

Dear Fellow Democrat:

I CANNOT TAKE REINHARDT'S "I CANNOT TAKE YORTY"

First, I wish as much success to National Committee Reinhardt's dissertation against Mayor Sam Yorty as Mayor Sam Yorty's dissertation against President John F. Kennedy had. It deserves the same.

I do not intend to defend the political life of Mayor Sam Yorty. He can do that without any help from me. I do want to point out, however, that in our Democratic Party there are many mansions. There are Liberal Democrats, Middle of the Road Democrats and Conservative Democrats. I'm glad they are there because they give balance to our Party, and fair and decent action among them gives it its life. None of us, I am sure want nor will we tolerate domination from any one segment or any one group. Our Party is Democratic and everyone has a right to be heard, including Stephen Reinhardt and Mayor Samuel Yorty. But "DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN FOR CALIFORNIA" is so prominent on the "I Cannot Take, etc.," pamphlet, I presume we are all to take his words as the official pronouncements of our Party. If that is the case, then we must read out of the party every Democrat who ever voted for Mayor Sam Yorty. THIS I CANNOT TAKE.

If we condemn one Democrat because he did not support another Democrat at some point in his life, then can we expect an "I Can't Take Unruh" because he did not support Vice President Humphrey in the last Presidential election, or an "I Can't Take Warshaw" because she supported Ronald Reagan in 1966? The "I Can't Takes" become endless and this I CANNOT TAKE.

I agree with Reinhardt that this is a "time for integrity", and if he had any, he would have resigned as National Committeeman before he allowed his name to be affixed to such a cheap political smear, and a very poor one at that.

Let's look at its contents. It has all the elements of a smear.

Make sweeping accusations which will take volumes to answer; use such expressions as "welfare of our party" and "sought to improve our society". They have emotional appeal. Scatter throughout words like "ugly", "junket", "slander and vilify", "gutter tactics", "national scandal" and "master strategist". They're loaded and carry much weight. By all means, accuse your antagonist of being a "Benedict Arnold". No smear worthy of the name should be without a "traitor" paragraph (p. 3). Surround the object of your attack with "sinister forces", but for Heaven's sake don't accuse him of doing the same thing to your side on the same page. People might have short memories, but they do have eyes and they are not stupid. (p. 2) Tell your readers to "review the record" to find out what your foe said about a whole list of prominent people (p. 3 & 4). You know full well that nobody has the time and the implication is clear that he never said anything nice about any of them, which is exactly what you want.

Be certain to devote a page or two to quoting him out of context. This is an old trick but it still gets a lot of mileage.

Don't forget that you've accused him of consistently refusing "to support" Democrats for public office (p. 1, paragraph 1). Don't point out, as on page four, that he publicly offered to endorse Jesse Unruh for U.S. Senate in 1968, who was at that time strong "middle of the road". A lot of changes can take place in two years and it's best not to dwell on that point. Assassinate his political character by calling him a "political Character assassin". (Bottom of p. 4). And charge immediately (top p. 5) that his "campaign tactics surpass the bounds of common decency". This has to be said quickly so your readers won't notice how far your own tactics have surpassed the bounds of common decency.

When you feel you have destroyed your enemy personally, you must bury him with a barrage of charges about his works. It is weak to begin with an old cliché like "wracked by scandal after scandal". A little imagination could make it "scandals rock city hall daily". Then say, as on p. 5, his Commissioners have been indicted, convicted and sent to jail for bribery, etc., but don't say this has happened to only four, as in the following sentence. People don't know there are hundreds of commissioners appointed, and four undeserving people over an eight-year period is not a bad record at all. On the contrary, it makes your adversary look good. In addition, your readers just might know that commissioner are appointed on the recommendation of many prominent people, among them, Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy. So, don't mention numbers. Leave it wide open and people will think everybody is corrupt.

It is foolish, if you expect your smear to work, to try to blame the corruption of other elected officials on your opponent. If you take that illogic, every dishonest man who ever violated the public trust should never be sent to jail, since he cannot possibly be responsible for his own acts. We would be perfectly justified in blaming the Lt. Governor because some State Senator takes a \$5,000.00 bribe. A good tactic, which we find at the bottom of p. 5, is to take national scandals, over which your adversary has no control whatsoever, and wrap them around him. If your readers are not too intelligent, you might make a point or two. It is not good form, however, to blame him for national catastrophies like the Watts Riots (p. 6). The fact that he did not "participate in the decision to call out the National Guard" does not strike me as a good example of his dereliction of duty. I think everyone knows the Governor is the Commander-In-Chief of the Guard. If being 600 Miles distant from the city at that time is cause for criticism what opprobrium must be heaped on Governor Brown who was 10,000 miles away. He was in Greece cruising among the Isles. Are we to look forward to an "I Can't Take Brown, Either", because of it? It is a weak point and should not even be mentioned.

When you say that a man has "earned the reputation" of being anti-labor, people take it to mean that he has worked hard at it, consistently at it over a long period of time. To make believable that charge, you need a lot more than an innocuous statement quoted out of context. Throwing in the National Association of Manufacturers helps, but it is not nearly convincing. Too many laboring people know your adversary's record in this area and they won't buy it. Best not to try.

A good combination of words appears at the top of the last page, "Can long survive". That coupled with "sought to bring to this nation" (p. 1) ties it in with Abraham Lincoln, and everyone feels clean when they read Lincoln. It also gives your smear a classic flavor.

Don't be skimpy in calling him names. There is only one in the whole smear (last page). They ought to appear throughout.

Mr. Reinhardt talks about puppets. I wonder whose marionette he is? Here is the National Committeeman, supposed to represent all Democrats in California, tearing our Party apart in the primary. He intrudes into the Governor's race by smearing a candidate who obviously must be waging a very successful campaign. He, along with a few other puppet party leaders, who long ago lost contact with the people, misused their party offices to promote a political unknown for the office of State Controller. This is the one spot on the ticket where they all ganged up on the only man we know can defeat Houston Flournoy in November, John R. Dean. He must be waging a very successful campaign, too. Everyone knows that was a phony attempt to buy the votes of California's Mexican-American minority for the Hon. Jess Unruh in June. The M.A.P.A. Convention, however, shows their little ploy didn't work. Unruh failed to receive their endorsement.

Unquestionably, Fellow Democrats, National Committeeman Reinhardt's work is a smear. If he truly desires unity in our Party, as he so often proclaims, I suggest he do something really positive to attain that end. He should resign his position at once as National Committeeman. He could also encourage those other "king making" party leaders to do likewise, and LEAVE OUR PRIMARY ALONE. A rigged primary is no primary at all!

Their neat little package of hand picked candidates shows they learned much from their visit to Chicago. However, they have obviously forgotten the lesson of Chicago, don't try to "con" the people. I cannot take it. I hope, for the future of our Party, you cannot take it either. I know the voters will not take it on June 2nd.

Sincerely yours,



E.H. Cain, Chairman
Imperial County Demo. Central Comm.

EHC:ceb