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THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
October 5, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL

DIVIDING THE DEMOCRATS

MEMORANDUM TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
H. R. HALEMAN

FROM: "RESEARCH" (As Requested)

Because the Old Roosevelt Coalition was composed of numerous parts, there is more than one fissure within the Democratic Party which can today be exploited to the benefit of the President. Some examples:

IDEOLOGICAL FISSURES

The most readily obvious division among Democrats is along ideological lines -- the left and the New Left versus moderate and conservative Democrats. Militant blacks, the rebellious on the campus, the radical chic of Eastern liberalism are all within the broad confines of the Democratic Party. So, too, is their most antipathetic adversaries, the blue collar, white collar conservative Democrats.

To exacerbate the ideological division, a few suggestions which surely can be emended and added to:

1) The Platform Plank Against Extremism. The Democrats mirror to some extent the Republicans of 1954, and pressure for a plank in both parties denouncing Left-wing extremism, and New Left attempts to subvert and overthrow American institutions would be divisive in the Democratic Party. Specific denunciations of the Black Panther Party, SDS, those who have attempted to politicize and destroy the great American universities -- these are proposals to deeply divide Democrats. The goal is to focus Democratic attention on this. Could perhaps be done by a Dole speech, calling on both Republicans and Democrats to incorporate such a plank in their party's platform -- a speech made after some particularly outrageous campus incident preferably.
2) Republican Praise for Attacks on the Left: Rather than attack the hard left, de rigueur for Republicans, we should shower praise upon Jackson and the Conservative Democrats who denounce the left wing within their own party. A specific example is Jackson's attack on "environmental extremists." We might well go back, dig up Jackson's attacks on his party's left wing, and use them. We did this to some good effect in the early 1970 campaign with the Vice President quoting Meany's and other denunciations of extremism in the Democratic party.

3) Republican Praise for any Democratic Support on Vietnam. More injurious to HHH and Muskie, than an attack on their Vietnam position (which should not be excluded) is "praise" for their support of the President on occasion. This goes far toward making them "Establishment" and driving a wedge between them and the ideological hard core of their party.

4) The McGovern-O'Brien Reform. The Left is counting heavily on these reforms. They may not be carried out to the letter. If they are, they will likely result in one humdinger of a convention; the President's political campaign personnel should be on the watch for violations, which are almost certain to occur - and then elevate those violations in the media as shifting the young, the poor, the black and the women. We have already had some success with this in the Monday piece, which got national attention, alleging that O'Brien had thrown in with Muskie, they were putting the "fix" in at the convention, and throwing the blocks to the McCarthy kids and McGovern. Democrats are extremely sensitive about this; and concerned about the Convention.

(In this quarrel, our publications and spokesmen, it seems to me at present, should take the side of the Far Left, saying we disagree with them, but that they have a just cause, and the Power Elite within the Party is denying them effective participation.)

5) Left-Wing Democratic Complaints, i.e., from McGovern and his people should find an echo and an amicus curiae in Republican statements and publications.

6) A Mailing List should be prepared and kept up to date of all Democratic convention delegates, as they are named. Anything any major candidate says that is offensive to their faction should be brought to their attention, and the attention of the press in their area.

Example: Humphrey's statement ruling out all signers of the Southern Manifesto should go out, one-page, to Southern delegates, and Southern papers -- particularly, say, those in Carolina where Sam Erwin was ruled out, and Oklahoma, where Carl Albert was ruled out by HHH.

7) We should make sure that women will have a voice in the party. In a couple of the more liberal conferences, major issues relating to women's rights have gone to the floor.

REGION:

South vs. North issue; but Party is essential in the South and mail in the North.


2) The Integration of the Supreme Court.

3) Selective Integration of education, power, wh...

Many of us are going to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is not the Supreme Court. It is a creation of a group of men, not the Supreme Court.

Frankly, I...
7) We have to develop several covert outlets within the national press, who will ask the hard questions that only a political adversary can think up. In addition, and perhaps as a substitute for this, we should develop several divisive questions worked up, and distributed at major press conferences of the leading Democrats. Also, direct mail to questioners of major Democrats — in short, little briefing papers to newsmen — should go to those who interrogate them on ABC, NBC and CBS Sunday shows.

REGIONAL FISSURES

South versus North. Here the dividing line is essentially that of the race issue; but it goes further into the "liberalism" of the national Democratic Party leaders, and major candidates, which does not sit well with the essential "suburban conservatism" and even "Wallaceism" of Democrats in the South. To force a choice here, we need more than just rhetoric and mailings. Actions taken by the President and Administration are decisive here:

1) The Supreme Court nomination of a Southern Strict Constructionist will force Democratic Northern liberals, and major candidates, to anger either the South with a veto vote, or the blacks and the labor movement and the Northern liberals. A highly qualified Southern Conservative nominee to the Supreme Court is de facto a divisive issue in the Democratic Party.

2) Elevation of the issue of compulsory school integration and neighborhood integration, via such as "bussing" and the Ribicoff Plan. Clearly, this puts Northern liberals like Muskie on an untenable hook. And with the Detroit horror show shaping up, this is going to be even more a national "voting" issue. Mr. Wallace has recognized this.

The serious problem here is that while Muskie may be in favor of compulsory integration by his votes — the Administration is the one that is seen as in power, while various odious ruling and policies are being enforced.

Many of my sources tell me that it is the President — since he is invisible— in office, and has made strong statements — who is today being hurt worst by the bussing fiasco. That is not as it should be as I understand that the President political and moral position is that it is wrong and contra-productive to forcible integrate the races.

However, if we are to draw a line between us and the Democratic liberals, which leaves the Democratic conservatives on our side of the line — then action will be required, in my judgment, on the President's part.

Frankly, this requires the kind of historic decision, bringing a constitutional
end to the national pressure to integrate races in housing and schooling -- which requires a decision on the part of the President. This would really tear up the pea patch; and our current policy is one of accommodation with the courts not confrontation.

In conclusion, this is a potential throw of the dice that could bring the media on our heads, and cut the Democratic Party and country in half; my view is that we would have far the larger half. But that is not my decision.

3) A Wallace Candidacy in the Primaries: This is an excellent vehicle for surfacing and hardening the divisions within the Democratic Party, in the South. Regrettably, such a primary run is likely to hone his organization for a pass at the general. And if Muskie is the Democratic choice, "There's not a dime's worth of difference between them" is an effective slogan. But Wallace victories in Florida, North Carolina and Tennessee -- if they are in the cards -- could create some truly serious problems for the Democratic Convention.

4) The Defense Issue: Though less so than before, defense is an issue on which the majority of Republicans and conservative and Southern Democrats unite on one side -- with the liberal Democrats on the other. Again, this involves Presidential decision. Should the President elevate this issue, it is one which would divide the opposition party straight down the middle with Meaney, Jackson and the Southerners on one side -- and Kennedy, McGovern, Lindsay on the other.

Again, however, the accomplishment of such a division requires a Presidential elevation of an issue where we have sought to mute differences via our thrust. "We have already re-ordered our priorities," the Defense Budget is the "lowest percent of GNP since the Fillmore Administration," etc.

5) The elitism and quasi-anti-Americanism of the National Democratic Party have little appeal below the Mason-Dixon Line; and we should contrast the Party of Roosevelt, Truman, and JFK -- with the party of Ramsey Clark, Ronald Dellums and George McGovern.

ETHNIC/RELIGIOUS

The great Northern cities see a clear dividing line between the liberal, academic, intellectual Democratic elite in the Party -- and the working class Roman Catholic, Polish, Irish, Italian Democrats, from the Bronx, Queens and Cook County.

1) My view has been that these minorities, Poles, Irish, Italian Catholics, are larger minorities and easier to win than the “media minorities” -- i.e., Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians, etc., the darlings of the mass media.
Conspicuous appointments of the larger minorities, the more available minorities (Irish, Italian, Poles, Slovaks, etc.) would reap us greater dividends, and wean away from the Democratic Party a more significant base than the play being given today say to blacks.

2) Aid to Catholic Schools: Clearly this divides the Democrats who run the New York Times from the Democrats who run for office in Queens and the North Bronx. The President's strong stand on abortion, a gut issue with Catholics, is another divisive factor within the Democratic Party -- if we can force Democrats to come down on one side or the other.

Again, however, these issues which have been shown by Governors like Rockefeller to be deeply divisive to Democrats on the State level -- have to be elevated on the national level in order to do us any good. There is another drawback. They are also divisive to Republicans. The Ripon Society liberals will be anti-aid to Catholic schools, anti-abortion, and more concerned with "censorship" and "repression" than porno.

But the favoritism toward things Catholic is good politics; there is a trade-off, but it leaves us with the larger share of the pie. If we want to throw the dice on this divisive issue, the way to do it is via a specific, tangible program of Federal assistance to non-public schools to save them.

Here, too, we have to force Democrats to choose among their vital voting blocs -- where the interests of these blocs directly collide.

3) Fourth Party Candidacies. Top-level consideration should be given to ways and means to promote, assist and fund a Fourth Party candidacy of the Left Democrats and/or the Black Democrats. There is nothing that can so advance the President's chances for re-election -- not a trip to China, not four- and-a-half percent unemployment -- as a realistic black Presidential campaign.

4) Black Complaints: As we did with Muskie we should continue to champion the cause of the Blacks within the Democratic Party; elevate their complaints of "being taken for granted."

ECONOMIC FISSURES

Where before, the economic interests of the Roosevelt Coalition were complimentary or harmonious, today that is not the case. This fissure, too, can be exploited:

One could divide it between the loafing classes (welfare, students) and the working classes.
A cutback in welfare, a hard-line on welfare would force Democrats to choose between the working class outraged by the excesses in that program and the welfare class, which is becoming a cohesive voting bloc.

A specific political position of stating that while the Democratic Left is constantly speaking up for the welfare class in this country, "the time has come for someone to represent the working class" might well be considered philistine or worse by the media, but would seem to be good politics. Tax relief, for example, is of a good deal more interest and concern for the working men of this country, than the massive welfare scheme we have proposed -- and the President is more likely to get working class support, Wiley's Welfare Mommas behind him.

Note: Since taking office, the President has increased by 500 percent -- from $400 million to $2 billion -- the food stamp and food assistance funds; and he still gets it in the neck for "starving the poor." Methinks there would have been more gratitude and greater rewards if those funds had been directed to the President's potential friends in the working class, and their interests.

If the President would become the visible and outspoken champion of the Forgotten American, the working people of this country -- and assert that the welfare types have been taken care of for years; it would force a division within the Democratic Party, would align the media against us -- but methinks it both divides them and assists us.

Like other proposals, the above calls for what the Vice President has termed "positive polarization" and requires really the kind of go-for-broke decision that we may not feel is either necessary or justified by our comparatively good field position.

The Black Vice President bumper stickers calling for black Presidential and especially Vice Presidential candidates should be spread out in the ghettos of the country. Also, anti-Muskie stickers. We should do what is within our power to have a black nominated for Number Two at least at the Democratic National Convention.

INSTRUMENTS:

The President — Used to the Absolute Minimum. His Muskie comment was most helpful [on the Black V.P.] but the President and the Presidency are the quintessential political assets we have and should be used in a partisan situation, only in extremis.
The Vice President: We need a decision as to whether he can be used, or should he -- both from him and from higher authority within the campaign. Of course, he has incomparable visibility; he can make political issues in a way that few others can.

MONDAY -- Excellent credibility in the media; has already been used to good effect; will continue to utilize it along lines suggested in above memorandum.

MAILING OPERATION -- There should be set up a Mailing Operation to Democrats, on the Hill, and in the Party and Delegations, which will make sure that none of them misses a majority candidate position that is against his interests. Example, pro-abortion statements might be mailed to all Catholic newspapers and wire services. Cut-the-Budget-to-the-bone statements should be mailed to military and conservative publications, etc.

This operation would serve as midwife of the Democrats Right to Know. We ought to consider how to set this up, with perhaps the least possible "Republican" credentials; or perhaps if that cannot be avoided, set up some "Kremlinologist" operation for the Democratic Party, acknowledge it; and play it straight. Would require a full-time operation; and what should be avoided at all cost is the "excessive" mailings that really turn off editorial writers and the like.

GOVERNORS/CABINET OFFICERS/HILL PEOPLE -- When and how these types are to be used is a decision that needs to be made; also, what of Dole's use. Not much in a major way can be accomplished, absent a political operation which can "produce" for them what needs to be said. It is hard to visualize this being done on a part-time basis.

WHITE HOUSE POLITICAL AIDES -- Should they take the risk of "feeding" these kinds of materials from the WH?

Above are some thoughts on Dividing the Democrats, that need honing and discussion.