


September 10, 1976

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator Mondale

From: Dick Moe 

Attached are Caddell's most recent polls on the key states, the overall figures of which I gave to you the other night. The religious breakdowns dramatize the fact that, if accurate, our problem is clearly with urban Catholics. Pat thinks that the unmistakable message of these polls is that if we were just getting our normal share of the vote amongst Catholics, we would be 20% ahead nationally. It troubles me that these figures do not square with the New York Times report of this morning, but its clear enough that we do have something of a problem.

The Times survey of this morning on the issues, which I sent to the plane, really sums the whole thing up in terms of issues. What we have to do is draw the line clearly in a traditionally partisan way, particularly on the economy. I tried to stress to Jody last night that it's by far our best issue, and happily it is the one that concerns the greatest number of people. You have been hammering at it effectively, but I believe we can't do it too often. Our problem is to try to come up with new news angles on it, and we are working on that.

CALIFORNIASEPTEMBER 1-2

<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	48	32	20
Protestant (55)	51	28	20
Catholic (20)	49	32	19
Jewish (6)	51	19	30
Other (7)	42	47	11
None (13)	35	43	21

<u>FORD</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	53	34	13
Protestant (55)	53	32	15
Catholic (20)	63	29	8
Jewish (6)	58	36	6
Other (7)	39	43	18
None (14)	42	46	13

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
OVERALL (100)	44	41	9	6
Protestant (55)	45	41	11	3
* Catholic (20)	40	47	11	1
Jewish (6)	54	43	5	0
Other (7)	24	40	2	35
None (14)	53	30	1	16

ILLINOISSEPTEMBER 3

<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	48	32	20
Protestant (57)	48	31	20
Catholic (30)	47	36	16
Jewish (3) *	57	30	13
Other (4) *	39	28	33
None (6)	47	23	30

<u>FORD</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	66	27	7
Protestant (57)	64	30	7
*Catholic (30)	72	22	6
Jewish (3) *	58	17	25
Other (4) *	56	40	5
None (6)	68	25	8

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
OVERALL (100)	39	48	12	2
Protestant (57)	38	49	12	1
*Catholic (30)	37	48	11	4
Jewish (3) *	59	36	6	0
Other (4) *	36	45	18	0
None (6)	45	45	7	4

MICHIGANSEPTEMBER 1-2

<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL(100)	53	28	18
Protestant(58)	52	29	19
Catholic(29)	50	30	20
Jewish(2)*	60	30	10
Other(4)*	71	24	5
None(6)	69	22	9

<u>FORD</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL(100)	62	29	9
Protestant(58)	63	28	9
Catholic(29)	60	30	10
Jewish(2)*	60	40	0
Other(4)*	60	35	5
None(6)	61	33	6

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
OVERALL(100)	42	47	8	3
Protestant(58)	41	49	7	4
*Catholic(29)	44	47	8	2
*Jewish(2)*	60	40	0	0
Other(4)*	45	34	21	0
None(6)	45	40	14	0

NEW JERSEYAUG. 31-SEPT. 1

<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	53	26	22
Protestant (45)	58	23	19
Catholic (37)	49	27	24
Jewish (11)	50	24	27
Other (4) *	23	56	21
None (4) *	55	25	20

<u>FORD</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL (100)	49	38	13
Protestant (45)	50	38	13
Catholic (37)	48	38	14
Jewish (11)	51	35	14
Other (4) *	53	43	5
None (4) *	48	38	14

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
OVERALL (100)	49	34	14	4
* Protestant (45)	49	32	16	4
* Catholic (37)	44	38	14	4
Jewish (11)	63	29	8	0
Other (4) *	43	43	4	10
None (4) *	47	38	8	7

OHIOSEPT. 2-3

CARTER	FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE	CAN'T RATE
OVERALL (100)	53	32	15
Protestant (64)	51	32	17
Catholic (29)	55	35	11
Jewish (1) *	59	31	10
Other (3) *	77	17	7
None (3) *	55	14	31

FORD	FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE	CAN'T RATE
OVERALL (100)	57	38	6
Protestant (64)	58	35	6
Catholic (29)	56	40	5
Jewish (1) *	62	28	10
Other (3) *	42	58	0
None (3) *	41	45	14

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDNET

	CARTER	FORD	UNDECIDED	NOT VOTE
OVERALL (100)	45	43	10	2
Protestant (64)	43	45	10	2
* Catholic (29)	47	41	10	2
Jewish (1) *	38	62	0	0
Other (3) *	69	23	0	9
None (3) *	64	21	14	0

PENNSYLVANIASEPTEMBER 2

<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL(100)	57	27	16
Protestant(52)	57	29	14
Catholic(36)	57	26	17
Jewish(4) *	50	25	25
Other(4) *	64	30	6
None(3) *	50	14	36

<u>FORD</u>	<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>	<u>CAN'T RATE</u>
OVERALL(100)	59	33	8
Protestant(52)	67	27	6
Catholic(36)	55	37	9
Jewish(4) *	59	20	21
Other(4) *	26	43	32
None(3) *	27	73	0

GENERAL ELECTION FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
OVERALL(100)	44	41	12	2
Protestant(52)	35	51	11	2
Catholic(36)	49	34	13	3
Jewish(4) *	47	24	26	3
Other(4) *	62	29	6	4
None(3) *	79	7	14	0

Tx 4840

	CARTER	FORD	UNDECIDED	NOT VOTE
<u>OVERALL</u>	44	41	9	6
<u>SEX</u>				
Female(51)	37	46	10	6
Male(49)	50	36	7	7
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25(11)	52	41	2	6
26-35(21)	53	38	2	6
36-45(15)	39	34	16	11
46-55(17)	45	40	12	4
56-65(17)	34	46	10	10
Over 65(18)	41	49	6	3
<u>AREA</u>				
Bay(23)	41	41	11	6
Sacramento(9)	42	41	8	8
LA Suburbs(18)	38	49	8	5
Los Angeles(34)	48	37	7	7
San Diego(8)	45	45	2	9
Fresno(8)	50	32	17	1

Dick Nixon brother  
 graduated - went to law school  
 clerked for judge  
 long held up in murders

C. L. E. H. -  
 T. and M. -  
 E. C. -

ILLINOISSEPTEMBER 3

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
<u>OVERALL</u>	39	48	12	2
<u>SEX</u>				
Female (51)	38	49	12	2
Male (49)	39	47	12	3
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25 (10)	37	54	3	6
26-35 (19)	52	38	9	2
36-45 (18)	42	51	7	1
46-55 (17)	30	50	19	1
56-65 (19)	40	41	17	2
Over 65 (17)	31	60	9	1
<u>AREA</u>				
Chicago (26)	51	31	15	3
Cook Co. (19)	28	66	6	1
Chicago Suburbs (10)	23	59	18	0
Upstate (20)	34	54	10	1
Downstate (24)	45	42	11	3

	CARTER	FORD	UNDECIDED	NOT VOTE
<u>OVERALL</u>	42	47	8	3
<u>SEX</u>				
Female(51)	42	46	9	3
Male(49)	41	49	8	2
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25(10)	43	44	12	2
26-35(23)	44	49	6	2
36-45(18)	37	55	6	2
46-55(20)	40	45	12	4
56-65(15)	44	45	6	4
Over 65(14)	44	49	6	1
<u>AREA</u>				
North(14)	44	47	7	3
Bay(12)	34	58	6	3
Southwest(15)	32	55	12	1
Detroit Suburbs(17)	36	48	11	4
Detroit(30)	54	37	7	2
Southcentral(12)	38	54	6	3

NEW JERSEYAUG. 31-SEPT. 1

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
<u>OVERALL</u>	49	34	14	4
<u>SEX</u>				
Female(51)	44	35	17	4
Male(50)	52	34	10	4
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25(11)	44	42	6	8
26-35(17)	44	43	10	3
36-45(16)	56	39	4	2
46-55(21)	50	27	16	7
56-65(17)	56	31	13	0
Over 65(19)	41	30	26	3
<u>AREA</u>				
Bergen Co.(13)	50	37	9	5
Essex,Passaic,				
Hudson Counties(26)	49	30	16	4
Suburbs Northwest(26)	41	41	15	4
Trenton-East (17)	57	29	9	5
South-Coast(18)	47	34	18	1

OHIOSEPTEMBER 2-3

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
<u>OVERALL</u>	45	43	10	2
<u>SEX</u>				
Female(53)	41	46	11	2
Male(47)	50	39	9	3
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25(10)	56	40	2	2
26-35(18)	42	50	4	5
36-45(14)	48	36	13	4
46-55(20)	50	42	8	0
56-65(19)	47	37	12	3
Over 65(19)	34	48	17	2
<u>AREA</u>				
Cleveland(15)	46	43	12	0
Northeast(22)	57	33	5	4
Southeast(8)	47	38	12	3
Cincinnati(15)	41	45	13	2
Dayton(13)	44	45	10	0
Toledo(10)	48	45	6	2
Columbus(17)	32	50	13	4

	<u>CARTER</u>	<u>FORD</u>	<u>UNDECIDED</u>	<u>NOT VOTE</u>
<u>OVERALL</u>	45	41	12	2
<u>SEX</u>				
Female(53)	43	42	12	2
Male(47)	45	42	10	2
<u>AGE</u>				
18-25(9)	55	35	11	0
26-35(14)	47	44	8	2
36-45(16)	48	34	12	6
46-55(18)	46	44	10	0
56-65(21)	47	38	14	1
Over 65(23)	33	50	15	3
<u>AREA</u>				
Pittsburgh(14)	47	44	9	0
Southwest(13)	43	44	13	0
Northcentral(22)	45	44	8	3
Northeast(15)	41	43	12	4
Phila. Suburbs(16)	33	46	17	4
Philadelphia(20)	54	30	14	2

J. Edgar

UNDECIDEDS

		<u>FAVORABLE</u>	<u>UNFAVORABLE</u>
CALIFORNIA:	CARTER	48	19
	FORD	32	21
ILLINOIS:	CARTER	27	25
	FORD	55	24
MICHIGAN:	CARTER	44	25
	FORD	51	16
NEW JERSEY:	CARTER	46	15
	FORD	44	25
OHIO:	CARTER	52	20
	FORD	44	34
PENNSYLVANIA:	CARTER	54	17
	FORD	69	17

- Q: You have indicated recently in a couple of interviews that you thought that your so called religious problem was about over in terms of people being concerned about your religious views. Can you explain why you feel that way?
- A: I believe that the so called prejudice against me because I am a southerner and a baptist was over estimated to begin with. Most people in this country I think have a remarkable absence of prejudice because of ones own religion. We have seen this demonstrated very vividly in the south. Georgia; for instance, voted for Al Smith. And in 1960 when there was a great deal of prediction that John Kennedy could not carry Georgia we gave him a bigger margin of victory in our state than he got even in Massachusetts. Although there were a lot of similar predictions that I couldn't carry states outside the south I had good and I think almost remarkable success there. So, that's one reason that the inate prejudice of people against me because of my religion was overestimated to begin with. The second thing is that because of my success in the primaries, people began to study the beliefs of southern baptists and they detected a very strong inclination to separate church and state on my part as was expressed very clearly by John Kennedy when he met with the Protestant ministers in 1960 in Houston and I think as they have known about what our religious beliefs were their concerns were elevated. The awareness that President Truman was a Baptist also tends to give people the sense that there is no conflict between our own beliefs and a proper performance as a possible President. Also the third thing and the last point I make is that our public opinion polls have shown since the convention on a nationwide basis that I have strong support from all religious groups and that there is no prejudice against me because of my religion.
- Q: A lot of the concern has been not so much prejudice as a question of what does Jimmy Carter as a southern Baptist know about life in the inner city or Boston or that sort of thing so to turn the question around a little bit, what have you done during the primaries recently to sort of educate your self about the religious groups' cultural areas that you have not been as familiar with as you would have been with the south?
- A: To an almost unprecedented degree I have campaigned throughout the country and have tried to present myself among groups in every part of the nation not only as a candidate but in a learning process to answer questions that are put to me in an open forum and to express my views to people who are different in background and experience from myself. I have also lived all over the country. I have lived in San Francisco, in San Diego, in Maryland and in Virginia. I went to school in New York. I have lived in Connecticut twice as well as in Georgia. So I have had a background of experience among different kinds of people and in different kinds of communities that have stood me in good stead as well. We have deliberately tried to involve in our campaign knowledgeable people who represent aspects of American life that have not been part of my own experience.
- Q: I believe that one of your aides said that you were just in with Senator Eagleton and that you have been attempting to learn about life in St. Louis for example from Senator Eagleton.
- A: Yes, that was one of the things that we discussed. As you probably know there was a referendum in Missouri about support for parochial schools and this is

a matter that I have had to address as the Governor of Georgia. We have a lot of parochial schools in our own state. The most heavy concentration of them is in the Savannah region and I visited there often as a matter of fact all four years that I was governor. I went over and spent all day in the St. Patrick's day celebrations and always went to mass early in the morning and so forth and I am familiar with the tremendous contribution that has been made in the educational processes of our country by people particularly catholics who send their kids to private parochial schools because they want to combine religious education with secular education. We have faced this question as a state in Georgia. We passed a constitutional amendment and a law which was passed during my own term of office for the first time allotting financial support to individual students who go to private colleges in Georgia. And this was readily acceptable. This is the kind of issue I have had to face as a Governor and of course as a candidate and now as a nominee, and Senator Eagleton was very helpful to me in explaining to me the attitudes of his own people in St. Louis. One of the concerns is that the Supreme Court has several times backed state aide to students in private colleges but not to students in elementary and secondary schools.

- Q: I know and now the Democratic Platform talks about seeking constitutionally acceptable ways to do that. Do you favor that?
- A: Yes. I would have no objection to that. Obviously I will have taken an oath before God to honor the laws of my country and I certainly would do it, but the indication of my own is not just acceptance but active pursuit of aid for students to go to the private colleges. That is an indication of my willingness as long as the public money is not used for religious instruction then I see no incompatibility there.
- Q: You would approve of secular funding for reading, writing, you know the secular subjects, as opposed to, you know, if they were to be divided that way?
- A: Yes, obviously if the laws and the interpretation of the constitution would permit.
- Q: Since we are talking about the Supreme Court and the Constitution one of the concerns by a number of people, Catholics and otherwise, had about the abortion plank in the Democratic platform opposing an amendment to overturn the Court decision, many people feel that this is an effort to deny them their constitutional right to seek redress with the system--their right to attempt to amend the constitution.
- A: The wording of the Democratic Party plank was, I think, inappropriate and was not in accordance with my own desires. I did not know what the wording was. My statement on the abortion issue has been expressed often and if you have time I would like to repeat it. I think abortion is wrong and I think that the government ought not ever do anything to encourage abortion. Georgia had a very strick law on abortion prior to the Supreme Court early in 1973 which I favored. The Supreme Court struck down the Georgia law that was a test case which only permitted abortions when the mother's life or health was considered to be in danger, or if the pregnancy was a result of rape and rape had been proven in court. Only then abortions were permitted under those circumstances in the first trimester of the pregnancy. That was my preference. After the Supreme Court ruled that the Georgia law could no longer be effective

then we passed the most strict interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling as the present law in Georgia. Under my administration we should do everything possible to minimize abortions under whatever ruling the Court might have in effect at that particular time. We need a comprehensive nationwide program for sex education, for better adoptive procedures, for family planning and this is something that I have pledged myself ever since becoming a candidate to pursue. It would be inappropriate for any citizen to be deprived of the right to seek an amendment to the constitution and I think it is inappropriate for the Democratic Party to seek to obstruct a change in the constitution and as you undoubtedly understand the President himself has no role to play in the constitutional amendment. If an amendment is proposed in the House or Senate and passed it goes directly to the state legislatures for ratification. So my own position on abortion is much more conservative than the opinion expressed in the platform.

- Q: Would it be fair to say that you are rejecting the platform plank in that sense?
- A: I just don't agree with the wording of the plank. The insinuation of the plank that opposition to citizen effort or legislative effort to amend the constitution is inappropriate is what I object to.
- Q: You said just now that you were not involved with that and you had said at the press conference at which you announced Senator Mondale as your running mate that neither yourself nor your staff so far as you know were involved with that. One thing I found that both sides on the issue agree with, from the right to lifers and the U.S. Catholic conference to the National Womens Political Caucus was that Stu Eizenstat and Joe Duffy drafted that language as an attempted compromise between those who wanted silence and those who wanted a stronger pro-abortion position.
- A: I didn't know that. I was not familiar with that and as you know if you have read my statements on the issue, I have never opposed the right of people to seek an amendment to the constitution.
- Q: In terms of minimizing the needs for abortion -- two points -- there has been some criticism that emphasis about family planning is in some ways a negative approach and that there should be more emphasis on the life support approach and other strong social program in support of women with problem pregnancies -- would that be a route that you would follow-up?
- A: Yes it is. I would do everything I could through moral persuasion and through my own actions as President under the laws which I will be sworn to enforce to minimize a need for abortion. It is obvious to me that human life should be protected. It is obvious to me also that abortions are evidence of a failure to prevent unwanted pregnancies and whatever ones own religious beliefs might be that I think would be the case. I don't believe anyone would deliberately have sexual intercourse knowing that it was going to result in an unwanted pregnancy and ultimately as a last resort in an abortion. So whatever I could do as President I would do so. I have come out openly in opposition throughout the campaign against the use of federal money to finance abortion.

4

Q: That was my next question dealing with that in Congress -- under what circumstances if any, would you approve the use of medicaid funds, for example, for abortion?

A: I would not approve of it at all. If the courts rule that it must be done obviously I would have to comply as President to carry out the laws of our country but, I don't favor the use of federal money for abortion.

Q: And this--would you oppose the payment for abortions in national health insurance or any program of that kind?

A: That is correct.

Q: One of the groups concerned about the abortion issue has been the Catholic hierarchy. Have you had any contacts with the hierarchy or any plans for any meetings or anything like that?

A: Yes, I have had contact with them both directly and indirectly and hope to continue those discussions not only on abortion but on other issues as well. It is part of the campaign effort itself and it is certainly part of the instruction or the learning process that is an important pre-requisite to being a good President.

Q: Can you be specific about any of those contacts?

A: Well, I think it would be better for the leaders within the church to reveal those conversations. I don't think that it is up to me to do it.

Q: You talked about the Baptist concern for separation of church and state -- in general what's your attitude toward churches lobbying on issues like abortion or hunger or civil rights, that sort of thing -- and would you as President look to churches to support your policy?

A: Well, you know the Baptist Church is very vocal in its stand on matters that we think involve a moral question and I know that the Catholic Church has been insistent on preserving its right to express views publically on matters of importance that involve morality or that involve questions that are considered to be important to the members of the church. This is something that I think is a legitimate part of our electoral process and I would expect to pay very close attention to views expressed by religious denominations in this country.

Q: One of the church-state issues is in some peoples' minds is the question of prayer in the public schools. Do you have any reaction to that?

A: I don't think that any person should be forced to pray at a certain time or pray in a certain fashion in the public schools. I think private prayer should be permitted but to require prayer I don't approve and I think that the court rulings on that subject are proper.

Q: Again on the church and state thing -- can you give me one example of a way in which your religious convictions have shaped your political actions and an example of an instance in which you set aside your own personal religious convictions?

A: Well, in my own religious convictions on the abortion issue are in conflict with the laws that our nation must observe and as I said I favor the very strict abortion law that Georgia had originally had but after the Supreme Court ruled, as Governor of the state, it was mandatory that I comply with the ruling. That is one instance where my own beliefs were in conflict with the laws of our country. I try to utilize my own religious beliefs as a constant guide in making decisions as a private or public citizen. We had court reform to provide better equity in the court -- we have initiated complete prison reform to give more compassionate attention to the needs of Georgia people. We have instituted treatment programs for alcoholics and drug addicts, for mentally retarded children and all of those I consider to be poor, deprived, dispised, unfortunate, illiterate, afflicted, belong to a group against which there is discrimination and it ought to be the prime responsibility of me as a powerful influential public servant. And as a governor I think that if I tried to ascribe that completely to religious convictions that would probably be inappropriate, but my life has been shaped in the church, my deep commitment as a christian, and my knowledge of the example of the life of Christ and the observation through my own religious learning of the attitude of Christ toward other human beings has been obviously an example that I followed.

Q: The Vice President Rockefeller the other day said that the one thing you are going to have to show during the campaign is how you reconcile your talk of love and compassion with ruthless hardball politicians. How do you reconcile those things?

A: I don't acknowledge the ruthless or hardball characteristic. I have been victorious in some hard fought campaigns and I guess it would have been much more thoughtful if I had let my opponents win, but I don't recall any evidence of ruthlessness that was claimed by Mr. Rockefeller.

Q: There have been other more general charges when people have worn out their usefulness that you dispose of them or that you have been known to hold a grudge, something like that...?

A: I am not perfect. Like all human beings I am sinful and I certainly have made mistakes. But I think that if anyone would analyze the permanent status of my staff members for instance, as contrasted with any other campaigns that I observed this year, we would compare favorably. Most of the people who are now working with me have been with me for a long time. The newcomers to my campaign like Pat Cadell more recently and say Bill Vandoven in New York and others, I think, would testify that there is no inclination on my part to discard people once their usefulness has been terminated. If someone did show me an inability of proper performance in an assigned position or if someone should show me an inability to serve the public well or had some discovered moral defect that I thought would destroy the confidence of the people in my campaign or in the government I would not hesitate to dispose of their services.

Q: Recently Michael Novak who is a Catholic columnist author had made the point that he was criticizing the involvement of Pat Cadell. Involvement may be the wrong word, the fact that his polling firm was selling information to the Saudia Arabian government and that he saw a conflict of interest in that. And he made the point that Carter sees himself as a moral man and that people who have a very strong image of themselves as moral people can become convinced that anything they do is moral that they are almost incapable of doing wrong -- do you see that as a problem?

- A: You know that completely violates all the teachings of Christ to become proud and self-satisfied and to be critical of or judge ones fellow human beings. If there is one thought that permeated the teachings of Christ about man's own weakness and sinfulness it was self-pride and self-satisfaction and a feeling of superiority and a feeling of strength in the absence of God's guidance. And if I should be guilty of this accusation -- and Mike Novak doesn't know anything about me -- but if I should be guilty of the accusation, then I would be in that respect sinful in the eyes of God. I think that my own attitude, my own demeanor, my own constant searching for better answers to questions, is matter of public record and I didn't read the article. The only article I have read that was critical was by William Safire, former staff member of Nixon, I didn't know that Novak had said the same thing...but I hope I don't have that attitude.
- Q: Novak's point was that if that same sort of apparent conflict of interest had appeared in a Nixon aide that the press would have been all over it and it would have become a major scandal and that sort of thing happening with a Carter aide seems to be ignored almost as though there was a double standard involved.
- A: The fact that Novak wrote about it shows that it hasn't been completely ignored. There have been articles about it in the Washington Post and I think there have been two articles about it in the New York Times. I know that Safire has written two articles about it. I have talked to Cadell about his other clients. He had his corporate and foreign clients long before he was retained by me to do the political analysis and I think he has been open and above board about that relationship with Saudia Arabia. Before he took on Saudia Arabia as one of his routine clients he went and checked with several of the leaders in the Jewish community in this country to see if they saw any evidence of conflict. He has made or offered to make available to at least one critical columnist, William Safire, answers to the kinds of questions asked to show that there was no conflict, and I don't detect the conflict myself. I see nothing wrong with a foreign country knowing the attitude of the American people toward that country. I think that it probably would result in an enhancement of peaceful relationship among the nations of the world. And I am sure that other countries have commissioned pollsters in this nation to get that kind of result. And I am sure those pollsters, on occasion, have had political clients and the conflict is one that I have an inability to detect.
- Q: Concerning foreign nations you have spoken out a number of times in terms of American aid and support for the developing nations. There was a lot of talk-- Senator Mansfield today was saying that Jimmy Carter was turning to some of the same old faces and may not really be able to give us a new foreign policy. Are you concerned about that? Do you anticipate a strong push toward aiding the developing nations as sort of a new emphasis in foreign policy?
- A: Well, that would not be the only thing I would want to discuss. The first hope is that I might re-cement the strong and continuing relationships that have in the past existed between ourselves and our natural allies and friends, including the European nations, Japan and nations in this hemisphere.

Secondly, that we might continue to pursue a better understanding with the Peoples Republic of China and the Soviet Union. As a corrolary we might have a more individualized relationship with mutual respect. I am searching for common interests with individual developing nations of the world. In the past, almost by default, we have permitted, even encouraged those nations to turn to the Soviet Union for instance, or Cuba, for their friendship simply because we have not paid adequate attention to their needs. So, the cummulative change in foreign policy would be encompassed in those three principals. I have made speeches on that subject and I am going to make two or three additional speeches between now and the general election. One would be on world food supplies and how they might be maintained and distributed in a more equitable way. Another would be the realtionships which ought to exist between ourselves and our potential enemies in the Soviet Union and in China and the third speech which I have already begun to prepare is to spell in more definitive terms our relationship with the nations in the Southern hemisphere who would be primarily the developing nations. No other candidate so far as I know has made comprehensive speeches on foreign affairs.. I have already completed four of them -- one general in nature; one on nuclear weapons, nuclear power; the testing of peaceful devices, the control of atomic wastes; one on the Middle East and one on the relationships with the Allies and friends in Japan and Europe. I think this series of seven or eight or perhaps more speeches on foreign affairs collectively will express my views very clearly.

*file*  
*Sen. Mondale*

To: The Carter Campaign  
From: Cambridge Survey Research  
Subject: President Jimmy Carter;  
Post-Convention Images

The enclosed memo by Professor Robert P. Abelson of Yale University analyzes the second batch of 100 in-depth interviews dealing with voter images of President Jimmy Carter. Conducted immediately after the Democratic Convention, the interviews themselves have already been distributed to the campaign.

To summarize Professor Abelson's analysis, there has been substantial growth in the amount of information voters have about Jimmy Carter and an overall increase in the ability of voters to see him in a positive light. From the June interviews to the post-convention interviews, the proportion of respondents expecting Jimmy Carter to be good with foreign leaders has gone from 51% to 63%; the proportion expecting action on the welfare mess rose from 44% to 61% and the proportion expecting positive action on taxes rose from 35% to 47%. On the other hand, before the convention voters assumed, largely because Jimmy Carter is a Southerner, that he would be against busing. In June 47% expected Jimmy Carter to be against busing and 10% expected him to be for busing. Now "anti-busing" only outweighs "pro-busing" by 26%-18%.

Voters who like Jimmy Carter are beginning to compare him positively with JFK. On the other hand, his detractors are seeing him more frequently as a "Democrat" or a "Liberal". There has been no decrease in the proportion of voters seeing him as "evasive on issues", which could be a problem. It needs to be emphasized that Jimmy Carter is not two-faced or slippery but, instead,

The Carter Campaign  
Page two

is tolerant, careful and open -- a person trying to find new resolutions to old problems and realistically avoiding simplistic approaches.

Over 40% of all the respondents mention limits on the President's ability to accomplish anything, particularly limits due to an "obstructionist" Congress. It does not seem to occur to voters that the obstructionism is not a permanent feature of Congress and might be due to Gerald Ford's vetoes and the lack of "Presidential" leadership. Instead they seem to see Congress as obstructionist per se. It should be pointed out that "President Carter" could, in fact, lead Congress into positive action.

Report prepared for  
Cambridge Survey Research  
Robert P. Abelson  
August 11, 1976

Carter as President: Images after the Convention

The interviews

During the week following the Democratic convention, respondents were asked in depth to picture Jimmy Carter in the White House, dealing with foreign leaders and with domestic issues such as busing, welfare, and tax reform. The format was the same used in the June interviews (which formed the basis for the July 2 report), with the addition of a specific question whether Governor Carter's religion or Southern identity was of concern. As before, 100 respondents in 8 key Northern states were randomly sampled.

Personal characterization

One particular question was ideal for yielding personality impressions of Jimmy Carter. That question was, "What kind of person do you think President Carter would be in dealing with foreign leaders?" Altogether, 63% responded in generally favorable terms, 27% predominantly negatively, and 10% had no clear impression. (In June the figures were only 51% generally favorable, 25% negative, and 24% without a clear impression). The most frequently mentioned of all the personal characteristics was warmth or sociability (34%), followed by strength and decisiveness (27%). The most commonly mentioned negative characteristic was inexperience (18%)-- the same percentage as in June on this "foreign leaders" question -- and weakness (10%).

Half the mentions of inexperience came from Republicans.

On the question, "What worries or uncertainties about President Jimmy Carter come to mind?", the following table classifies the frequencies of main worries among Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

<u>Worry:</u>	<u>Democrats</u>	<u>Republicans</u>	<u>Independents</u>
Nothing, no worry	21	10	7
Weak or inexperienced	5	5	1
New and unknown	3	5	4
Too liberal	3	9	2
Too conservative	3	2	0
Too much religion	1	0	3
Miscellaneous	5	3	3
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
(Total sample)	(44)	(35)	(21)

The most salient figure in this table is the 9 Republicans who see Carter as "too liberal". This preferred negative comment will doubtless be emphasized in the campaign.

When respondents were asked directly whether they thought religion or Southern identity were problems, the divisions were very heavy toward "no problem". In the total sample, 60 said religion was no problem, 23 saw it as an advantage, 9 as a source of concern, and 8 didn't know. Those seeing an advantage thought a religious President would be more moral and have more compassion. Those expressing concern were mainly distrustful of an overly

self-righteous President. On having a Southern President, 71 of this all-Northern sample saw no problem, 9 an advantage, 11 a disadvantage, and 9 didn't know. Advantages included fairness toward a Presidentially under-represented region, and a special understanding of race problems. The disadvantage was typically a fear of cronyism. (For example, one respondent expected the White House staff to represent a "Georgia River Boat Gang".) The fact that Governor Carter owes nothing to the politicians of other regions and can choose an entirely new team, coupled with the well-advertised tightness of campaign control in Atlanta, invites potentially increasing public concern with cronyism. Suggestion: Appointments of staff and advisors from other regions, when they occur, should be well-publicized as offering diversity of regional representation.

Throughout the interview, various interesting spontaneous ideas came up. Nine respondents out of 100 brought up JFK in one way or another: ("He reminds me of JFK"; "like President Kennedy, he...".) These nine all intended to vote for Carter, even though only three were Democrats. This identification, in other words, helps more than it might hurt. Suggestion: Do not avoid the JFK analogy. However, a too obvious attempt to milk it might backfire, as much of the worry about Carter being an unknown relates to perceived slickness of media image.

Another interesting type of spontaneous mention was of "Democrats" or "the Democratic Party". Nineteen respondents made such mention, according to the breakdown on the next page:

Intend to vote for:

	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Ford</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Mention Democrats	9	10	0
Do not mention	43	19	19
Total	(52)	(29)	(19)

Proportionately, many more Ford voters (34%) than Carter voters (18%) mention Democrats. The label "Democrat" is not so much a rallying banner for loyalists as it is a red flag for the opposition.

Of danger as a campaign theme is the notion that Carter is evasive on issues, two-faced, etc. A careful tabulation of such mentions was made, according to party identification and intended vote. Here is how the 25 respondents who mention this idea break down:

<u>July data</u>			
	<u>Mention "two-facedness"</u>		
for:	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Ford</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
are:			
<u>Democrats</u>	5	0	3
<u>Republicans</u>	3	9	1
<u>Independents</u>	0	2	2

Below, the June data are given for comparison:

<u>June data</u>			
	<u>Mention "two-facedness"</u>		
for:	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Ford</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
are:			
<u>Democrats</u>	6	0	0
<u>Republicans</u>	4	2	2
<u>Independents</u>	2	2	2

The month before the Democratic convention, only 2 of 17 (12%) of Ford Republicans invoked the two-facedness theme. After the convention, 9 of 21 (42%) mentioned it. Clearly this theme seems to be gaining currency with the opposition. Some suggestions on counteracting this were given in my July 2 memo.

### The power of the Presidency

Perhaps the most interesting of the spontaneously mentioned ideas is the notion that the power of the Presidency is limited by forces such as Congress, or big business, or "the system". An astonishing 43% of all respondents mention some limitations on the President's power. (In June the figure was 31%.) Often this is seen as a good thing, restraining the President from excess; sometimes as a pity, that the President won't be able to make much progress; and often matter-of-factly, as a somewhat jaded comment on the way things work.

Suggestion: Acknowledge the public's concern about the power of the Presidency. Do not overpromise. Meanwhile, suggest that the President can set the tone for cooperative initiatives all around, and can be responsive to a progressive Congress. Governor Carter has already done this, but emphasis on specific possibilities for effecting cooperation with Congress might be worthwhile. The image of Congress itself needs brightening. Congress was often pictured in these interviews as a sluggish, obstructionist body.

### Domestic issues

An interesting trend has taken place on the busing issue. Asked to guess "President" Carter's attitude toward busing, the division among those

guessing opposition, neutrality, and approval was as follows in June and July:

	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>
Opposition	47	26
Neutrality	10	27
Approval	10	18
Don't know	16	20
Miscellaneous	17	9

The decline in perceived opposition to busing, (and the corresponding increase in perceived neutrality or approval) has a simple explanation. In June, many respondents assumed that Carter would be strongly opposed simply "because he is a Southerner". This assumption has given way to an appraisal which is in part more realistic, in part more political. Many of those now assuming neutrality toward busing comment that the President can't do much about it anyway. Of the 18 assuming that Carter favors busing, half intend voting for Ford.

There is also a trend in perceptions of how Carter as President would handle "the welfare mess". Responses were grouped into two clusters, as follows:

Do something -- "clean up the mess"; "improve the system";

"put them to work"; "reduce welfare"; etc.

Do nothing -- "keep it the same"; "have even more of it";

"he can't change it"; "do nothing"; etc.

Here is the tabulation:

	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>
Do something	44	61
Do nothing	26	24
Don't know	30	15

The July perceptions are sharply partisan. This is the tabulation according to intended vote:

	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Ford</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
Do something	40	12	9
Do nothing	6	14	4
Don't know	6	3	6

The vast majority of Carter voters see him as doing something about welfare, whereas only a minority of Ford voters see Carter as doing something.

In like vein, there is a trend in perception of Carter's prospective tax policy. Grouping responses into those expecting improvement ("of the system", or "for the middle class", "the poor", etc.) and those suggesting no improvement ("he'll raise taxes", "he won't change the system", etc.), the table is as follows:

	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>
Improvement	35	47
No improvement	43	45
Don't know	22	8

Again, there is a partisan division in the July data, with Carter supporters

rather more inclined than Ford supporters to envision improvement.

In general, Governor Carter has done well in conveying an optimistic sense about the domestic prospects of his Presidency, at the inevitable price of hardening the skepticism by his opposition.

#### Summary

On balance, these new interviews show that perceptions of Jimmy Carter are even more favorable than in June, and contain more realism and detail. There are newly emerging hints of partisan perceptions. Democrats tend to respond in broadly positive terms to Carter's personality, and on economic issues; Ford Republicans bring up issues the opposition will probably emphasize: hinted liberalism on unpopular causes, the Governor's alleged two-facedness, and inexperience in foreign policy. As in the June sample, there is no indication that being devout is a campaign liability, and being a Southerner is only of minor concern.

I'm Walter Mondale -- and I'm running for Vice President with Jimmy Carter.

We believe the choice in this election is clear.

Eight and a half million Americans are out of work ... we've had the highest sustained inflation in the past 25 years ... and there is no sense of leadership or vision from the present Administration in Washington.

In this election -- just as in the 1960 Presidential election -- we are at a crucial turning point.

Then, as now, the Republican Party simply defended the past ... and offered no hope for real leadership and change.

Jimmy Carter offers that hope.

Like John Kennedy, there are some who seem concerned about his accent or his religion.

But most Americans recognize that it's not how a man talks ... or how he worships God ... that's important.

And they recognize that there's only one ticket ... and one political party ... which truly offers the chance for strong, honest, and compassionate leadership in dealing with America's real problems ... and in getting this country back on the right track.

Please give us your help.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)