

The original documents are located in Box 64, folder “June 8, 1972 - H.R. Haldeman - California Primary” of the Robert Teeter Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

June 8, 1972

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR:

MR. H. R. HALDEMAN

FROM:

ROBERT M. TEETER

SUBJECT:

California Primary

This memorandum will outline my observations with regard to the effect of the Humphrey-McGovern debates on the apparent shift of voters to Humphrey late in the campaign. My thoughts are largely based on what I have gleaned from the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the CBS polls and not on any data which I have collected or had a chance to analyze. The following are the important points:

1. I doubt that there was a major shift from McGovern to Humphrey, rather I suspect there were a large number of voters who were originally predisposed to Humphrey prior to the campaign and temporarily moved into the undecided column by the McGovern campaign. When they actually voted they voted their basic predisposition to Humphrey. The fact that McGovern was a new, unique, and relatively unknown commodity and the fact his campaign was a much larger, more obvious and better financed effort than Humphrey's would have contributed to the shift to the undecided category. This is a phenomenon I have seen in other elections where a new "rising star" was running against an older, well-known established political figure. The fact McGovern actually got about the same percentage in the election as he did in the Field poll and also the fact that the undecided voters in the Field poll were demographically similar to the Humphrey voters would support this conclusion.
2. The debates also seemed to sharpen the focus on several of McGovern's extreme positions and locked him into those positions. Apparently many of these views were unpopular with the Humphrey voters (older voters, blue collar workers, and Jews). This probably contributed to a movement of undecided voters back to Humphrey.
3. McGovern outspent Humphrey in the media by a considerable margin, while the debates and subsequent reporting of them probably comprised a large proportion of Humphrey's total media exposure. This exposure came shortly after the Field poll was conducted and at the time when the shift back to Humphrey was occurring.



Determined to be an
Administrative Marking

By SAD NARA, Date 6/21/09

4. While I have not had a chance to study the turnout figures, the active business-labor campaign against the environmental proposition may have caused some disproportionate turnout of people who were against the proposition and who were largely Humphrey voters. This is supported by the Yankelovich survey which found that a large majority of Humphrey's total vote voted against the proposition while a large majority of McGovern supporters voted for it.

5. The Field poll may have had some effect itself in giving Humphrey some underdog votes while causing some apathy among McGovern supporters, although I doubt that this effect was very great.

We will, of course, pick up primary vote on the California study which we are starting next week which should give us some insight into the nature of the Humphrey and McGovern support.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

