

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

WHORM Subject File Code: FG002-38
(Federal Government Organizations: Former Presidents:
Carter, James Earl, Jr.)

Case file Number(s): 700500-End
Box Number: 6

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

2004
700543
FG-2-38

Memorandum to Governor Jimmy Carter
from Adam Walinsky
The Northern Campaign and The Catholic Problem

By now you have probably heard, more times than you care to, that your campaign has a "Catholic problem". At least in the press, the statements of this problem I have seen have been little more than unsupported assertion. This memorandum will attempt to describe the problem, to set forth its dimensions and causes, and to suggest ways of dealing with it. The long analysis and description may seem unnecessary; nothing could be further from the truth, and nothing could be less useful than a two-page memo with six short suggestions. There is no quick fix to this problem. The key is understanding.

Two prefatory notes: First, the problem is real. It is not just a matter of what Jim Miller writes in the Tablet, or Rev. Andrew Greeley in 150 church papers, or Jimmy Breslin in the News: It is at the heart of the uneasiness that Caddell finds, and it is beginning to pervade the consciousness of the newsmen. True, only a few real politicians have said anything about it, many more have been reassuring, and no organized protests have been made. Take no comfort from this. Feeling excluded, blacks will form a caucus and have press conferences; Jews may fill a room with contributors and test you on every nuance of the Israeli question. Catholics will do neither. They will just wait for you in a voting booth, and give it to you behind the curtain. They may or may not bother to tell the pollsters first. As to the politicians, no one is about to tell you that they can't carry their people for you; then you wouldn't need them, would you? They say of a man in praise, in Irish Boston, "he wouldn't tell you if your coat was on fire". Of course, it may be that all my concern is unnecessary, that President Ford will fumble every ball on his own one-yard line, or run for a score of wrong-way touchdowns, to use The Nixonian metaphor. But I think not. And you do not impress me as a man who wants to back in on the mistakes of others. You want to win, and so do I.

Second, the problem cannot be solved by meetings with the staff of the Bishop's Conference. The problem is not of the bishops' making, and neither they nor any other "representative" of Catholic interests can broker the vote for you. Indeed, there is no single "representative", broker nor any collection, who can do the job for you. This is a vote that you must -- and can -- win for yourself.

Of course I do not pretend to predict the course of this election, nor do I presume to prescribe a program for inevitable victory. At best, I can try to further understanding, to identify tendencies, strengths and weaknesses, problems that should be met and actions that seem likely to be helpful now -- to hurtful. So I will not attempt to review your existing strengths, or the considerable achievements of your nomination; those are celebrated enough, and they are no guide to the increase and solidification in your strength that I know you desire. Finally, I do not pretend to universal expertise. I know far more about New York than I do about other states, and while New York shares characteristics with many, it is identical to none. But I do think you want to carry New York this fall, just as I think you would have preferred to do far better in the New York primary, which could easily have been done. So let us get on with it.

I. The Catholic Vote and its importance. Catholics are about 35 percent of the American population; they represent slightly more of the voting electorate. However, their importance in Presidential elections is disproportionate to their numbers, for two reasons. First, they are concentrated in the big states: more than 70 percent of the Catholic vote is in thirteen states with 281 electoral votes. Eliminating the two of these states that are also Southern (Texas and Louisiana), the eleven remaining have 245. No matter how solid the South and border states (total: 147), a Democrat cannot be elected without many of the Northern Catholic states.

The point of greatest import, however, is the proportion of Democrats who are Catholics. Catholics are 36 percent of the New York population, and

probably 60 percent of the basic Democratic vote. In New Jersey, which is 40 percent Catholic, Catholics are about 75 percent of the Democratic vote. Similar relative proportions obtain in the rest of the major Catholic states: Massachusetts, 56 percent Catholic, Connecticut 46, Wisconsin 34, Illinois 32, Pennsylvania 30, Minnesota 30, Michigan 25, Ohio 21, California 20. In each of these states, Catholics are far more likely to vote Democratic than are Protestants; and in many of them, Catholics are more than a majority of the Democratic vote.

Thus analysts who speak of the "Catholic vote", as if it were just one of many groups with its own concerns and crotchets, make a profound error. In most of the major industrial states that are on your prime target list, the Catholic vote is virtually synonymous with the Democratic vote. They are not in the Democratic party; they are the Democratic party. They are the battleground and the key to this election.*

One of your staff was recently quoted as saying that Catholics would not be a problem because ethnic bloc voting is declining. This is like applauding at a funeral. When Catholics vote as a bloc, they vote Democratic. When their bloc voting declines, Republicans win.

Another way of stating this is the time-honored formula that to win a national election, a Democrat requires at least 65 percent of the Catholic vote. In 1960, Richard Nixon got 22 percent, and lost narrowly (with many Protestants switching away from

*And the Republicans know it. The prime sources for Auletta's recent piece on how you could lose are James Finkelstein and Tully Plessner, two of the best Republican pollster-advisers. The talk about Jim Buckley or Peter Domenici for Vice-president is in the open now, and speeches and statements of both Ford and Reagan are beginning to sound more and more like elements of a Northern, Catholic strategy.

Kennedy); in 1968, Nixon got 33 percent, and won narrowly; in 1972, with 51 percent of the Catholics, he won an enormous landslide. (Similarly in state-wide elections: in New York, for example, it was Catholic defections from the Democrats that elected Nelson Rockefeller, and James Buckley. Democrats have won just two state-wide elections since 1948: Robert Kennedy in 1964 and Hugh Carey in 1974.)

And there are some disturbing signs. You know that your primary difficulties were almost all in heavily Catholic states and areas: not only Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey, but also Baltimore (as against the rest of Maryland), Detroit (as against the rest of Michigan), South Milwaukee (as against the rest of Wisconsin). Of course, Jerry Brown is a Catholic, and appealed strongly to that vote. But it was Mo Udall, a liberal Arizona Mormon, who won metropolitan Detroit. More disturbing perhaps than these negative votes themselves is what they could portend. For Catholics, especially in New York, tend not to be heavy voters in primaries. Rather they tend to sit back, and then vote up -- or down -- what the party's other voters have offered them for a ticket. When they feel excluded, they tend to punish Democrats, and they are capable of doing so in a frightening fashion. Without bragging, because the general election made clear the true magnitude of my achievement, I won a contested state-wide primary for New York Attorney General in 1970, by better than 2 to 1, with a total vote of well over 600,000, on an expenditure of less than \$60,000. Running on the infamous ticket headed by Arthur Goldberg, also a primary winner ("There's only one white man on that ticket", said Dan O'Connell, the legendary Albany leader, "Basil Patterson. And he's black"), I lost the general election by a cool million votes. The people who voted against me in November had simply not bothered to vote in June. This year again, the bulk of Catholic voters -- which means the vast bulk of Democratic voters in the North -- have yet to be heard from.

II. Keys to Understanding. There are two Democratic parties. One is the party of William Jennings Bryan: rural, Protestant, nativist, evangelizing, dry. The other is the party of Al Smith: urban,

immigrant, industrial, Catholic (and Jewish), wet. The first begins with Jefferson, and (save for its eternal dilemma of slavery and race) is responsible for most of the classic traditions of American freedom. The second begins later, with the immigrant waves and (marred throughout its history by the corruption of the cities) is responsible for most of the traditions of government as provider and guarantor of equality and economic justice.

The antagonisms between these parties are very old, yet like a Kentucky feud, they have left their inheritances down to the present day. More than this, the facts that gave them birth have present counterparts that still exacerbate and renew the old quarrels.

Clearly you understand the deep and tangled roots of the relationship between blacks and whites in the South; you feel its history through your very fingertips, in a way that Northerners like myself cannot grasp even dimly. What I hope you can also come to grasp are the roots of this other division, to understand the old nightmares of the Catholic North and their possible effects upon this election; and more important in the end, their lasting effects on the American nation, and the Presidency you will pursue.

For American Catholics are now only part way along one of the most difficult and desperate climbs ever undertaken by any people. They came here, not in search of freedom, but of survival. For just one example, the Irish: When 15,000 of them were starving to death every day in the potato famine, Queen Victoria contributed five pounds to the Irish Relief Fund. That was the sum of Britain's assistance. So the Irish fled to America. But they were not much welcomed here. Freed slaves were used to break the first Irish strikes on the New York docks; Pinkertons shot them down in the Pennsylvania mines in the 1880's (as National Guard troops controlled by the Rockefellers and the Carnegies would shoot them down in the copper mines in the 1910's, and in front of the Homestead plant in the 1930's). They were the most despised of people, regarded as sub-human, lower

even than blacks. It was said that "our Celtic fellow citizens are almost as remote from us in temperament and constitution as the Chinese". Convents and churches were sacked and burned, mobs clashed in the streets, and the Know-Nothings -- a party founded on anti-Catholic bigotry -- captured Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky and most of New England, including every major office in the state of Massachusetts. "No Irish Need Apply" signs went up in Boston shortly after the Civil War, and persisted into the 20th Century. These immigrants came, for the most part, without the traditions of learning and commerce that did so much for Jewish progress; so always they did the dirtiest and the most dangerous of jobs, dying by the thousands on the Erie Canal, and on a score of railroads, in the mines and the unspeakable factories of the developing nation. Louis Adamic, a chronicler of their lives, once wrote that the immigrants were "the dung that fertilized American's greatness"; and the Irish widow woman, with her brood of orphans, was a stock character of literature.

This is not the place, and I am not the person, to give you a full history of the immigrants. But you cannot fully understand what the parochial schools really represent, if you do not know that they were founded in reaction to public schools that openly proselytized for the Protestant religion, and taught contempt for Catholicism and all its practitioners and works. You cannot fully understand how Catholics feel about the South and Southern politicians, if you do not recall that the great issue of the 103-ballot Democratic convention in 1924 was whether to pass a resolution condemning the Ku Klux Klan, which in its 20th century revival was principally an anti-Catholic organization -- and that the fight against the resolution, in favor of the Klan, was led by the forces of Underwood of Alabama, and William G. McAdoo, Woodrow Wilson's son-in-law, a Georgia-born Californian. You must always remember (for many Catholics do) the crosses that were burned, all over the South, when Al Smith ran in 1928*. Of course memories of the

*They were also burned in Protestant Suffolk County on Long Island.

specific incidents have faded, among Catholics as among others; not one political reporter in a hundred would know of them in the first place. But the attitudes they birthed have survived the memories.

You must also remember (telescoping rapidly to the present) that it was not until 1960 that Catholics, 35 percent of the population, elected their first President, and that anti-Catholic opposition cost him much of the South and Protestant West; that even this great victory, this fantastic psychic liberation, was suddenly torn away from them by a bullet, and then another; and that the perceived villain, the man who was seen as destroying the legacy of these bright young avatars of Catholic dreams, was a Southerner and a Protestant.

And in political terms, you must recognize much more. For the deaths of John and Robert Kennedy coincided in time and circumstance with another, institutional upheaval. The 1960's were the time when the Democratic party finally fell to the "reformers" -- to the coalition of high-minded, well-educated, well-off professionals, the young, the black, the Puerto Rican, the women as interest group -- which had, in one form or another, been locked in combat with Tammany since the creation of the first city machines. Why and how that happened is a subject for another rainy day. What is relevant here is that under the impulse of prosperity, leisure, war, and communications, the machines -- which is to say, the institutional structure that had always succored the immigrants within the Democratic party -- collapsed and lost their influence before their job was done.

The result was a time-warp, that was and remains enormously destructive to the Democratic party, and to our politics generally. It is true that the immigrants, by the 1960's, were demonstrably better off than the racial minorities whose plight was virtually the exclusive focus of government policy during that decade. The Irish have the highest annual incomes of any group (save Jews) in the country, with Italians a fast-rising third; Irish rates of college attendance are now higher than those of Episcopalianians.

But this economic and educational progress has not brought with it the social and political recognition that such achievement, born of bitter struggle over so many years, might have been expected to bring. So we had the spectacle in 1972 of a Democratic Presidential candidate promising to appoint another black to the Supreme Court, promising to appoint a Mexican-American to the Supreme Court, but never even acknowledging the fact that for all their achievements, there has never been an Italian on the Supreme Court, never been an Eastern European (other than a Jew) on the Supreme Court (indeed that there has not been a Jew on the Court since 1969, and never been more than one Irishman at a time). Only two Catholics, Smith and Kennedy, have ever been nominated for national office; there have only been two Italians in the Cabinet, and only one of them a Democrat, sad Anthony Celebreze, who was the butt of jokes and was gone within a year.

Nor was this only a matter of high office. I am not yet forty years old. In my own life, I was excluded from schools that would admit no more than a ten percent quota of Jews. When I graduated from law school in 1961, I had to stand at least thirty places higher in the class than a Protestant to get a job at the same law firm. Yet academic and employment discrimination against Catholics, particularly Italians, has been longer-lasting and in some ways more pernicious than against Jews; there is, for example, currently a lawsuit in Federal Court in New York, based upon the fact that the great law firm of Cravath, Swaine and Moore, which has had Irish partners, which has some Jewish partners, which has at least one woman partner, has still never had an Italian partner, and refuses even to interview students from predominantly Catholic law schools.

Yet just as Jews and Irish, Italians and Poles, in the 1960's, were beginning to break out of the quotas against which they had struggled for generations, they were being told that they must again be subject to discrimination, this time in favor of racial minorities, or women; and that this new quota system could cost them, not only a symbolic seat on the Supreme Court, but their own promotion, their own job, or a place in college for their own children.

-5-

And in a not-so-curious coincidence, the new attention for the concerns of blacks, and the political alliances that flowed from it, often and easily slipped off into the cheapest bigotry. In 1969, for example, liberals by the bushful deserted Mario Procaccino, the Democratic candidate for Mayor of New York City, to support the ineffably Protestant John Lindsay, primarily on the ground that Procaccino gave insufficient support to the demands of blacks and Puerto Ricans. That year, New Yorkers amused themselves with the joke, product of a Yale University faculty room: "Italians may not be an inferior race, but they give the best imitation of one I've ever seen". That crack still draws chuckles from many who, if you had substituted blacks as the subject, would react with outraged silence and unconcealed disdain. (Try it on some of your staffers; I did.) There can be few of us who have never laughed at a Polish joke; but more remarkable, when Johnny Carson told some on national television, people laughed even more at the attempt of some Poles to get equal time. From these roots also was born the myth of the racist, war-mongering hard-hat; when in fact, Catholic ethnics were and are far more likely to share neighborhoods with blacks, to send their children to school with blacks, than are the McGovernite suburban liberals; and working-class Catholics were earlier and always more opposed to the war than were the more educated and "liberal" (remember that it was Dearborn, Michigan that first, in 1966, voted in a referendum for a complete pullout from Vietnam).

And there was, of course, much more. For as with any group on the way up, the progress of some, even many, was by no means shared by all. The average industrial worker of the eight Eisenhower years spent the equivalent of one full year out of the eight on unemployment. His job was still dirty, noisy, unhealthy, debilitating to body and spirit. His neighborhood, especially if he lived in one of the old ethnic ghettos, was likely to be deteriorating, redlined, perhaps slaughtered by a freeway. He, or his children, could often not think seriously of college: as late as 1959, out of the top fifth of all graduating high school seniors, two-thirds did not go to college, in the vast majority of cases

because their parents could not afford it. Things began to turn up for this man about mid-1962, when an expanded defense budget, and some good luck, started a real economic expansion. But just as he was beginning to enjoy the fruits of this expansion, just as new scholarship programs were starting to open up college for his children, just as his wife got a second job so they could think about moving to the suburbs, or buying a rowboat -- just about then, the cities erupted, and the war in Vietnam began in earnest.

1965 was much more than the year when workers' real incomes began to drop again. It was also much more than the year when Catholics, like other citizens, began to feel the impact of disorder, insecurity, unsettling change. It was the year that they began to lose their government, and to lose the party that had been their shelter and political expression since they first came to these shores. Almost from the first day when the attention of Presidents, Congress and the press began to focus on the long-delayed demands of racial equality, down to this very moment, there has not been one single element -- not one -- on the entire liberal, Democratic agenda that relates or responds, in any way, to the needs and demands, real or imagined, physical or psychic, of the immigrants and the immigrants' children. Indeed, it was overwhelmingly the Catholic Democrats who time and time again were called upon to pay the real price of awakening justice. Their city neighborhoods were most affected by the rising tide of crime and disorder; their children's schools, as in today's Boston, were suddenly wrenched into new and threatening shapes; their jobs, whether on the line, or laying brick, or in university classrooms, were now the targets of others. They paid the taxes, sent their sons to Vietnam -- and watched, first in bemusement, and then with growing fury, as their local leaders were shoved aside by new federal programs, as government poured their tax dollars into experiments that were as threatening as they were often wasteful, and as a new ethic of dependency and welfare entitlement mocked the incredible labors they had made in the search for success and assimilation.

Their bitterness and resentment were captured and brilliantly exploited by Buckley's 1970 slogan: "Isn't it about time we had a Senator?"

One could go on and on, into the "social issues", the threats to family, to ancient values, to moral standards, that were discussed and analyzed as causes of the 60's discontents. What has been said, or alluded to, is more than enough to explain the rage (there is no other word) of the Catholic reaction to George McGovern. The accidental Lyndon Johnson and Harry Truman aside, McGovern was the first Democratic candidate since 1924 to come explicitly from the Bryan party (FDR was a patrician, but he was Tammany's man and Smith's inheritor in New York; Stevenson was Daley's man in Illinois). McGovern's nomination also represented the triumph of the new politics -- all the coalitions aligned against the remnants of the Al Smith party. His support of the quotas (or "affirmative action"), inside the party and in the institutions of government, was obvious and bitter poison to those who had been the victims of WASP quotas within their own lifetimes. And his tax and welfare "reforms", far from being perceived as equitable or just, were in fact seen as another WASP attempt to put the immigrants back in their old place. For immigrant money tends to be new money, much of it made in the boom of the 60's. It is therefore less secure, both psychologically and actually: when business goes down, these people can lose everything. More important, his plans would not have humbled the great WASP fortunes, but would have hit hardest at the professionals and businessmen whose money must be made over again every year. So the Irish, and the Italians, and the Jews saw McGovern hitting directly at them: not only at their pocketbooks, but at their entire position, at the heavily mortgaged houses in Westchester and Nassau, at their children's college educations, at their very ability to escape the constant conflict and tension and fear of the City neighborhoods from which they came. McGovern complained, at the time of the California challenge, about "changing the rules of the game after it has been played"; he never understood that he was pro-

posing to change the rules of another far more vital game, after it had been played. The immigrants and their children had suffered discrimination, worked to overcome it, and achieved a precarious success within the system. So when McGovern and the intellectual economists proposed to take the fruits of the game, and the government jobs and judgeships, away from the winners, and award them to those who (for whatever reason) were not willing to play the same game, the result was obvious and predictable. And all this -- the threatening programs, the new dominance of their party by alien forces -- was offered them by a stranger, a farmer, a preacher, Bryan revivodus, a man who never understood the first thing about them, about their history or present circumstances. At a 1973 post-mortem, one of the party's best organizers offered a simple motto for the future: No More Protestants.

Would that the result could have been interred with his hapless campaign. But the fact is that, like the rest of history, it has survived to plague us today. What I have found very difficult to get across to your able young staffers is that you do not have the luxury of a clean slate on which to write the book of this campaign. Perhaps you in the South and in Georgia were so successful in breaking the chains of your past, that you cannot conceive that our inheritance could not be as easily shucked off. But it is not. I cannot stress too strongly that you are walking in strange woods, and they are filled with land mines. Every step you take carries the danger of waking the ghosts, not only of the McGovern campaign, but of the long history, the divisions and resentments and fears, that have plagued the immigrants since their first landings. Whatever their present relationships, I suspect that no white man meets a strange black, in back-country Alabama, entirely free from the history of black and white in America. For me to campaign there, in my present ignorance, would be foolhardy. So it is entirely without any hint of patronization, or arrogance of any kind, that I urge you now to consider how little you may appreciate what really makes us tick, to consider the little that I have been able to set forth here, and use it, not as a

guide to perfect understanding, but as a stimulus to further learning; and above all to consider, most carefully, the direction of your present campaign.

III. Some immediate problems. In what follows, I will try to concentrate on that which can be changed, rather than to lament what is done or immutable. The past will be gone over only when it furnishes a guide to understanding, and a signpost to the future. Here then are some of the problems, actual and potential, that I see:

1. The coalition. This I think is the most dangerous of all: for who is in it, and who is not. You won the nomination overwhelmingly with the votes of Protestants, white and black, often from rural areas and small towns, and from the threatening ghettos. You were not perceived as asking for the support of Catholics in any serious way. You did not name one as Vice-president; you did not even manage to have one bless the convention proceedings, for what must be the first time in living memory. It is all very well, and a gesture of enormous importance to the future of American life, to have had Martin Luther King Sr. on the platform at the end, and to sing We Shall Overcome. But it is dangerous in the extreme to thus symbolically portray your coalition as white and black Protestants (and a few Jews), without the Catholic voters of the North.* That by itself raises all the most threatening echoes of the new politics, the coalition without Catholics that can win primaries, but never a general election.

2. The response to party pressure groups. Rightly or not, you were perceived as responding too quickly to the demands of the most vocal elements of the party. Your early strength, I believe (certainly

*That picture was dangerously close to the devastating Detroit photograph of you with the bosses of industry and labor, and Coleman Young.

your early appeal to me) was precisely that you did not automatically respond to the loudest or most "liberal" voices, whether on aid to New York City, on the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, or on abortion. But as the convention approached, you did respond on abortion, you did meet with and satisfy the women on representational quotas, you did meet with and apparently satisfy the militant blacks, you were perceived (which is what counts) as responding to the Times and the liberals on Mondale. All this reinforces the unfortunate perception of your coalition -- especially when you fail to meet with the Italian caucus. But it does much more. Seeing (as do most of us) only through the prism of their own experience, many Catholic voters see most of what they think has gone wrong with their party as the result of this kind of political pressure: no sensible person could adopt the liberal positions on (blacks, quotas, crime, welfare, etc.); these positions must be adopted solely to get votes. Therefore, one will be consistently perceived as a politician of integrity only if he finds a way to say No to some such organized demands. It is the liberals' inability to do this, on any issue, that has done so much to convince people that liberals are hopelessly phony.

3. The staff. This problem has two aspects: internal and external. The external is a perception that there are not a lot of identified Catholics around you. People read those articles in Time and Newsweek and the Sunday Times Magazine. They want to know who is close to you, with whom do you consult, who will be left in the room after the formal meetings are over. They look for names that sound like theirs. For these purposes, political allies are helpful but finally inadequate, because all know (or think they know) the differences between politicians who support you, and the staff you select to share your private thoughts. They can see, on that staff, plenty of Atlantans; they can see blacks, in abundance; Jews are immensely reassured to find three Jews (even if one of them has an Arab name). But they do not see Italians, or Poles; they do not see any Irishmen, even though the Irish have been the foremost political mechanics of the party for generations.

The internal consequences are more subtle, but they are also more profound. You cannot be expected to properly pronounce "Italians", if there is no one discussing your speech with you who is sensitive to how deeply "Eye-talian" can be resented. There has to be someone there, to tell you how important it is to meet with the Italian caucus, or to get your New York campaign out of "21", indeed out of Manhattan entirely, and into Parkchester, Red Hook, Corona and Valley Stream. Someone has to be there to work with your scheduler, and with your speechwriter, and your issues director, to get you to the right people, and the right places, and help you to say the right things when you get there.

An example of what can go wrong when these things are absent is what has happened to you on parochial schools, where the Catholic press is doing its best to beat your brains out. According to Greeley, whose column appears in more than 150 diocesan papers around the country, you announced your opposition to aid to parochial schools in a speech at a Jewish synagogue. (The only story I saw, in the Times, referred only to your strong support for the principle of separation of Church and State. Unfortunately, separation of Church and State, in New York and elsewhere, is an anti-Catholic code phrase. It is equated to opposition to parochial schools because it is the rallying cry of all the high-minded Jewish and Protestant organizations that go to court to fight every attempt to aid parochial schools, and then hold banquets to celebrate their victories over slavish Popery.) This simply cannot be done. Catholics are, by and large, supporters of Israel; not out of any special fondness for Jews, but out of admiration for tough fighters, and contempt for the Arabs. But they resent beyond measure the fact that Jews can obtain for Israel, which is a religious state, \$2.5 billion a year of U.S. aid, while aid to Catholic schools is somehow barred as violating the Constitution. In effect, Catholics cannot be helped as Jews are, because the Catholics in question are American citizens. So if you must oppose aid to Catholic schools, the last place to do it is in a synagogue. And anyone who understood these tensions would never have scheduled you, in the two days before the New Jersey primary,

into what seemed on television like every synagogue in an overwhelmingly Catholic state. The yarmulke is very soft, but it can be an effective weapon of political seppukku just the same.

All this is not meant, in the slightest, as criticism of your present staff. I am hard put, indeed, to express my admiration for the job they have thus far done for you -- brilliant, controlled, and bold, and with a remarkable niceness of timing. But it is not given to the most brilliant of us to have experienced everything; and the most difficult thing of all to learn is how to look through a stranger's eyes. You would not expect to visit a foreign nation without an interpreter. It is not an admission of weakness, it is a confirmation of intelligence and strength, to equip yourself with guides to the foreign nations within our midst.

4. The issues. Those that would be helpful I will mention later, along with the other suggestions for change; they are too intertwined with other aspects of the campaign for separate treatment. Here it should be noted only that the campaign, thus far, has not yet dealt directly with a single Catholic issue in a remotely positive way. Much of what you have said appeals greatly to Catholics, for they are also Americans, who respond like others to issues of general concern. Nonetheless, a group which feels so excluded from so much of recent political events requires that at least some of its own issues be directly addressed, if only as a token of sympathy and a recognition of their special importance. I want to feel, after all, that you know me, understand me, care how I feel about you: not as one part of a general mass, but in my special and unique character. So far, for Catholics, that is missing.

5. The style. Here I do not refer to your personal style. It is your own, it is you, and it is not for me to criticize. What I refer to, rather, is the style of the campaign. There is a sense of more reserve than we respond to, of a hardness that borders on the harsh; the campaign has been perhaps too effective in dealing with adversaries, in humbling them, in making painfully clear

to everyone where the power truly lies. And there is just too much of it. Today, just a week after the convention in which the delegates acted like sheep, everyone united in your praise, and the press was unanimous in its judgment that the old powers (pointedly including the principal Catholic inheritor) were dead -- after all this, you came back to New York, for a series of meetings with the powerful.

Thus neither during your convention, nor after it, were you seen as a candidate. Your victory was proclaimed, but we had no part in producing it; should your further victory follow the appointed script, it will all be seen as inevitable, automatic. you have said that you owe nothing to anyone but Andy. But we need you to owe us something. Our politics, the politics of the Al Smith party, are built on mutual need, mutual assistance, the creation and recognition of debts. Disinterested, dispassionate "good government", to us, is Protestants, John Lindsay, what Smith himself called "goo-goos"; it represents everything that is antithetical to the Catholic and immigrant political tradition. We live too close to government, it occupies and shapes too much of our lives, and our experience has been too bitter, to trust the kind of government approved by the editors of the New York Times (perhaps the most anti-Catholic paper in America; its idea of a good story, Robert Kennedy used to say, was "More Nuns Leave Faith"). And we want the debt to be to us, not to self-appointed brokers; Abe Beame or anyone else delivers no votes in Queens.

IV. Some initial suggestions. What follows does not purport to be a complete program, nor a guarantee of victory; nor does one exist. It does represent, I think, a fair cross-section of the kind of actions that can help.

1. Start campaigning personally for the Catholic vote, and start doing it now. This may be the most important of all. Personal campaigning is the single best way to show that you care: that you know where to find them, and that you like them enough to go to them, to spend time with them, to take part in their rituals and their talk, to listen

to what they say and find out how they live.

And the time to begin is now. So far as Catholics are concerned, the Convention was a negative. But just as that was totally unnecessary, and could have been nipped at the outset without serious damage, so you can stop any damage from spreading further if you act now. To stay idle, far away on a Southern farm, is only to emphasize your distance from them; and the longer you wait before going to them, the more time there is for whispers to build into a whirlwind of discontent. Above all I believe it is imperative to act before the Republican convention. For if Ford does take a Catholic as his Vice-president, you are chancing a rapid shift and solidification of sentiment that will leave you running to catch up through November. And always, what comes freely and unmasked is far more appreciated than what comes after, and in reaction to, a strong bid from the other side. Moreover, there is simply no time to do this job properly after Labor Day. Five days is not enough for safety in New York.

It cannot be said too strongly, moreover, that I am not talking about meetings with the Bishops. The hierarchy speaks principally for itself, and it is far more likely to follow than to lead its parishioners. The hierarchy did not start the anti-abortion crusade, but was forced to join in the train of the spontaneous and autonomous Right-to-Life groups. Time and again, the hierarchy has been willing to yield to financial pressure, and close parochial schools; parents have held sit-ins in church offices to protest. Of course, you do not want the hierarchy sniping at you, and steps to smooth relations are welcome. But here as elsewhere, they will respond above all to how well they think you are doing with Catholics generally.

Nor are there ethnic community leaders capable of delivering their voters; if you wait for these to appear, you will never meet with anyone. (The only ethnic leader capable of actually delivering a vote in New York is a Rabbi named

Morris Sherer, and most Manhattan politicians and reporters don't even know his name.) Similarly for union officials: when one tells you that he can deliver his own vote and few others, you have found an honest man.

Consultation with, and deference to leaders of various kinds is important; but only as symbolism, as a token that you recognize the importance, of the group from which they come. The only real way to gain support from Catholic voters is to go to them yourself, in the toughest places you can find: in the Holy Name societies and American Legion halls of Brooklyn and Buffalo, South Milwaukee and South Boston. Of course you cannot visit them all, nor enough to make a direct difference. But the word will get around. I had urged your staff to do some of this in New York, during the flat dull periods of the convention. You can still do it now, before the Republicans meet, while the nation's eye is focussed upon you almost exclusively. Besides, for all that I have been emphasizing their differences from you, another and equal part of the truth is that these people are not very different at all. They are good people, and you will enjoy it.

2. Get some identifiable Catholics around you, the more and closer the better. This does not mean just campaign workers in various states, through these are important. It means people near you, in your headquarters and on your plane, people who will catch the eyes and ears of the national reporters, who will be seen on the television. Before the convention, I urged your staff to select someone like Peter Flaherty, to whom I understood you were close, to be one of your principal spokesmen before the cameras, so that Catholics could see and be reassured by his apparent closeness to you. I was told that could not be worked out; but there is a long campaign still ahead.

o As to the internal, the substantive input of Catholics to the campaign, there is one major requisite: diversity. Catholics are as various as any other large population, and there is no one of

whom I know with a monopoly of wisdom on dealing with all of them. Rather there are many, each with a part of the truth. Geno Baroni, for example, came to ethnic politics via the Civil Rights movement; therefore his experience and vision are principally focussed on Catholic neighborhoods. These are important, even vital, but they do not encompass the younger, rising generations, the doctors and lawyers, engineers and executives who have moved to the suburbs, whose Catholic identity is of a different sort. Michael Novak returned to ethnicity from the academy and the study of history; his experience and vision focus on national and cultural roots, and he is less solid on class issues, where many Catholics have deep interests not directly related to their origin. Greeley is closer to the city machines, to Daley personally and politics as a profession. The point is assuredly not to denigrate the potential contribution of any one, for all can be enormously helpful. It is, rather, to urge that the problem, as near as possible, be grasped whole, and not through the particular lens of any single individual.

(And do not, for your advice, rely overmuch on politicians. Elected officials, for reasons at which I can only guess, seem to work very hard at denying, if not their origins, at least the role those origins have played in their own success. I have never heard Jack Javits discuss his Jewishness, or Hugh Carey his Irish Catholicism, or Shirley Chisholm her blackness, as critical elements of their electoral victories, though each is inconceivable apart from those characteristics.)

3. Start stressing some Catholic issues. These fall into three categories.

(a) Catholic religious issues. Of these there are only two: abortion, and aid to parochial schools. Abortion cannot be trifled with: you have your position, it is as good as it can get, and cannot be improved upon in any direction without corresponding loss in the opposite. Nor, I believe, should you be overly concerned about the hierarchy on this issue. Its attempts to regulate the sexual conduct of its parishioners, according to Greeley, has prob-

ably cost the Church more communicants than any other cause since the time of Luther.

What is important is to recognize that the Right-to-Lifers also have a moral sense; they are not against abortion because the Pope sent them a telegram. I know that you know this. The problem here is to avoid over-identification with your pro-abortion supporters, who for the last decade have acted (in states like New York) as if Catholics were pigs, without moral sensibility or intelligence, people who may perhaps be allowed to vote for our candidates, but are not permitted to have candidates of their own. Avoid moral absolutism, and you will be all right.

Aid to parochial schools is a horse of an entirely different complexion. First as to the merits: Catholic elementary and secondary schools now enroll over 4 million schoolchildren, about one out of every 12 in America. They are in increasing financial trouble, and there have been many closings; yet their collapse would add an insuperable burden to already overburdened cities. More important has been the quality of their performance, especially in the inner city. In the New York archdiocese, 60 percent of parochial school students are black and Hispanic; there are literally dozens of parochial high schools, all over the country, where an enormous proportion (up to 90 percent at St. Martin de Poore's in Detroit, where 90 percent of students graduate and 80 percent of those go on to college) of students are blacks, many or most not Catholic. Parents, black and white, send their children to parochial schools because they are virtually the only schools in many places where discipline prevails over chaos, where children can learn, where teachers and administrators act as if they really believe that there is in each child a spark of the divine. Moreover, they are in many instances the last, indispensable cement holding city neighborhoods together: more whites probably move to the suburbs in search of safer schools than for any other single reason. Thus the continuation, indeed the expansion, of the parochial schools is a goal much to be desired.

Next as to the politics: millions of students means millions of parents*, not to mention the tens of millions of Catholics for whom your support of aid to parochial schools would be the most solid and meaningful of signs that you were on their side. For this has always been one of the points of sharpest collision between Catholics and liberals, deeply embittered by that liberal self-righteousness that treats defeats of Catholic interests as triumphs over the devil, equal in moral import (for that is the way our liberals operate) to the war in Vietnam. The very picture of smugness is someone from the ACLU or POAU who has just heard that another parochial aid program has been defeated. The bases are loaded, and this is a home run waiting to be hit.

And it can be constitutionally done. The key, from the recent Court decisions, is that while all direct aid programs are prohibited, as are tax deductions or credits limited to parochial schools, nothing bars the government from extending to parochial schools the same benefits as are extended to other, secular charities. Therefore, to aid the parochial schools, we need only convert the first \$25 or \$50 of the present charitable deduction, into a dollar-for-dollar tax credit. Then the churches can go to their parishioners (not just those with children in school) and say, you have \$25: you can give it to the government, or you can give it to us; the one thing you cannot do is keep it. Under these conditions, not only parochial schools, but also universities, block associations, orchestras, anti-poverty groups -- even the ACLU -- could greatly increase their revenues, in a perfectly constitutional and non-discriminatory fashion. Indeed, the plan could be presented as a measure for tax equity, since those who use the standard deduction (probably 75 percent of those with children in parochial schools) now get no benefit from the charitable de-

*And they are concentrated where you need them. Parochial School enrollment in New York is 750,000, in California 400,000, Pennsylvania 500,000, Illinois 450,000, Ohio 350,000, New Jersey 300,000, Michigan 250,000, Massachusetts 200,000.

duction at all, while it saves the wealthy hundreds of millions.

e Finally, I would be remiss if I did not tell you that however unintentionally, your acceptance speech appeared to many Catholics as a wholly undeserved condemnation of their schools: the more so, since 70 to 80 thousand of those seeking the shelter of "exclusive" private parochial schools every year are black, the great majority of whom cannot pay the tuition but are given scholarships from general church revenues. I am sure that this is not what you meant to condemn; but that is what came across to many. At any rate, the promulgation of the suggested plan can more than make up any damage.

(b) Specific Catholic social issues. The most obvious of these, for the reasons stated earlier, is the tangle of discrimination, affirmative action and quotas. The point is not to reject just claims of blacks and other minorities. It is to recognize two points: First, the government regulations, particularly those coming out of HEW, strike most people as absurd (Ford's greatest single political stroke was probably his order rescinding the HEW directive that would have been banned father-son or mother-daughter functions in schools). Second, others besides blacks and women have suffered discrimination and still do. In this connection, you need make no wild promises: it would be an enormous step, one never taken by any American president, just to observe that there had never been an Italian on the Supreme Court, and very few on the Courts of Appeals.

(c) General Issues which deeply affect Catholic constituencies. On these I am sure you are already well briefed: neighborhoods, cities, the economy. Of all of them, however, I suspect that the one with the greatest potential impact is crime.

This is so for many reasons. First are the facts. It is not just that New York City, to take by no means the worst example, in 1975 had 1675 homicides. It is that in only 857, or 54 percent of the cases, was the victim known to the assailant.

Thus for the first time in our history, the old adage that most violent crimes take place within families and acquaintance circles is coming into question. The fear this engenders is immense.

Second is the incredible response of the legal and political system, which I believe has done more to erode faith in government over the years than all the events of Vietnam and Watergate. People who struggle all their lives to make a living and a life, for themselves and their families, simply cannot accept that a violent intruder -- into their neighborhood, their children's schools, their own person -- should be slapped on the wrist and let loose again. Yet in New York State, the average time served for an adult homicide is three years; a juvenile killer, until the recent amendment of the law, could expect a few months in a custodial center; now the judges may, but are not required to, impose mandatory sentences of up to one year. Once our trouble was that the police, and the rest of the entire system, were ineffably corrupt: Harlem was referred to as "the Gold Coast", where a policeman could make \$50,000 or more out of one corrupt narcotics transaction. Now, after years of commissions and special prosecutors, our problem is that the police and the entire system are ineffably lazy, they have given up; it is more than three years since the Department announced that it would no longer even investigate thefts of property of less than \$1,500. A recent investigation showed that local school administrators were reporting, to the Board of Education, only one-third of the violent incidents in which they had been required to call the police for assistance. There are more homicides committed by juveniles each year than there are total expulsions from the New York City schools. In effect and in fact, our governments have largely abandoned the first duty of any government worthy of the name: the duty to protect their own people.

As you know, the heaviest burden falls on the communities of the poor. The homicide rate in Detroit today is greater than the rate prevailing in Northern Ireland through the worst days of the current civil war. A young black male born in any