

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>
55	18	11/22/1971	<input type="checkbox"/>	Domestic Policy	Memo	From Kenneth L. Khachigian to John Whitaker RE: Farm Option. 5pgs.

## DOCUMENT WITHDRAWAL RECORD [NIXON PROJECT]

DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE OR CORRESPONDENTS	DATE	RESTRICTION
N-1 [51]	memo	Whitaker to MacGregor re appointment for Page Belcher w/ President	11/15/71	C(Nixon)
N-2 [52]	memo	Khachigian to Whitaker re farm opinion	11/22/71	C(Nixon)
N-3 [53]	memo	Whitaker to President re mtg w/ Page Belcher	1/25/72	C(Nixon)
N-4 [54]	letter	Belcher to President re his feelings	1/18/72	C(Nixon)
N-5 [55]	schedule proposal	from Parker via Chapin re call to Belcher	1/17/72	C(Nixon)
N-6 [56]	memo	Whitaker to Parker re Presidential call to Cong. Belcher	1/17/72	C(Nixon)
N-7 [57]	memo	Whitaker to MacGregor re appointment w/ President for Belcher	1/6/71	C(Nixon)

FILE GROUP TITLE

**WHSF WHCF: SUBJECT FILES CONFIDENTIAL FILES**

BOX NUMBER

1

FOLDER TITLE

**[CF] AG - AGRICULTURE [1971-74]**RESTRICTION CODES

- A. Release would violate a Federal statute or Agency Policy.
- B. National security classified information.
- C. Pending or approved claim that release would violate an individual's rights.
- D. Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy or a libel of a living person.

- E. Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information.
- F. Release would disclose investigatory information compiled for law enforcement purposes.
- G. Withdrawn and return private and personal material.
- H. Withdrawn and returned non-historical material.

Presidential Materials Review Board

Review on Contested Documents

**Collection:** WHSF:WHCF:SubF:[CF]

**Box Number:** 1

**Folder:** [CF] AG - Agriculture [1971-74]

<u>Document</u>	<u>Disposition</u>		
51	Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy
52	Return	Private/Political	
53	Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy
54	Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy
55	• Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy
56	Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy
57	Retain	Close	Invasion of Privacy

## THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 22, 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN WHITAKER

FROM: KENNETH L. KHACHIGIAN *KLK*

SUBJECT: FARM OPINION

Based on the available data (which is unfortunately slim), I am optimistic about the President's standing among farmers vis 'a vis his potential Democratic opponents in 1972.

Here's how some of the statistics look. Compare them to the President's showing in 1968 when he got 51% of the farm vote to HHH's 29% to Wallace's 20% -- while the national breakdown was approximately 44% - 43% - 13%.

NIXON v. MUSKIE

		RN	Muskie	Wallace	Und.
January 9-10	National	44%	44%	9%	3%
	Farmers	54	33	6	7
March 12-14	National	43	39	12	6
	Farmers	54	20	11	15
May 7-10	National	39	41	12	8
	Farmers	49	31	16	4
August 16-20	National	42	36	11	11
	Farmers	43	30	16	11
October 8-11	National	43	35	13	9
	Farmers	55	22	13	10

NIXON v. KENNEDY

		RN	EMK	Wallace	Und.
January 9-10	National	48	38	9	5
	Farmers	48	37	9	6
March 12-14	National	46	38	11	5
	Farmers	49	28	11	12

KENNEDY cont'd

		RN	EMK	Wallace	Und.
May 7-10	National	42%	41%	12%	8%
	Farmers	40	41	6	13
August 16-20	National	43	38	10	9
	Farmers	41	30	16	13

NIXON v. HUMPHREY

		RN	HHH	Wallace	Und.
January 9-10	National	48	38	10	4
	Farmers	53	31	9	7
March 12-14	National	50	36	12	6
	Farmers	57	26	9	8
May 7-10	National	42	39	12	7
	Farmers	45	29	14	12
August 16-20	National	43	37	11	9
	Farmers	46	28	17	9

Since these are extracted from Gallup trial heats and because the farmers sampled therein are not always statistically adequate, there is a good deal of variation in these figures. However, some trend can be seen. That is, against Muskie, the President does enormously well among farmers. Against Humphrey the President does very well but is not getting a majority of the vote -- as he did in 1968.

Kennedy however seems to do better than the others among the farmers, and as I have said in earlier memos, I don't know how to explain this. In any event, it would seem that if Teddy is the President's opponent, he will hurt us more in the farm belt than would Muskie or Humphrey. A substantial farmer vote for the President will be necessary to carry certain states, and if Teddy cuts into that, it will hurt, if not in absolute terms, at least in electoral vote terms.

We have two other polls which give us additional information in Iowa and Illinois.

In Iowa, the Des Moines Register's "Iowa Poll" has the President tying Kennedy 42-42 among farm voters and leading Muskie 46-40. He has comfortable leads of 51-31 against HHH, 44-31 against McGovern, and 46-32 against Lindsay. Wallace gets from one to 5% among farmers. With the exception of Kennedy, these closely parallel the President's statewide matchups with these opponents. Kennedy is doing better among farmers (a tie) than he is statewide (RN leads 47-38).

In Illinois, there is a Prairie Farmer magazine poll using a representative sample taken in October. The results show that the President is doing extremely well in Illinois. He leads Muskie 49-24; Humphrey 57-19; and Kennedy 57-24. This one contradicts the Kennedy strength in Iowa, yet it may be a reflection of low corn prices and the greater number of corn farmers in Iowa.

I hate to make any hard conclusions based on the data we have. It is simply too sketchy. But looking at what we have, I am not panicky about our chances among farm voters. I don't think that raising prices is going to win us all that many votes. Chances are we wouldn't be able to raise prices as high as they would like anyway, and a token raise might have the reverse effect (plus the accusation of "playing politics"). I've often said that the best way to gain rapport with farmers is to constantly show them that you understand and sympathize with their problems. Telling them that they have it "good" won't work.

One last point. Everybody keeps saying we are in trouble with the farmers, and that we are scrambling to get on their good side before 1972. This just isn't supported by the polls. Yet this has received such a currency among the political commentators that it has become conventional wisdom.

What we need to do is get out the word that we have good farm support, and we have it because the President is doing a good job. On the contrary, if Butz' appointment and other Administration actions appear to be attempts by us to shore up the farm vote, it makes all our moves seem overtly political. Let's make it appear that we do things for farmers not because we are in trouble with them but because we are doing well with them and that our actions are but a series of ongoing Administration initiatives that farmers approve of.

Finally, let me put in another request for a poll. We can't keep whistling in the wind without knowing exactly where RN stands with farmers. We need at least one good, comprehensive poll which tells us about farmers in 1972. Unless we get this, we are going to continue to consider actions we may not need, or fail to take actions we do need.

Some General Opinion Indices Which Reflect on the Mood of the Farmer -- Gallup Polls

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Nixon is handling his job as President? (October 8-11, 1971)

	Approve	Disapprove	No Opinion
National	54%	35%	11%
Farmers	65	23	12

GALLUP -- SATISFACTION INDEX

September, 1971

Would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your housing situation?

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Don't Know
National	73%	23%	4%
Farmers	73	21	6

Would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your children's education?

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Don't Know
National	63%	26%	11%
Farmers	73	19	8

Would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of life in your community?

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Don't Know
National	75%	21%	4%
Farmers	80	15	5

Would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your family income?

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Don't Know
National	62%	35%	3%
Farmers	60	38	2

This shows by and large that farmers are not the sulking, grumbling, brooding lot that they are often portrayed to be. Even on the question of family income, they are only a fraction under the national average and even then the majority still expresses satisfaction.

What these indices tell us is that the farmer is at peace with himself, in general, and that there is good reason for his high approval rating of the President. There are other things besides farm policy which colors the farmer's thinking of the President. And on those factors we are scoring well. This ought to be kept in mind while we worry ourselves on how the farmer is going to vote in 1972. Let's not play on his disenchantments as much as we speak to his belief that things are still pretty good in this country.