). The Field poll was, presumably closed end, i.e., 7 or 8 names were listed on a card.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPUBLICANS:</th>
<th>This survey</th>
<th>Field Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know, undecided</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnew</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldwater</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCloskey</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others (none over 3%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same question, among Democrats:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATS:</th>
<th>This survey</th>
<th>Field Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know, Undecided</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskie</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphry</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (none over 3%)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, we asked specific head-to-head questions of Republicans to gauge the general strength of McCloskey and Lindsay. A head-to-head, President vs. Governor, was included only to measure the President's base of strength.

The results, Republicans only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nixon 76%</th>
<th>Nixon 76%</th>
<th>Nixon 65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCloskey</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Lindsay 12%</td>
<td>Reagan 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Don't Know 12%</td>
<td>Don't Know 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above strongly suggests that no serious opposition is currently evident within the Republican party, that Democratic voters have not yet focused on a candidate, and that preliminary planning for the delegation and primary should proceed with the serious problems of the general election in mind.
residential Job Rating and the Issues in California - June 8, 1971
95 Telephone Interviews, 493 Registered Voters. Sample appears to be valid.

RESIDENTIAL JOB RATING: "How would you rate the job Richard Nixon is doing as President - excellent, good, fair, or poor?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Survey, May 1971</th>
<th>Statewide last Campaign Survey Oct., 1970</th>
<th>City of S.F. Only April, 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENT'S BALLOT STRENGTH: "If the election for President were held today, and Richard Nixon were running for re-election, would you vote for him?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Regis. Voters</th>
<th>Rep. in '70</th>
<th>Dem. in '70</th>
<th>Reagan in '70</th>
<th>Unruh in '70</th>
<th>Northern Calif.</th>
<th>Southern Calif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison, the 1968 vote results in California were:
Nixon: 48.0%      Humphrey: 44.9%    Wallace: 6.8%

HE ISSUES: "What do you think is the most important problem facing the State of California in 1971?" Note that the question precludes international problems such as Vietnam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May, 1971</th>
<th>October, 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much welfare</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy: Air/Water</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor welfare to needy</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessities, inflation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, narcotics</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naidu Reagan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, financing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is apparent that since the close of the '70 election, the economic issue has mushroomed. When people are out of work, ecology and even "law and order" shrink. Air pollution may not be named simply because it's spring. After a hot smoggy summer in L.A., it may re-emerge. Taxes are already the No. 1 issue. A state tax increase this year could have serious repercussions.

CONCLUSIONS:

A 1972 Nixon victory in California looks quite difficult. The President's job rating is slipping, and by a 5:3 margin Californians claim they would vote against him. Given a specific opponent, however, this situation would undoubtedly improve.

With serious Republican defections (17% is three times what Richard Nixon can afford to lose) and the apparent 6:1 trade-off in Reagan voters opposing Nixon versus Unruh voters favoring Nixon, Reagan assistance and involvement in California would be most beneficial.

To achieve victory, taxes must be kept down, unemployment must be solved, and people must have confidence that unemployment has been solved.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: H. R. HALDeman

SUBJECT: New Hampshire Primary

You asked that the Attorney General be informed that he must silence Governor Peterson and Senator Cotton on comments urging you to campaign in the New Hampshire Primary.

Jeb Magruder contacted Governor Peterson on November 20 about the inappropriateness of this comment. In addition, Magruder asked Stuart Lamprey to make this point to Senator Cotton as well as Governor Peterson. Peter Flanigan also mentioned this to Governor Peterson.

After the Governor Peterson statement, Lane Dwinnell, the Nixon State Chairman in New Hampshire, said that although he hoped the President would campaign in New Hampshire, in light of the President's busy schedule it would probably not be possible. Harry Flemming also talked with Senator Cotton and Stuart Lamprey on December 7 and emphasized that his comments on the President's campaign plans were inappropriate.

As to the other primary states, the Attorney General has instructed all of his crew to make the point to all Nixon State Chairmen and organizations not to expect the President to campaign in their primary states. All statements and comments to the press are to reflect this view that you will not campaign in the primary states.
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MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: H.R. Haldeman
SUBJECT: New Hampshire Primary

You asked that the Attorney General be informed that he must silence Governor Peterson and Senator Cotton on comments urging you to campaign in the New Hampshire primary.

On November 24 Jeb Magruder discussed this matter with the Attorney General, who has not talked with Governor Peterson personally nor does he feel it is appropriate at this time.

However, Magruder contacted Governor Peterson on November 20 about the inappropriateness of this comment. In addition, Magruder asked Stuart Lamprey to make this point to Senator Cotton as well as Governor Peterson. Peter Flanigan also mentioned this to Governor Peterson.

After the Governor Peterson statement, Lane Dwinell, the Nixon State Chairman in New Hampshire, said that although he hoped the President would campaign in New Hampshire, in light of the President's busy schedule it would probably not be possible.

Harry Flemming talked with Senator Cotton and Stuart Lamprey on December 7 and emphasized that his comments on the President's campaign plans were inappropriate.

As you may recall, you and Governor Peterson exchanged letters on November 30 and December 8 regarding his support for your re-election (copies attached).

As to the other primary states, the Attorney General has instructed Jeb Magruder and Harry Flemming to make the point to all Nixon State Chairman and organisations not to expect the President to campaign in their primary states. All statements and comments to the press are to reflect this view that you will probably not campaign in the primary states.

HRH:GS:lm
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

December 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: H.R. HALEMAN
SUBJECT: New Hampshire Primary

You asked that the Attorney General be informed that he must silence Governor Peterson and Senator Cotton on comments urging you to campaign in the New Hampshire primary.

On November 24, Jeb Magruder discussed this matter with the Attorney General, who has not talked with Governor Peterson personally, nor does he feel it is appropriate at this time.

Magruder contacted Governor Peterson on November 20 about the inappropriateness of this comment. In addition, Magruder asked Stuart Lamprey to make this point to Senator Cotton as well as Governor Peterson. Peter Flanigan also mentioned this to Governor Peterson.

After the Governor Peterson statement, Lane Dwinell, the Nixon State Chairman in New Hampshire, said that although he hoped the President would campaign in New Hampshire, in light of the President's busy schedule it would probably not be possible.

Harry Flemming talked with Senator Cotton and Stuart Lamprey on December 7 and emphasized that his comments on the President's campaign plans were inappropriate.

As you may recall, you and Governor Peterson exchanged letters on November 30 and December 8 regarding his support for your re-election (copies attached).

As to the other primary states, the Attorney General has instructed Jeb Magruder and Harry Flemming to make the point to all Nixon State Chairmen and organizations not to expect the President to campaign in their primary states. All statements and comments to the press are to reflect this view that you will probably not campaign in the primary states.
December 10, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: H.R. HALEMENAN
SUBJECT: New Hampshire Primary

You asked that the Attorney General be informed that he must silence Governor Peterson and Senator Cotton on comments urging you to campaign in the New Hampshire primary.

On November 24 Jeb Magruder discussed this matter with the Attorney General, who has not talked with Governor Peterson personally nor does he feel it is appropriate at this time.

However, Magruder contacted Governor Peterson on November 20 about the inappropriateness of this comment. In addition, Magruder asked Stuart Lamprey to make this point to Senator Cotton as well as Governor Peterson. Peter Flanigan also mentioned this to Governor Peterson.

Harry Flemming talked with Senator Cotton and Stuart Lamprey on December 7 and emphasized that his comments on the President's campaign plans were inappropriate.

As you may recall, you and Governor Peterson exchanged letters on November 30 and December 8 regarding his support for your re-election (copies attached).

After the Governor Peterson statement, Lane Dwinell, the Nixon State Chairman in New Hampshire, said that although he hoped the President would campaign in New Hampshire, in light of the President's busy schedule it would probably not be possible.

As to the other primary states, the Attorney General has instructed Jeb Magruder and Harry Flemming to make the point to all Nixon State Chairman and organizations not to expect the President to campaign in their primary states. All statements and comments to the press are to reflect this view that you will probably not campaign in the primary states.
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MEMORANDUM FOR: 
THE STAFF SECRETARY

FROM: H. R. Haldeman

SUBJECT: New Hampshire Primary

It was requested that the Attorney General be informed that he must silence Governor Peterson and Senator Cotton on comments urging the President to campaign in the New Hampshire primary.

On November 24 Jeb Magruder discussed this matter with the Attorney General, who has not talked with Governor Peterson personally nor does he feel it is appropriate at this time.

However, Magruder contacted Governor Peterson on November 20 about the inappropriateness of this comment. In addition, Magruder asked Stuart Lamprey to make this point to Senator Cotton as well as Governor Peterson. Peter Flanigan also been asked to mention this to Governor Peterson.

After the Governor Peterson statement, Lane Dwinell, the Nixon State Chairman in New Hampshire, said that although he hoped the President would campaign in New Hampshire, in light of the President's busy schedule it would probably not be possible.

As to the other primary states, the Attorney General has instructed Jeb Magruder and Harry Flemming to make the point to all Nixon State Chairmen and organizations not to expect the President to campaign in their primary states. All statements and comments to the press are to reflect this view that the President will probably not campaign in the primary states.

Harry Flemming talked with Gov. Peterson on Dec. 7 and emphasized that these comments on the P's campaign plans were inappropriate.

As you may recall you and Gov. Peterson exchanged letters on Nov. 30 regarding his support for your reelection (copies attached).