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SUBJECT: GROUP OF VOICES

If Carter should be nominated by the Democrats— as still seems likely— we are going to need very strong support from a group which traditionally has been overwhelmingly Republican, but which recently has been increasingly shrinking to some extent drifting away, white Northern Protestants. As Kevin Phillips, Pat Buchanan, and others correctly have pointed out, the liberal and moderate wings of the white Northern Protestant group have increasingly been giving their support to Democratic candidates in New England, New York, and the belt of industrial states stretching from New Jersey to Minnesota. Phillips and Buchanan have not been much bothered by this development, as they have set forth the "New Majority" strategy which they claim will give Republicans a national majority, based on defections among white Southern Protestants and working-class Catholics, as well as on conservative Protestants in the rural areas of the Midwest and West. This strategy frankly writes off all of the Northeast, from Pennsylvania to Maine, and also the Great Lakes states of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and probably Illinois and Iowa. (The strategy holds out some hope of carrying New York, with the help of conservative Catholic ethnic groups.) Whatever their merits of this strategy against Humphrey or Kennedy— both of whom would probably hold most traditional Democrats among working-class Catholics — it will not work against Carter. Carter, who appeals to the new kind of faction among Southerners as John Kennedy did among Catholics, would undoubtedly carry all of the Deep South, leaving a gaping hole in the New Majority electoral strategy. We can not yield to him.
the 30 other States or Florida, among which President Ford should be able
to get a narrow or even split. We also should make a fight for Texas, although
these Carter will have the advantage. But the bottom line remains that we
will have to make up for losses in the South by doing specially well in
New England and the New Jersey-to-Minnesota industrial belt. (I doubt that
we can carry New York.)

These states have widely varied populations, but can be divided into the
following rough categories: conservative Protestants, mainly in rural
areas (though working-class Protestants in the urban areas tend to be
conservatives, at least on social issues); moderate-to-liberal Protestants,
particularly in the suburbs; Catholics; Jews; and blacks. (The size of these
groups of course vary greatly. Jews, except in New York, are relatively few,
but are strategically placed and articulate. The fact that they traditionally
have been so heavily Democratic makes a shift among them particularly
important— as happened in 1972.)

We may hope to make some inroads among black leadership groups against
Carter, but the primaries have indicated that rank-and-file black voters
relate favorably to Carter's personality, regardless of what their leaders
tell them, which will reinforce their strong tendency to vote Democratic
in November. The primaries show that he is not their first choice, but they do not as of
now react strongly against them as they did against Johnson in 1972.
Catholics in the Northern industrial states should be a very important
target, appeals to not only on economic issues, but also through the
kinds of cultural and social initiatives that have been recommended by Bill Brooky. I think, however, that it would be overly optimistic to expect to do as well among Catholics as Nixon did in 1972.

Jews, on the other hand, are definitely concerned about Carter. Originally we should not feed whatever suspicions Jews may feel toward Carter's religious beliefs. But we should make every effort to give liberal Jews "something to hang their hats on" to justify a vote for Ford.

Polls and primarys show that Jimmy Carter has unusual appeal for conservative rural Protestants in the Northeast and Great Lakes states. (Note: for some reason, in the Far West, Republican victory in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin can not be achieved without heavy Republican majorities in the upstate rural counties.) We must solidify the President's cultural appeal to those areas, and make clear that he, unlike many Republicans, does not "take them for granted." I can think of few things that would do the President more good politically than to be identified with a dynamic program for S&AM "rural development."

But to win S&AM in the Northern industrial states we are still going to have to attract strong majorities among the middle-class Protestants concentrated in the suburbs of metropolitan areas who tend to be moderate or liberal in their political attitudes. These groups tend to be favorably disposed toward the President—they supported him strongly in the primaries, and in states where they were few he tended to lose to Reagan. Most of them are from Republican backgrounds, and find it more natural to cast a Republican ballot than the majority of Catholics or Jews. Moreover, their "liberalism"—among those who regard themselves as liberal—
tends to be more social and cultural than economic. Most of them are feeling the bite of taxes, and have been frightened by inflation—they are scared by Humphrey-Dawkins. But we need to reach them on social and moral issues as well. Protestants—even conservative Protestants—tend to be moved by moral concerns. They want to be on the side of the angels. To attract them, it will be most helpful for the President to be identified with a program of “reform.” Fortunately, the elements for such a program are already in place, as set forth in the State of the Union message. As I have mentioned to you before, however, I do not think the elements have been sufficiently identified as a coherent program, or presented as a positive means for achieving social progress. I think we should also seek to establish cultural identification with middle-class Protestants wherever possible—for instance, on a relatively minor matter, I think Archibald MacLeish would be a good choice for the Nobel of Freedom for Literature—both because he is qualified and because he is a representative figure of Protestant (particularly New England Protestant) culture.