

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>
3	12	5/2/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: the use of a prominent national labor figure for the campaign. 2 pgs.
3	12	4/3/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: an attached memo from Lou Harris on RN's public image during the campaign. 1 pg.
3	12	4/3/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson for "The File" RE: RN's role in the 1972 campaign. 4 pgs.
3	12	2/10/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: the role of issue questions in polls. 1 pg.

<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>
3	12	1/11/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: public opinion on RN's international relations and his handling of the economy. Trial heat numbers against various Democratic candidates and Wallace are also included. 4 pgs.
3	12	9/22/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: a meeting with Bob Dole and the White House's relations with the Republican National Committee. 2 pgs.
3	12	8/11/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: a planned meeting between Meany and Chavez in California on the subject of Fitzsimmons and the Teamsters. 1 pg.
3	12	10/12/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: a comment supposedly made by RN during the 1968 campaign reported by "Time." Handwritten notes added by Haldeman and some unknown party. 1 pg.
3	12	8/5/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: Lou Harris's meeting with Larry O'Brien and the latter's thoughts on the potential Democratic candidates in the 1972 election, the economy, and key electoral states. 3 pgs.

<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>
3	12	7/23/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: various union developments, particularly within the AFL/CIO. 1 pg.
3	12	7/12/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Colson to Haldeman RE: poll figures on Muskie and an analysis of Kennedy's chance for the Democratic nomination in 1972. 2 pgs.
3	12		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Other Document	Notes taken by unknown, possibly Colson, relating to information relayed by Harris. This information included polling figures on specific demographics, the status of various Democratic hopefuls, and issues with the "New York Times." 4 pgs.

May 2, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Labor Man

Wholly apart from George Bell's condition and availability, we have needed for some time a heavy weight in the labor field. Our efforts over the last couple months have been to recruit a top drawer labor leader for the 1701 operation. We could easily get a Teamster, but in view of the Hoffa release and the Fitzsimmons arrangement, that would be unwise. We need someone from the AFL-CIO, but in view of Meany's current attitude all we can come up with are old, retired hacks or people who have no future within the AFL-CIO -- certainly no one sufficiently well known and heavy to do the job.

In talking about this with Pete Brennan's deputy, Don Rodgers last week, Rodgers urged that the job be done from within the White House with relatively unknown organizers out of 1701; any heavy weight who would be willing to run the risk to his future in associating with the campaign would insist on doing so from inside for several reasons: first, there is more clout; second, it could be justified with Meany and third, he would be better received within the labor movement as someone from the White House even if he was acting in a political capacity. If he were operating out of 1701, he simply would not be able to get in with the key labor leaders; they can justify dealing with the White House, they can't with a Republican President's campaign apparatus.

In addition to discussing the general plan with Rodgers, Cashen and I explored his own personal interest. He is Brennan's full-time paid professional and a very shrewd, well known and respected building trades leader. He happens to be extremely bright and a

diamond is just enough rough to get along very well with the average labor leader. I talked to Mitchell and Shultz, both of whom were very enthusiastic, based on what they knew of Rodgers and particularly on the strategy and the way in which I explained Rodgers' proposals. We are going to have trouble getting Rodgers. Among other things, there are serious financial complications. Mitchell is waiting for the final word from Rockefeller and then will meet Rodgers and we will take it from there if you approve. Shultz is ironing out things with Hodgson, but to my pleasant surprise, Shultz seemed entirely in support of the concept.

Rodgers' best contacts, by the way, are with buildings trades leaders in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, the very labor constituencies that we need to make our major efforts with.

If all of this works out, we will, therefore, be proposing the addition of one man on the assumption that Bell is back with us at some point. Bell can assist Rodgers and also handle other things here very easily. Obviously George is not even in the same league with Rodgers, either in terms of mental equipment or, it goes without saying, contacts in the labor movement. Rodgers has also had a lot of political organizing experience in New York.

It may necessitate a call from the President to Pete Brennan to finally put the lock on this but I will resist that hard and will recommend it only if absolutely necessary. At the moment, Mitchell is trying to work through Rockefeller.

April 3, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Attached Thoughts from Lou Harris

You might like to glance through the attached. I think it makes a fair amount of sense. Harris told me that he had been giving this a great deal of thought and he rattled through this when we had lunch together a few weeks ago. I know there will be a hundred and one armchair experts who will give us advice on the President's style and posture during the campaign, so you can throw this away if you think it has no value. I have also not translated it as articulately as Harris gave it to me, but I think I have caught the basic thrust of his point. By and large I tend to agree with him.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

EYES ONLY

April 3, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE

SUBJECT: Random Thoughts from Lou Harris

Harris believes that the President needs, between now and the election, to continually create "straw men". Meany affords us the best opportunity, but we've got to work at creating others -- deliberate enemies. The President is against those who plunged us into Vietnam but now want to sell out America's honor. The President is against those retailers who over-charge consumers. The middle man example in the food price issue is a perfect illustration. If there isn't a natural villain, create one so that the President can be the defender of the public interest against natural enemies.

Harris believes that the President should be forceful but not strident; that whenever he is strident, the President brings out the hostility of a latent anti-Nixon feeling which still exists with a large body of people, but that when he is deliberate, quiet, rational, forceful, he does not engender this latent hostility.

Harris believes that we should downplay the campaign throughout the year, make it as boring as possible. Harris believes that a bland campaign will help us in that we will benefit greatly from a low turnout. Also, people react better to the President if he does not polarize on gut issues. This does not mean that we should not address the issues; we should defuse as many as possible, but not arouse the passions of the electorate with a very divisive issue that might bring out our opponents (as with anti-labor legislation, for example).

Harris believes the key to our success is in avoiding having the American electorate act emotionally or precipitously with respect to the President's candidacy. He points out that as his pollsters question people, they get a better response after the questioning than at the outset. More people favor the President's re-election after they have been walked through the issues than when they are first confronted with the question cold, "Do you favor the President as against Candidate X?"

One of the President's strong points is that people think he is trying hard. He is beginning to develop a characteristic of sincerity, that he is really working at solving the problems. Harris advises that we should articulate everything we do rationally, calmly, quietly, and forcefully. Make people think, make people thoughtful. Do not provoke instant emotional reactions. The President's style has come through very

well as being deliberate. We should not let him go swinging or overreacting. If our opponent becomes strident, we should take it in stride. The more irresponsible the opposition becomes, the more the President is helped in being looked at as a solid, steady, strong and deliberate statesman. Be the "solid brick in the middle" Harris suggests. Ask people to think of the issues seriously.

In this same vein, we should turn the lack of so-called charisma into an asset, arguing that no one has the right to use the office of Presidency for the development of a personality cult, that personal promotion is not the measure of one's success as President. One cannot run the country through charm, rather through ability. Nixon's style is to be serious and dedicated, that that is more important than personal image.

Harris believes that Nixon's image is now being sharpened as a rational, thoughtful, deliberate leader, all of which can be destroyed if there is a spontaneous reaction or a sharp galvanizing of the opposition in the months ahead. Harris believes that if people are asked calmly and quietly to think through the choice for President, that the President cannot be beaten by any of the present Democratic Presidential candidates. If on the other hand, the election turns into

a heated, highly controversial, emotionally charged campaign, we will simply bring out enough anti votes to defeat us; there are just more of them than us and if we galvanize them, we (not the Democratic candidates) can beat ourselves. The key at the moment is to maintain the tone that we have presently achieved and to hold it throughout the election year.


Charles W. Colson

EYES ONLY

February 10, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Polling

Apropos our conversation on polls this morning, I think it might be a very interesting experiment to have our pollsters ask at the outset of the interview the approval question and the trial heats. Then go into the development of issue data and all the questions about the President that would be a part of the poll. At the end of the session, the interviewer might say, "I just want to check my notes once again. How did you say you would vote between Nixon and X?"

If there is any shift, i. e. , any change at the end of the interview from the beginning, this could be very significant information. More importantly, the profile of the kind of people who shift could be invaluable. That would identify the type of voter we really need to get to with issue material. That is, the people who can be sold if we work on them. Conceivably that could be the swing vote.

Harris said he would do this for me. On the other hand, I have some reservations about having him do this. We all know he is for sale and, while he is presently in our hands (I think), there is no telling what might happen in the future. The more I think about it the more I would be inclined to have it in the hands of one of our suppliers whom we can control rather than in the hands of Harris.

Would you let me know?

January 11, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: Latest Harris Poll

The latest Harris Poll was conducted December 28 through January 4 (ironically I urged this date upon Harris. I obviously did not know that the bombing was going to be resumed during the week after Christmas. My preference for the week was based upon the fact that we had a lot of good year-end stuff, good TV the week before Christmas and that we had really put the Congress down -- a point that was coming through in the media. I was also influenced by the Time "Man of the Year" Award. In any event, it turned out to be a very bad call time-wise).

On the trial heats it is Nixon 42, Muskie 42, Wallace 11. In a two way race, it is Muskie 48, Nixon 45. The Wallace vote, in other words, takes 2 away from Muskie for every one he takes away from us. Harris will not publish this information. He gives it to us for our guidance but agreed with me that it would be better not printed. It should be noted that all year long it has been the conclusion from the Harris data that Wallace was hurting Muskie more than us.

Harris will print the Muskie trial heat next week. We had discussed whether it would be better to wait awhile, but then we should get it out of the way, hopefully letting the President rise again in the polls the next time around. My thought was that it would be very bad to have this come out in February because people look at the publication date, they don't look at the date the poll was taken.

Against other candidates, our standing is relatively unchanged. It is Nixon 46, Humphrey 37, Wallace 12 and, in a two way race, Nixon 51, Humphrey 40. Against Kennedy, it is Nixon 45, Kennedy 29, Wallace 10, and, in a two way race, Nixon 50, Kennedy 41.

In the case of the Muskie gain, the big shift has taken place in the \$15,000 and over category -- the white professional upper middle class suburbanites. In early November, we were 53-37 over Muskie with this vote. Now it is 45-42. We only have a slight lead. This once again, has been all year long the most volatile group. It swings back and forth. Muskie is the only Democrat who can make inroads with this group and whenever he does he surges ahead in the polls. Neither the Kennedy-Humphrey or any of the others seem to be able to make any dent in this group which is critical to us and which is growing by leaps and bounds.

There was also a shift with the young people. Undoubtedly it was attributable to the bombing. We lost a little bit of ground in rural areas which Harris believes could be the bad attitude among small farmers at the moment.

Harris attributes all of this to the India-Pakistan situation, as to the handling of which we have a 28 positive and 48 negative rating. This is very low, particularly in a foreign policy area where we have come out the strongest in all of the Harris ratings. Significantly all of the other foreign policy ratings are down as well. Harris' theory is that when we are affected badly in one foreign policy area it rubs off on all others. On handling Vietnam it is 40 positive, 54 negative. Working for peace in the world is now 51 positive, 44 negative. It was in September 64 positive, 34 negative. In the foreign policy ratings, there are large "not sures" indicating there has been a real slippage here.

Harris does not believe, with the exception of the young voter, that the bombings caused the problem; he argues that it was India-Pakistan. Personally I disagree with him although he supports his case by pointing out that on handling Vietnam we did not show the same deterioration we did in all other areas. Harris believes that people got concerned over India-Pakistan, that maybe it would upset our initiatives with China and Russia and the general idea of achieving peace in the world. This is where he feels we were hurt. Also, the college educated, higher income groups would be much more sensitive to the sophisticated issues involved in the India-Pakistan controversy.

Just for purposes of comparison, in the over \$15,000 group the President beats Kennedy 47-32 and Humphrey 56-29. It is in this area that the entire difference with our standing, vis a vis, Muskie, can be found.

Also this is a group which does turn out to vote and which, as I pointed out, is an increasing share of the electorate. Hence, it can be critically important and there is a good lesson from all of this. That is, that Muskie is the one Democrat who can seriously penetrate this group.

On the positive-negative rating, we have dropped from 53-46 to 49-47. Harris will not feature this in a column but will bury it in statistics in a column relating to something else. It should be noted that this is not really much of a decline. All of the published Harris poll data of recent weeks has related to a combination of two polls. One taken the last week in October and one taken in the second week in November. We suffered a precipitous decline in between the two polls and rather than show us up one week and down the next, Harris, at my suggestion, combined the poll data. Hence, the 53-47 was really a lot better than where we actually were in mid-November. In the November poll, if that were broken out separately, we actually had about a 49-47 rating or just what we had in the latest poll.

There was some bright news on the economy. In all categories he showed significant improvement. For example, on the key question "Are the Nixon economic policies keeping the economy healthy", in July we were 22 positive, 73 negative. In November, 34 positive, 60 negative and now in the latest January poll, 38 positive and 56 negative -- still not good but the trend is coming up very well. In terms of keeping unemployment down we now get a 26 positive, 66 negative (in July it was 16 positive, 77 negative). For the first time in two years, a majority do not think that prices are rising more rapidly than before. In response to the question "Is the country in a recession?", today 49 percent say yes, 33 no. In November, it was 56 yes, 27 no. In August it was 62 yes, 24 no; In March it was 65 yes and 21 no. Again, the figures aren't good, but the trend is excellent. A majority feel now that there will not be a recession next year by a 35-31 score. This is a complete reversal of the response received to the same question last summer. The key question politically on the economy is "Are the Nixon economic policies doing more good than harm?" The reply to that is now 48 doing more good than harm, 27 doing more harm than good. Once again, a complete reversal from the position last summer.

Of passing interest, people by a 66 to 20 margin favor keeping controls for another year. Harris honestly believes that Muskie's rise in the polls

is a temporary "blip". The fact that he appears to have a lot of momentum (and in Harris' opinion does have a lot of momentum) has been getting a lot of publicity and doing very well in terms of his public image contrasted with an unsettling period in foreign affairs for us has brought him even with us again, but Harris does not feel it will last because on the issues and on handling the key issues we turn out much better.

Harris believes the following to be most significant:

Which candidates do you believe can do a better job with respect to the following issues?

	Nixon	Muskie	Wallace	None	Not Sure
Working for peace	39	34	8	3	16
Keeping the economy healthy	38	32	8	3	19
End to Vietnam fastest	36	30	11	4	19
Trust most personally as the man in the White House	36	33	9	4	18
Keep down taxes and spending	35	29	10	6	20
Race and civil rights	30	34	14	3	19
Solving problems of the poor	30	35	10	4	21
Crime - law and order	31	30	18	3	18
Air and water pollution	31	36	8	4	21
Health and education	34	34	9	2	21

NOTE: The foregoing was dictated by Mr. Colson over the telephone. It is very rough and rambling but at least gives the raw data of the latest Harris sample.

EYES ONLY

September 22, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: RNC/Senator Dole

I just had a one hour session with Bob Dole to try to crank him up to do a better job of defending the President and hitting back at the Democrats. Dole didn't disagree with any of my points but he is a very different man than he was a few months ago.

1. He is having some serious internal problems with Tom Evans. I assume you are aware of this.
2. He feels the staff at the RNC is incompetent and Nofziger is not doing the job he wants done but he, Dole, doesn't feel he can shake things up.
3. He made the point that we are not giving him enough support, speeches, material, etc., a point he said he made with the President. To the extent that we have not done this, it will be instantly remedied, but I pointed out to Bob that he has the whole National Committee apparatus and that he shouldn't be leaning on us and more importantly shouldn't be taking such minor complaints to the President. I also pointed out that Nofziger had specifically asked us not to send speeches for Dole, Nofziger wanted to write them. Dole's answer was that Nofziger hasn't been writing any good speeches lately.
4. He is obsessed with our lack of support in the farm area and really acts generally demoralized.
5. He fully recognizes that he has made virtually no news for the past two months but I think he honestly doesn't know what to do. I suggested a press conference attacking the Democratic partisan obstructionists for openers. He may do this tomorrow, but he again complained that he had no staff help to get ready for a press conference. I honestly believe his own self-confidence has been eroded for some reason.

--

We are going to start pumping him up directly with some stuff from here. He seems to welcome the idea. You will get loud screams from Nefziger but we have got to try something to get Dole back out front and also to build up his own self-confidence. The two, I suspect, go hand in hand.

August 11, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON
SUBJECT: George Meany

You may have noticed in the article reporting Meany's China blast at us that he plans to meet with Chavez while in California this week to try to get Chavez under control. As you know, Chavez is fighting the Teamsters and Fitzsimmons would never consider reentering the AFL-CIO as long as Meany was supporting Chavez and Chavez was in turn blocking the Teamsters.

Meany and Fitzsimmons have discussed the Chavez situation before and the whole representation issue of the produce growers in California. Fitzsimmons has been trying to get Meany to straighten the problem out, but Meany has been heretofore reluctant to get into it.

I think it is a reasonable surmise that if Meany is meeting with Chavez it is to please Fitzsimmons and thereby pave the way for the Teamsters to rejoin the AFL-CIO. This is, as I have indicated to you before, very much against our interests politically and I would hope that you might pass along to those involved the suggestion that Fitzsimmons be pinned down at the earliest possible time on this point. We should want him to remain independent through next year.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

HIGH PRIORITY

EYES ONLY

EYES ONLY

October 12, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: CHARLES COLSON *mc*
SUBJECT: An alleged comment by the President.

Time, this week, has a very sharp dig at the President regarding an alleged comment during the 1968 campaign that the nation isn't ready to elect a Jew to national office.

Obviously this will hurt us with the 2% Jewish vote that we would otherwise get, but more importantly if allowed to build, very effectively offsets the Muskie VP remark.

Do you know if the President made any comment of this nature?
If he did not, I think we should demand a retraction by Time.
If he did make such a remark, I think we should flatly and quickly deny it.

*No
cont.*

How?

*File
H died
mc*

*Maybe better we should
not build it up
any more - & just
leave it die*

V
EYES ONLY

EYES ONLY

August 5, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

SUBJECT:

Lou Harris

Lou Harris rode down on the plane from New York yesterday with Larry O'Brien. O'Brien talked to him like the old confidant that he once was. According to Harris, O'Brien made the following points:

1. The early runners, McGovern, Bayh, etc., are all dead. Scoop Jackson is picking up some support but is making a mistake by putting all of his eggs in one basket, i. e. Florida. O'Brien believes that even though Jackson has Holland and Smathers working for him, Muskie will get Chiles and Askew and Muskie will win the Florida primary.
2. Muskie has a big leg up and is improving his lot with the pros; he has picked up some very effective regional coordinators.
3. Jackson's one hope is that the defense issue will come back hard. O'Brien believes that in fact it will but he still won't be able to make a strong race.
4. Teddy is not out of it "by any means". His problem is that he will have to make a decision next January on the California primary. He probably, according to O'Brien, will not go in (Harris has it from Steve Smith that Kennedy probably will go into California). If he doesn't go in, according to O'Brien, Muskie will win the nomination unless he "commits a terrible goof".
5. The one candidate over whom O'Brien feels he has no control is Gene McCarthy. O'Brien considers him a son of a bitch, a spoiler and a sorehead who is still mad at the guys who did him in in 1968. Whoever the candidate is (with the exception) he will stay in and run on a fourth party ticket; he's especially irked at Muskie and Humphrey and would love to stay in the race if either of them are the nominee.

- 4.
6. The one exception is if Teddy were nominated; for some curious reason he does not want to block Teddy. O'Brien says that Teddy's man, Dave Burke, now works for Howard Stein and this could be behind it. O'Brien considers a McCarthy fourth party candidacy as the biggest danger the Democrats face next year. He also says that McCarthy is a "money" man who will run if he thinks he can make something out of it, but he won't unless he has financial backing and there is some money in it for him personally.
 7. Humphrey will try but can't make it. He'll never quit trying and will go into California.
 8. Lindsay will become a Democrat in mid-August, but will not run for the Presidency.
 9. O'Brien feels that the economy is the only issue that the Democrats have. He simply cannot understand why the President has not used selective wage and price controls. This would cut the legs out from the Democrats and take away their only issue. He considers that all the "dove" candidates are dead and that the President has completely taken over the "peace" issue. No Democrat can profit politically in the foreign affairs field, but they can win on the economy unless the President pulls the rug out and does some spectacular things, which O'Brien feels the President is entirely capable of doing. As he puts it, "It's all in the President's control. But, I don't understand why he hasn't done it".
 10. O'Brien is not concerned at all about money. He has no intention of paying off the \$9 million debt, \$800,000 of which is owed to Daley (who is very unhappy about it). The Committee collected \$1.7 million on their dinner, they will spend it all this year but Strauss is doing an excellent job and thinks that he can raise the funds needed for a Presidential campaign next year without any difficulty.
 11. O'Brien believes that Texas was a fluke in 1960 and 1968 and that the Democrats should clearly write it off for 1972. He sees no chance of winning it but he does believe that they can win Ohio, Illinois and New Jersey. He, therefore, believes that California will be the swing state in the election. He thinks that the "Nixon South" is gone as far as the Democrats are concerned, that they might pick up one or two border states but that's all and they need Wallace in the race to deny us the deep south. If Wallace were not in, they would lose the entire south.

12. O'Brien's attitude is guardedly optimistic. He said as he moves around the country he finds that the economy is really biting people and that if the President does not do something fairly significant and if the Democrats play to this issue alone, they can win. He is very cautious in his outlook, however, and is extremely worried about the McCarthy situation which he kept coming back to in the course of the discussion.
13. O'Brien thinks that Reagan is no asset in the coming election, will not help us in California and is the most dangerous problem the President has within the Republican Party?

From all of the foregoing, two things of significance emerge in my mind. We should be planning how to encourage McCarthy's candidacy. It may all turn on one man, Howard Stein. If Stein agrees to go all the way and bankroll McCarthy's candidacy, McCarthy will stay in the race all the way, even as a spoiler. Stein is Jack Dreyfus' partner as you know and I would think that through Bill Rogers or others, we could perhaps encourage Stein's commitment to McCarthy. It would even be worth pumping some money in.

A second point which seems to me to be very important is the Democratic debt. We have an analysis of the Democrat's creditors and we should start on the outside a pressure campaign to force them to pay their bills before they start spending new money. Obviously we can't get involved in this from here but some of our business friends on the outside might be asked to organize a campaign to put the screws on.

You and I talked about this many months ago. It was my judgment then that we should not try to embarrass the Democrats over their debt or create public sympathy for the "poor" Democrats, but rather wait until the campaign was about to get underway and then see that the creditors put the heat on them. If someone from 1701 were to pick a couple of good loyalists on the outside, they could start them to work on this now.

July 23, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

CHARLES W. COLSON

SUBJECT:

Teamsters

I have in accordance with your instructions stayed out of the Teamsters political activities. I can't help, however, but continue to be fed with information. George Bell has to hold Frank Fitzsimmons hand at least 3 times a week.

One point has come up which could be terribly significant politically. I think you should perhaps best raise it with the AG. I am sure you will leave me out of the discussion.

The AFL/CIO badly wants the Teamsters to rejoin and a major effort will be shortly undertaken to bring the Teamsters back into the AFL/CIO. The alliance formed between the Teamsters and the UAW has now been broken completely. There are no funds and both the Teamsters and the UAW are ripe for rejoining the ranks. It is in the interest of all 3.

Meany's one desire before he steps down or dies with his boots on is to reunite the labor movement. My information is that he will work at this intensively with a view to doing it before next year's elections.

As far as the UAW is concerned, We couldn't care less. In fact, from some standpoints it would be better for us politically to have them in the AFL/CIO fold because they will create political division within the ranks. The Teamsters is as you can well imagine quite a different story. My opinion is that the Teamsters will remain officially neutral but quietly work very hard for us, With money and organizational support. If they are merged into the AFL/CIO before then, however, they will probably be unable to do this. Hence it is in our interest to see that the merger does not take place. Fitz has it within his capacity to block it provided it is made clear to him that that is what we want. This agreement should be obtained very soon.

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
E.O. 12065, Section 6-102
By *jfw* NARS, Date *12/31/80*

CONFIDENTIAL

July 12, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:

H. R. HALDEMAN *7-11*

FROM:

CHARLES COLSON

SUBJECT:

Harris Polls

You have copies of the Harris polls on Kennedy for this week. Next week will be the Muskie trial heats, based on the same field survey of June 9-15. The figures are identical to May. In a 3-way race, the President trails Muskie, 42-40, Wallace gets 13, 5 undecided. But in a 2-way race, it's 46-46, 8 undecided. Harris intends to play this as "the President has closed the gap on Muskie's earlier lead" -- at least that's the way he's described it to me.

Harris points out that there is an enormous contrast between Muskie and Kennedy. The President still does well in the South, 40% to Wallace's 27 to Muskie's 26. But, in the West, Muskie beats us 51-43, in the Mid-West 49-41 and in the East 48-35.

Harris believes that the difference turns on the vote in suburbs and among independents. Interestingly, we do better against Muskie on the raw data than when the unlikely voters are eliminated (the opposite is true with Kennedy). This again illustrates that Muskie does best with high income, better educated suburbanites. In the \$15,000 per year and over category, the President beats Kennedy 52-36, but loses to Muskie 54-41. With the independent vote, however, the President beats Muskie 44-37 (on the last poll in May, Muskie won the independent vote 45-36 but he has offset this loss by increasing his lead in the suburbs.

Harris attributes Muskie's strength to the fact that he is bland, has a neutral image and does not really come across as a partisan Democrat. The lack of controversy with respect to Muskie is at this time his great strength, but will in due course tend to wear thin. The risk to him is that he will become boring and uninspiring.

Lou's close friend, Howard Stein, tells him that there is at least a 50/50 chance that McCarthy will enter the Presidential race as a fourth party candidate. As a result, Harris has done a 4-way poll showing the President at 37, Muskie 35, Wallace 12 and McCarthy 10.

By way of incidental intelligence, Lou says that the Kennedy people believe that Humphrey is absolutely dead as a result of the Kennedy/Johnson papers, that Muskie has been badly hurt but, that Kennedy has not been affected. I have to assume from this that they feel there is no ruboff from JFK to Teddy.

On the subject of the New York Times controversy, Harris believes we should layoff the issue as far as the press issue is concerned; as he puts it we have come out very well, that the real thrust has been against the Democrats and Kennedy and Johnson. He is in the field right now determining what the partisan fallout has been. Based on what he said I can pretty well surmise what he will come up with.

He advises that we should be careful not to appear to gloat over the Democrats' problems, especially LBJ, nor should we on the other hand appear overly concerned about the recent revelations. We should stay above the battle; he believes that the Pentagon Papers controversy will continue while the press issue fades and that our job is to keep the focus on the Democrats. Harris does not believe that the press issue is a gut issue, that it doesn't really affect people or motivate them. The feeling that they have been duped and deceived, however, is a strong emotional point that will endure.

Loc Hairs

identical to May

RN	44	RN	40	46
EMK	36	Muskie	42	46
wallace	13	wallace	13	4
undecided	7		5	8

- ↑
- Midwest Γ 47-38
 - South 42 - wallace (28) - EMK (23)
 - West 51-39
 - Suburbs 50-35
 - Grey uses under 30 45-37
 - College educated 54-43
 - uses Blacks 13-71
 - Independents RN 51-26
 - EMK in East 43-39

By contrast:

[w/ins play as comeback for RN]

Muskie - East 48-35,
 Midwest 49-41 Muskie
 South RN 40 wallace 27 Muskie 26
 West Muskie 51-43

Suburbs Muskie wins 47-42

Muskie
 Takes Young 46-38 (under 30)

Blacks R RN 59 Muskie

15,000 + over 52-36 ^{RN} over EMK
 54-41 - Muskie over RN

44-37 RA carries independent
over Muskie

in the last Poll Muskie won 45-36

But in suburbs he has increased
his lead -

South is with us against anyone -
Midwest + Suburbs are the key

next Monday + Tuesday is Kennedy
12 15 July

(Muskie-RA) (34 four way races)
19 & 22

(Cumbauer for RA)

Muskie holds up because he is bland;
neutral image - Doesn't really come up
as a Democrat -

Kennedy people think Muskie is
dead based on Kennedy's papers

HHH is dead -

at least 50-50, then McCarthy
goes with 4th Party - Howard Stern
- wants to teach Democrats a lesson

- wants to destroy present structure

37 RN
35 Muskie
12 Wallace
10 McCarty

Muskie has only strength with suburbs,
high income, sophisticated -

- [Muskie is clear front runner -
but this is his most awkward
stance -

N/Times
controversial

how Harris says lay off the
issue -

we've come out well - very well -
stay cool
in the field right now -

real thrust is against Deans;
Kennedy & Johnson

Be careful of (1) gloating over Deans' ^{troubles}
especially LR
(2) or to be concerned over
relations -

we haven't been hurt by current

con. Treasury - Public focus is on
Deems -

reading on LBJ + Kennedy Years -

Deems might go for a complete
Dark Horse - States - Governors

Gilligan is man to watch -

Senators ~~are~~ went too fast

???

Pentagon papers will last - 10x Times
issue will fade - no personal
meaning - but feeling they've
been duped + deceived is a
emotional point that will stick -